

we should have free wheat. And before long what happened? My hon. friend, elected to office purely and simply because of his opposition to reciprocity and because of his opposition to free wheat—because he would have no truck nor trade with the Yankees—soon went to Washington and Wall street, hat in hand, and begged those despised Yankees to lend him money to carry on the Government. What have we to-day without the agreement?—my hon. friend asks. We have free wheat, and he rejoices over the fact. But let him hesitate a bit in his rejoicing. The Canadian Reconstruction Association, which I think is a branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, sent the President, Sir John Willison, to study the question and he came back and reported that the reciprocity agreement which has hitherto remained on the statute book will not hereafter be honoured by the Americans. I will not blame them. For years the Americans were wrong in their negotiations, but there came a time when they were right and willing to forget the past and hold out the hand of fellowship. But unfortunately, owing to the action of hon. gentlemen in condemning all relations with the United States, Canada rejected the hand of fellowship, and if the American people were indignant in consequence, they cannot very well be blamed. But what is the state to-day? The reciprocity agreement is still on the statute book, but the Conservative press says: It is too late to talk of reciprocity now because the Americans will not stand for it. Well then, we have lost the benefit of seven or eight years which we would have had if we had accepted the hand of fellowship when the Americans were willing to stand for reciprocity. We are also told in the press that largely represents my hon. friend, that the whole trend of the United States now is towards high protection. The Republicans have come into power, they say, and there will be a revision of the tariff, and we are told that when that revision takes place it will be upwards in the direction of protection. That is the current story now, the report brought back by Sir John Willison. What does it mean? My hon. friend says we have certain things without the agreement, but we will not have many—according to their own story—so soon as the Americans undertake that revision. With the agreement we could have had these things not only for the last seven years but in the future, because out of that agreement, and through the operation of

it, there would have been an improvement in the relations between the two countries, and I have no doubt that the agreement could have been continued and converted into a treaty. We have lost these benefits for seven years, and according to the testimony of my Conservative friends, we are going to lose them all in the future, for they tell us that although the Americans to-day have given some concessions, they are going to abandon them at an early date.

Now, it is not with any great satisfaction that I am quoting these things regarding my hon. friend's departure from the faith of anti-reciprocity. Of course, I cannot fail to derive some amusement from them, and my hon. friend will admit that I have a good opportunity for that. But he would be a very sad, miserable, selfish, narrow man who, in the midst of his own rejoicing, could fail to take account of the sadness and sorrow felt elsewhere. I am rejoicing in the conversion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) the other day took credit to himself for having educated the minister in the advantages of income tax. Well, if my hon. friend is to be credited with being the preceptor of the minister in that respect, I think I should claim credit for his education in the virtues of reciprocity, which virtues he has suddenly discovered and is commending in so many ways. I am experiencing some of that joy which we are told prevails in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth, but I cannot fail to have some sympathy with those in distress. I cannot help thinking of the people of Toronto—good old Tory Toronto—who shouted for the hon. gentleman and made a hero of him simply because he was opposed to reciprocity, and for no other reason. Nor can I help having sympathy for those seventeen hon. gentlemen who broke away from the Liberal party because they would have nothing to do with the United States.

I cannot help feeling sympathy with the noble army of British-born and the Sons of England who rallied by the hundreds and thousands to defend the Old Flag against this dreadful crime. I cannot help but reflect upon the sadness and sorrow that enters their soul to-day as they find the hon. gentleman has broken away from the faith. And last, but not least, I cannot help but think of the anguish of that good Tory constituency of Leeds—Leeds that elected George Taylor. That is the kind of constituency Leeds was. Our dear old friend who has passed away was the embodiment of all that was Tory. Leeds elected