

L. Borden) in the west; and he also told us that he is not a high protectionist. It is true, no doubt, that the hon. member was with his leader in the west; it is equally true that we did not find him talking high protection or increase of duties when he was on that western tour. If the hon. member is not a high protectionist, I would like to know when he was converted, and under what influence that conversion was brought about. I remember that he took part in the debate on the Budget in the last session of parliament, and I made hasty, but correct, extracts from his speech on that occasion, and I will inflict them upon the House. He said:

I look upon a 20 per cent tariff as a very moderate tariff. I think that should have been increased on the bulk of agricultural implements and not diminished.

I would like to know whether the hon. member for Brantford on that western tour when he talked to the farmers of Saskatchewan and Alberta told them as he told this House last session that he thought a 20 per cent tariff was a very moderate tariff and that it should have been increased on the bulk of agricultural implements and not diminished. Again he said:

Then why should we jeopardize the \$500,000,000 of capital embarked in these manufacturing industries in order to give a very slight advantage to the agriculturist?

Did he tell the farmers of Alberta and Saskatchewan that it was a shame and a disgrace to jeopardize the \$500,000,000 of capital embarked in the business of manufacturing, that the agriculturists might be benefited? Who is this agriculturist whom he holds in such light esteem and for whom he has so little consideration? The man who came into the forest of these older provinces, hewed down the trees, drained the swamps, gathered the stones from the fields, and tilled the soil and made the highways; the farmer who went into the Northwest when that country was but a buffalo pasture and made for himself a home—this is the man for whom the hon. gentleman has so little sympathy that he thinks nothing should be done to give him even a slight advantage. And yet I will say for the hon. member for Brantford that he has been more honest in his speeches than some of his colleagues in this House. I remember when last session the duty on agricultural implements was reduced from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent some speakers on the Conservative side said there would be no resulting advantage to the farmer. But the hon. member for Brantford admitted that there would be a benefit for the farmer, even though he thought that benefit should not have been given. He said:

I doubt whether it will give him an advantage of more than \$2.50 on a mower or a reaper, and for that you jeopardize an import-

ant Canadian industry. It is a retrograde step. This country has gone too far in the direction of adequate protection to home industries to take such a retrograde step towards free trade.

Nice language for a man who is not a high protectionist. And again, from the same speech:

I may say that I think most of the reductions are not well advised in a general way. I think that any reductions that have been made would have been better not made, and that in some instances there should have been an increase where the reduction has been made.

Again I ask, is that the speech with which the hon. member favoured his audiences in Alberta and Saskatchewan? I point out that it has been said of the leader of the opposition that in framing his platform, every plank was left with a loop-hole, every declaration with a way of escape, that he was prepared to sail with any breeze that blew. And I say the same of the rank and file of the Conservative party that follow him in this House.

When the hon. gentleman who just preceded me, the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), spoke in this House last session on the budget debate, and when he stood up as a man in favour of a higher tariff, as a man who did not believe that any consideration ought to be given to the poor agriculturists that would jeopardize the Canadian manufacturer, every man behind him on the opposition benches applauded to the echo and cheered him loudly. A little while afterwards, in the same session, another member of the same party occupying the same benches, got up and moved that the duty upon agricultural implements be reduced ten per cent. Is that not hypocrisy? The same gentlemen who cheered the hon. member for Brantford who said that no reduction ought to be made but rather an increase, cheered with equal vigour members from agricultural constituencies in the western provinces who moved for a reduction of the duty to ten per cent. I have no doubt but that those Conservative members from the rural constituencies who moved for a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements will go into the next general election and tell their constituents how they moved for a reduction in the duty, but the wicked Grits helped to vote it down.

Again, I was amazed as well as surprised when I heard the hon. gentleman from Brantford speaking with a great deal of sympathy and consideration for the United States ports; he said there was a danger that the United States ports would suffer a loss of revenue because of the provisions of the French treaty, inasmuch as the Grand Trunk Railway, under that treaty, would not be able to bring the goods in by way of Portland and the American lines would not be able to bring in goods from