

out considering the fact that they are here for the first time, we can congratulate them upon the way in which they have acquitted themselves, and in days to come we shall be able slightly to parody the words of Samson and say that out of the producers hath come forth meat and out of the strong hath come forth sweetness. Perhaps the lady member will furnish the sweetness.

Now, it better becomes me to make complimentary remarks about this party, because I am not attached to it. I do not attend its caucus, but I have received kindness from its whip in the matter of arranging my seat in the House. I desire therefore to thank the Progressive party and express my appreciation of the courtesy it has shown me, a political stranger in a political strange land. But while I am not attached to the party, I find myself heartily in accord with a great part of its policies, except, unfortunately, in regard to the tariff. It is perhaps a matter of regret that the leader of the Progressive party was not able to visit British Columbia during the election. Had he done so it is more than probable he would have received greater support than he did. When speaking on the tariff the other day he was at some pains to modify somewhat the impression we had in British Columbia, during the election, that he was an absolutely out and out devotee of free trade. He was at some pains, I say, to modify that view; but I could not help observing, as I listened to the speeches of his lieutenants, more particularly the able one made by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) and that of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), that they, on the other hand, were not at all equivocal in expressing themselves as advocates of free trade first, last and all the time. While that is a natural attitude for them to take, as coming from the prairies—if I were a representative of the prairies I would also be a free trader—but coming as I do from British Columbia, I cannot, I am afraid, follow them in that regard.

British Columbia wants protection. That remark, I notice, gets some little applause from the members from Vancouver. Well, I am glad to establish a point of contact with my Conservative fellow members from British Columbia, but in this case it will be only temporary, because the kind of protection which is wanted in the district from which I come is not the kind of protection my hon. friends want, which is that of the policy advocated and worked for by

[Mr. Neill]

the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. In that regard, if I may be allowed to digress for a moment, I might mention an incident that is typical and indicative of much. Shortly after I was nominated I received a letter from Vancouver, I may mention that Vancouver is not in the district I represent, being probably 150 miles away from it, except for one small portion of the district that runs a little in that direction. I got a letter from a gentleman who represents the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and was resident in Vancouver. The first paragraph of the letter warmly congratulated me upon my nomination. I thought that was all right, and said to myself: "Here is a man, at least, after my own heart." I very soon found, however, that it was not my heart he was after. The second paragraph expressed the hope that I would not misunderstand him when he said that he trusted I should not get in. That was somewhat of a shock. It was rather like Isaac of old, but Isaac, when he blessed Jacob, did not in the next breath revoke the blessing. But I was compelled to accept the dictum—the Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken away, and I managed to swallow that. But when I went on to his next paragraph I got a further shock. He said he felt sure that I would have no trouble in signing a couple of pledges which he enclosed for me—"put your name on the dotted line" sort of business. I am sorry I have not that letter with me, but I have left it at home. I intend to have it framed, Mr. Speaker, as a concrete presentment of the sublimity of human assurance. That is expressing myself in a somewhat classic form. In the West we use more rugged language than you gentlemen in the East, and there we would describe it in two words, each of four letters, with a preposition in between. We would say, It was a something of a something. But as we must try to conform to the culture of the East, I will repeat that I regard it as a concrete presentment of the sublimity of human assurance. I think hon. members will agree with me in that description when I tell them what was in the letter. The first pledge required me entirely and absolutely to vote for high protection for the benefit of the eastern manufacturers. That was not the exact way in which it was worded, for, as you know, these things are put more discreetly. I do not know whether the word "high" was used; probably it was the