

So you will see the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman.

Then came the tariff revision of 1894, when agricultural implements, lumber and barbed wire were reduced; binder twine was reduced and coal oil was made 7½ cents, though, before the session closed it was reduced to 6 cents. It would be interesting to see what the hon. member for Western Assiniboia said at that time. In the "Leader" 29th March, 1894, he spoke thus:

You see the hon. gentleman had been making a pretense of advocating a reduction along these various lines, for the purpose of standing in with his constituency; and when the Government did make certain reductions, taking some of the duty off agricultural implements, this is what the hon. gentleman said in his paper:

From a commercial and political standpoint, the tariff reductions are bold throughout, and, looking at them all round, are eminently satisfactory.

When the Conservatives reduced the duty on coal oil to six cents a gallon, it was "eminently satisfactory." When the Conservatives reduced the duty on agricultural implements to 20 per cent, it was "eminently satisfactory." What has occurred since to change the hon. gentleman's view? Is it because he sits in Opposition? We know from his own words that he was quite content, when sitting under the whip of his party, to vote against the way he was talking in the House—in one case even voting against his own motion, I am told.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says that he is told that I voted against my own motion. Will the hon. gentleman say who told him, and, as far as parliamentary etiquette will allow me, I will brand that hon. gentleman as he deserves.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not see the point of order in the remarks made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. I will try to put it properly, to suit you, Mr. Speaker. The point of order I make is that the hon. member for Lisgar states that somebody told him that I had voted against my own motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no point of order in that.

Mr. DAVIN. He should give the name.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had moved a motion and voted against it. What I said was that it had been reported to me that he had done so. It was a matter of common report in the North-west, and from the most inconsistent record of the hon. gentleman, I do not think there is an hon. gentleman here but would be surprised if he did not make a motion and vote against it. I will sit down for a moment to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to deny the statement, and if he does deny it, I will look up the record.

Mr. DAVIN. Deny what statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The statement that has been made to me. He declines to deny it, Mr. Speaker, and I will go on.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not do anything of the kind. I wanted to know what statement I was to deny. I say that the statement which the hon. gentleman makes, he knows, that is, the statement made by any one, that I voted against a motion of my own, is false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that. He is saying that the hon. gentleman is making a declaration which he knows is not true.

Mr. DAVIN. No. I said he quotes somebody—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Take it back.

Mr. DAVIN. Take what back?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the statement made by the hon. member for Lisgar was not correct, and that he knew that it was false.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman quoted somebody as saying that I voted against a motion of my own. I said that somebody, whoever he is, that told the hon. gentleman that, if anybody told him, stated what was false. Is that out of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Where is the cheering now?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Evidently, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has lost his temper. I am not surprised at it, in view of the record which I have been able to lay before the House this afternoon; and I am sure that when his constituents read what the record is, he will be disposed to lose his temper to a much greater degree than he has on the present occasion. I may go on now with his record:

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved in amendment to the motion for Committee of Supply on 1st April, 1894, the effect of which amendment was to lower the duties on agricultural implements and the necessities of life. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia opposed that and asserted:

That, if the Opposition were in power, they dare not reduce the tariff lower than it has been reduced in the measure just brought down. The changes were too radical to suit Laurier and his friends; it left them but little to complain of, and for that reason they were not pleased.

The hon. gentleman says that if the Liberals were in power, they dare not reduce the duty below 20 per cent; yet he demands now that the duty must be swept away altogether. If it is any worse to introduce a resolution and then vote against it, than