

HON. MR. PERLEY—I am a young member of this House, and I desire on all occasions to treat every hon. member with that courtesy and gentlemanly treatment to which he is entitled, and I wish to say now that this afternoon I may have been a little rash in the remarks I made to my hon. friend across the House. But if I was, it was because I thought he was bringing up a matter that took place in the corridor, and that I was being misrepresented. However, if I used any improper language on that occasion I may say I am sorry for it, because I do not desire to do anything that would tend to detract from the honor and dignity of this House. I did think that the hon. gentleman, in referring to the members of the other House, was rather discourteous and unkind and, perhaps, that led me to express the feeling I felt. I think it is our duty here to guard and look after the interests of the people of this Dominion impartially. We are here, not by the popular voice of the country. We are here supposed to represent the interests of the country as a whole, and we are here as nominees of the Government, because the Government supposes we are men who are able to represent the best interests of the country, and that we have those interests at heart. For these reasons I feel more anxious to give that care and attention to all measures that come before Parliament that their importance demands, because if I had to appeal to the people for my seat I would have a check on my conduct that would necessitate my giving that care and attention to my parliamentary duties that the country expects. I feel that the same responsibility rests upon me as a Senator—that if I wish to keep in touch with the people of Canada, I should be in sympathy with them. I am one of the members of this House who was a strong supporter of the National Policy. I used every influence, when I formerly resided in the Lower Provinces, to encourage and support the Government in the enactment of what is known as the National Policy. I am more than a protectionist. I would advocate almost a prohibitive tariff, if I considered it an advantage to the country, but that idea has been knocked clean out of me. I had that idea before I went to the North-West, for I felt that in a small country like Canada we should foster our own industries, and

that it was necessary to have a strong amount of protection to establish native industries and build up our country, and make it the great and powerful nation that I still hope to see her. I found, when canvassing for the National Policy, that I was met with the argument that prices of home-manufactured goods would increase, that a few men would become millionaires at the expense of the many. My answer was that there was some force in the argument; that the disposition of all manufacturers was to get all that they could out of an investment, and that they would not manufacture at the start as cheaply as they would ultimately, and consumers would have to pay a higher price for a time; but we looked forward to the future when better facilities for manufacture and close competition would bring the prices of all articles down to a proper level. We experienced the high prices that were predicted by gentlemen on the other side of the question; I have experienced them myself. I know what I had to pay for agricultural implements in the North-West, in consequence of the newness of the National Policy, but what are we now met with? We are now met with monopoly to still keep up the high prices, and the argument that I advanced that over-production would keep down prices is killed at once, because we have undertaken to maintain and sustain a monopoly in this country which I know has for its purpose the keeping up of prices beyond what they ought to be. For that reason, I am strongly opposed to any system of monopoly. We have a law on the Statute-book now, but it is rendered inoperative by the words in question now before the House. The object is to handicap the law so as to make it impossible to put it in operation—and to prevent ordinary men with ordinary means from undertaking to enforce the law as it should be enforced. That is the reason I say that these words should be struck out, and the law made as forcible as possible. My hon. friend complains that we have not stuck to the question before the House. I tell hon. gentlemen that the country will not tolerate a system of combines. It is against our prosperity, and will take any nation by the throat that countenances any such system, and no honest or patriotic man will stand up in Parliament and assist in