

pupils of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition. They took hold of this question right on the eve of an election. They said to themselves: This is a good election cry; it is something we can sweep the province with; and Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, in 1892, advocated prohibition and said to the people: We will have a plebiscite, and if you vote for prohibition you will get it. What was the result? There were 45,573 voters on the lists in Manitoba at that time; 18,637 voted for prohibition and only 7,115 against. Did they get prohibition? Why, the Liberal leader took the same position in Manitoba as the Liberal leader has taken in the Federal House here. Mr. Greenway simply pigeon-holed the result and allowed the matter to stand as it stands at the present time. Although he had two and a half times as many votes in favour of prohibition in Manitoba as had been cast against it he still refused to act. The province of Ontario was in the same position under a Liberal Government. But another election was coming on in Manitoba at a time when the Greenway Government was discredited and was in a very tight box. The people of Manitoba are an easy people, at least they were once very easily fooled and cajoled by the Liberal leaders. In 1898 Mr. Greenway again submitted the question of prohibition. This time prohibition was carried by a majority of 9,000. Still there was no prohibition. The leaders of the Liberal party never implemented the pledge they gave to the people. It would seem that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to-day and the great Liberal leaders of Canada had been close and apt students of the German historian Bernhardt, who had taught that no pledge or promise should be kept unless it redounded to the interest of the party or state that was affected. That is what caused this great war that is going on to-day. The British Government, in its own defence, and in defence of its honour, determined to keep the promise it had given to the Belgians to protect the neutrality of their country. If the Liberal party of Canada had had control of a situation of that kind they would have had no difficulty in getting out of the responsibility as they have got out of other pledges that they have given to the people of Canada. I have devoted all the time I intend to give to this phase of the question.

MR. CARVELL: Hear, hear.

MR. BRADBURY: I think I have convinced even the hon. member for Carleton,

N.B. (Mr. Carvell), that it is not safe for the Liberal party to charge this side of the House with not implementing its pledges. I now wish to discuss one or two phases of the present Budget as referred to by our hon. friends on the other side of the House. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, during his discussion of the subject said:

But the general tariff to-day, as amended is such as to diminish the value and destroy the purpose of the preferential tariff to Great Britain.

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, that nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken from the Opposition benches has dealt with. The fact is that when you go into this matter you find that the changes in the tariff have not materially changed the preference given to the British manufacturer. The British manufacturer occupies the same position relatively that he did before. The proposition before the House increases the general tariff by $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and makes only 5 per cent of a reduction in the British preferential tariff which still leaves the preference in favour of Great Britain $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent better than it was before. Just an illustration; take item 453 in the Customs Tariff and you will find that on machinery the British preferential tariff was 15 per cent and the general tariff $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That is what it was before this change took place. That gave Great Britain a preference of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Now the new tariff adds 5 per cent to the British preferential tariff rate and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to the general rate. That makes the duty, under the British preferential tariff, 20 per cent and, under the general tariff, 35 per cent, giving a preference in favour of Great Britain of 15 per cent or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent better than it was. The same thing applies to item 567 which deals with clothing. Under the old tariff the preferential duty was 30 per cent and the general rate 35 per cent, giving Great Britain a preference of only 5 per cent. The new tariff, which we designate as a war tax, although that is disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite, adds 5 per cent to the British preferential tariff and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to the general tariff. The result is that we find that the duty on clothing from Great Britain is 35 per cent, while the duty under the general tariff is $42\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The preference given to Great Britain in that case is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent better than it was.

It is very difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, how hon. gentlemen opposite make