

which prohibit competition and maintain monopolies.

"That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure, has proved in many instances oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the consuming classes, and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits; is unfair and unequal in its incidence, and has been productive of discontent, verging on disloyalty, among those who suffer from its injustice.

"That no sufficient reason has been adduced, or exists, requiring investigation respecting the foregoing facts, which are notorious, nor justifying delay in the passage of remedial legislation, which is imperative."

And the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, on that occasion shirked the vote. But he explained the matter in an article he sent to the Regina "Leader," that court journal to which I have already referred. If you will allow me, I will read the reasons which the hon. gentleman gave for his course. I think they will be extremely interesting to the House. I shall quote very briefly:

"Any resolution impugning the existing fiscal policy is, as demonstrated on the strictly party vote on Mr. McCarthy's motion, regarded as one expressing want of confidence in the Government. It was impossible for Mr. Davin, advocating a protective tariff, to support a resolution condemning such a tariff and suggesting unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but we do not exaggerate when we say that Mr. McCarthy's proposals of reduction of customs met with the private approval of many members of both parties. It is easily understood that, with party discipline—

No matter what the hon. gentleman thought in private, we see what he did when it came to a vote in the House. I will not say as I said last session—

Mr. DAVIN. You may say anything you like.

Mr. RICHARDSON. For fear of being called to order I shall not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) took to the woods. I will merely say that he retreated to the tall timber.

Mr. DAVIN. Turn to the page of the same volume, where you will see that I brought down the Government majority to 14.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is getting uneasy now.

Mr. DAVIN. Not a bit of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman had better wait until I get through; I have a good many other things to remind him of.

And I would call special attention of the House to this sentence:

—with party discipline carried to the extreme to which it is in this country, individual action must be controlled by party reasons. Parliamentary procedure here leaves the private members no initiative. Expression of honest and true opinion is restricted. The individual responsibility of the people's representatives is overshadowed by the power of the Cabinet."

I think that the House will agree with me after listening to these sentences, that when it was charged recently that the hon. gentleman

Mr. RICHARDSON.

had crawled under the barn, the statement was warranted by the facts. The article continues:

"Members of Parliament, in order to be supporters of the Government, would not require to be extreme protectionists, just as there would no longer be a necessity for a Liberal being a free trader."

Now, in order to keep up the ruse with his constituents, on Monday, 13th February, 1893, the hon. member moved as follows:—

"That it is the opinion of this House that the duty on barbed wire, on agricultural implements, on coal oil and on cotton should be reduced so as to give no more than reasonable protection, and that the duty on binder twine should be abolished."

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was willing to have reasonable protection then, but he is extremely anxious now to have it abolished.

But he never pressed that motion to a vote. He conveniently took to the woods.

The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) had previously introduced a resolution to make binder twine free, but this the hon. member for Western Assiniboia had opposed. I will read a brief extract from his speech as reported in his own paper:

"Mr. Foster had promised to make known the Government policy on the tariff, and in the face of such a request he (Davin) could not have voted for the motion. Had he done so, he would have been supporting what, coming from a member of the Opposition, was practically a vote of want of confidence in the Government."

And yet my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and others argue that members on this side would be derelict in their duty—in fact, would be behaving outrageously—if they did not vote want of confidence in the Government of 1898—

Now, in the session of 1893, Mr. Cleveland had a motion for free coal oil, and respecting this, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia sent the following to his paper on 13th February, 1893:—

"A proposal was now before the House to abolish the duty on coal oil. He (Davin) could not go that far,—

But he has no hesitation in seeking to hold up the Government to ridicule, because they have not taken the duty entirely off coal oil—

—but that the duty should be reduced. Speaking on binder twine, he (Davin) made a strong appeal for free binding twine for the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west."

Members from the west can congratulate the hon. gentleman on any strong appeals he may make, but we would like to see him at least consistent enough to vote as he speaks in the House.

Then came the visit of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and Hon. Mr. Angers to the west, when the hon. member for Western Assiniboia proclaimed that what was wanted was free lumber, coal oil, agricultural implements, barbed wire, &c. He pointed out that coal oil at Regina was 50 cents a gallon. Yet when Mr. Cleveland's motion was up to put it on the free list, the hon. gentleman voted against it.