

was that wickedness? There was a proposal made absolutely to have an exchange of trade with the United States. My hon. friend could not stand that; he could not stand it for a moment. He, followed by seventeen other gentlemen, formed the Noble Eighteen of Toronto, shook the dust of Liberalism from their feet, and from that time forward identified themselves with the enemies of Liberalism. On that great issue we lost the valuable services of my good friend the Minister of Finance of to-day. And now what do we find? I find the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden) in the very interesting speech he gave us the other day using this argument:

I would like to remind hon. gentlemen opposite that some of the best features in the Budget the Finance Minister has brought down are features to which they gave devoted allegiance in a pact which was introduced only a few years ago

So we are asked by the hon. member for Brandon to recognize the fact that the Minister of Finance, who could not stand for any "truck or trade with the Yankees" in 1911, is now bringing down a Budget which contains many of the best features of the reciprocity agreement. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" was the slogan in 1911. It is true that the Minister of Finance has modestly disclaimed the authorship of that expression, but it was used in the campaign very generally, and no matter who was its author it was a correct and brief account of the campaign waged against the Liberal party of that time.

We have some further testimony. I find the very friendly Ottawa Journal, in its clever column of Parliamentary Correspondence, has the following on the subject:

As for reductions (net) on agricultural implements, western low tariff men should have no complaint in regard to them. They are the precise reductions provided for in Mr. Fielding's Reciprocity Act, Sir Thomas White having apparently taken the former's 1911 proposals as his 1919 model. The same thing may be said of wheat, wheat flour and potatoes. They are made free just as was provided for by reciprocity with the added step towards Cobdenism, that they are made free not alone to the United States, but to any country which makes them free to us.

Then I come to the address of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). He gave us some testimony which is not quite as agreeable as I should like, but I must give it as it reads. He said:

I want to remind the leader of this Government, (Sir Robert Borden) and his Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) and his Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) that every one of them came into power in 1911 as protection-

ists; I want to know why they deserted their colours—why they were afraid to mention the word "protection" in this House, and why, when it comes to delivering the Budget speech, apology must be made all along the line for every tariff item, and not a word with regard to protection or adequate defence of the industries of this country. I say this with all kindness, but I mean it to be understood, and I trust it is. The right honourable gentleman who leads this House came into power in 1911 on the reciprocity cry, and without that protectionist cry I believe he would have been in the cold shades of Opposition up to the present time.

So do I.

The Minister of Finance did the same, and although the Minister of Railways was in the House before that, he was a thoroughgoing protectionist up to that time, but even he never mentions the word "protection." I say that this Government have no mandate to do what the Finance Minister proposes and that I for one have no confidence in what they are going to hunt for. That is plain talk. I say I have no confidence in what they are going to hunt for. Why? Because every move they have made has been contrary to the platform on which they were elected. I assert, therefore, that the proposals of the minister are quite different to the platform on which he was elected, because he was elected on a policy which was opposed to reciprocity or to free trade with the United States. He has gone back on that policy in very many ways. Two years ago he granted free wheat, which was one of the greatest bones of contention in that tariff schedule of 1911.

So you have testimony, not from me, though I try to give impartial testimony, but from parties more directly friendly to the Government, including its loyal supporter the hon. member for Brantford, that the policy which these gentlemen have brought down now is in gross and flagrant violation of the policy on which they drove the Liberal Party out of power in 1911. I understood that the Minister of Finance this afternoon—and I again apologize for not having the pleasure of listening to his address—made the remarkable statement that the only objection he had to the reciprocity arrangement was that there was an agreement. I have read that passage in his speech once or twice, and I am bound to say I do not know what it means. I do not know whether he cares to explain what he meant when he said that his only objection was that there was an agreement.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If I recollect aright, I said that the chief objection I had was the same objection that Hon. George Brown had when the question of renewing the reciprocity agreement arose after 1866. The objection that he had was that no agreement should be entered into so as to bring the Canadian tariff into