

1911, when the Liberal party were defeated in trying to reduce, in a measure, the high tariff of this country, we have on many occasions moved resolutions to show that we still stand by the principles that we stood for at that time.

We are told by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) that this is not the time or the place to bring in a resolution of this kind. It certainly is the place, Mr. Speaker; I do not know what the Acting Prime Minister would consider to be a proper time. If we brought it in, as he suggests, in the Budget debate, it would still be a motion of want of confidence. There is no proper time, according to his way of thinking, for hon. gentlemen on this side to bring in a resolution which in any way interferes with the policy of the Government.

The Acting Prime Minister said that many things would have to be settled before this matter could be taken up. It is true that many things have to be settled, but in many parts of the country, particularly the part of it from which I come, where the same problems have to be solved, the people do not consider this an inopportune time to give attention to the tariff. Perhaps more men went overseas from my province than from any other, consequently, there will be more to come home. The fathers of these men and the people generally throughout that country think that this is the proper time to consider matters relating to the tariff. Not only do the farmers, representing seventy-five per cent of the population, hold this view, the three provincial legislatures have unanimously adopted resolutions in favour of action being taken. The Conservatives in the western provinces must be different from those in this part of the country, because these resolutions were supported by the Conservative Oppositions in the three legislatures to which I have referred. Surely the Acting Prime Minister cannot say that this is a political move; that it is made for the purpose of gaining something for party, when he knows that the Conservative Opposition in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba unanimously voted for resolutions in favour of tariff reduction.

A few days ago a platform was laid before this House—that of the United Farmers—that everybody engaged in agricultural pursuits stands for. The Western Legislatures stand for it; the tillers of the soil and the organized farmers of the three Western Provinces stand for it. It is not surprising that Liberals, particularly those who went down to defeat on the same ques-

tion some years ago, should stand for it; and in doing so they should not be accused of trying to make political capital. An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is, perhaps, as fluent and as well-informed as any to be found there, speaking the other day in favour of the large interests which this resolution is directed against, said that Toronto alone paid more income tax than the whole of the four Western Provinces. I believe that is absolutely correct, but it is an unfortunate condition when an area of not more than ten square miles can produce more wealth than the large areas of the Western Provinces. The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), came, perhaps, nearer the mark than any other when he said that the average income from exports of the farmers in the West was about \$700 per capita. I think that is pretty nearly correct, and the farmers who work so hard for what they receive want to reduce a little the income of the large interests and at the same time increase their own.

When the income tax law came into force a year ago many farmers found it difficult to strike a balance and find out what their net receipts were. I have in mind one farmer in the West who, if not the most intelligent man in his district, was as progressive as any other. I cite his case in order to show that the conditions in the West are not what they should be. This man, living in one of the most fertile parts of the country, with land and stock to the value of about \$50,000 found that his credit balance last year was \$95. True, the year was not one of the best, but he is no small farmer. His gross income was over \$7,000, but his expenses were almost the same amount. When you consider that we are paying over twice as much for a plough as we did five years ago, twice as much for wagons, harness, machinery of all kinds, and supplies, it is no wonder that this man's expenses were within \$95 of his gross income. You will admit that the farmer whose gross receipts are \$7,000 is a great deal more than an average farmer. Besides some hundreds of acres of land, this man had a splendid stock. He had over one hundred head of cattle and possibly forty or fifty horses. I have known him for thirty years, and I know that he has never used anything but registered sires for breeding purposes. He has improved his stock until probably it is the best in the country. Yet he found himself in the position that I have stated, and was obliged to borrow some \$2,000 to carry himself over.