

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I informed the House these figures were given before the Tariff Commission in Winnipeg and I never heard them disputed. If I did not believe them to be strictly accurate I would not repeat them in this House.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the McCormacks give these figures ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know anything of what the McCormacks gave. My belief is, from corroborative statements given to me, that these figures are strictly accurate. I was going on to say that the figures show that instead of paying 20 per cent, the settlers are paying at least 25 per cent for these implements. I would urge upon the Government, inasmuch as they have not seen fit to reduce the duty on binders, the desirability of having the restriction of this arbitrary valuation removed, and so enable the settlers in the country to secure their implements at the valuation which, I believe, is placed upon the implements in the United States. There is another important point to be considered in this connection. American machinery is universally acknowledged by the settlers throughout Manitoba and the North-west to be much superior to the Canadian-made article. In order to satisfy myself upon that point, I made careful inquiries from a considerable number of settlers; and when I was out visiting my old homestead about 50 miles from here, a couple of weeks ago, I questioned my brother and a number of his fellow farmers on that point, and they all assured me that the American implement was a much better one than those manufactured in Canada. Now, if that is so, you will recognize the importance of having these restrictions removed in order that the settlers may have the best implements at the lowest price. I am told that the life of an American implement is much longer than that of a Canadian implement. It is only fair for me to say, however, in that connection, that I discussed that point in Ottawa a few days ago with the general manager of the Massey-Harris Company and he asserted positively that the Canadian implement was equal in every respect to the American implement, that the steel was as good, that the iron was as good, and that in fact everything that enters into the manufacture of that implement, was equally as good as that used in the United States. In order to be perfectly fair, I present these two statements, the one from men who have no interest in saying that the Canadian implement is inferior, the other from a gentleman who is interested in saying that it is not; and I will leave the House to judge which evidence they wish to accept. Now, let us take ploughs. The Canadian article, according to such evidence as I have been able to procure in the North-west, never would suit the farmers. Of 80 gang-ploughs sold in Portage la Prairie

last season, 72 were of American make. I am sure the House will be astonished at that fact. It must be remembered that our exports must pay for our imports, and pay the interest on the national debt and on foreign loans. The agricultural exports for 1896 amounted to \$48,531,000, while the manufacturers' exports amounted to the paltry sum of \$2,249,000. It is true that in the rough the manufactured articles exported were put down at 25 million dollars, but this improperly includes 17 million dollars for lumber, the most important article of export next to agricultural products. It will therefore be seen that the exports of farm products paid for the imports. In view of these figures, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that instead of going any distance to assist manufacturers, this House should with one voice be in favour of assisting the agriculturists of Canada. It is said that the manufacturers have some 370 million dollars invested in Canada, and these figures are always used for the purpose of influencing Parliament to protect those industries. But I would make a plea for the farmers of Canada, who have not only 370 million dollars invested, but who have, I think, according to a moderate estimate, about 3 billion dollars invested in this country. They are the class, Mr. Speaker, who should receive the first consideration. Let me read to you a telegram which I received an hour or two ago. An announcement was sent up to the west this afternoon saying that the members from the West would raise their voices on this question; and I received this dispatch:

R. L. Richardson, M.P.,  
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Although products of the mines are insignificant in value, compared with the wheat yield of Manitoba, the Government makes mining machinery free, and leaves the duty on agricultural implements. Tell the House that the greatest mine in the country is the golden fields of Manitoba grain. The inference is obvious.

I am sure that those who have visited the province of Manitoba during harvest time, and all who have studied the figures of the agricultural exports, particularly the wheat exports of Manitoba, will agree with me in saying that Manitoba is indeed a gold mine, and that the farmers of that province should be considered infinitely before the mines of British Columbia.

Now, in connection with the duty on agricultural implements I wish to refer to another industry, and to give you a few facts with reference to the iron industry of Canada. I do so more especially as it has a very important bearing on the duty on agricultural implements. The Canadian duty is \$4 per ton (short), or \$4.48 the long ton of 2,240 pounds. If the Nova Scotia product were given to the manufacturer free of cost and delivered free of cost, he could not use it, because it is too hard; it lacks flexibility. In order to make a good mar-