

ernor General's Warrants to be issued to provide the necessary funds to carry on public affairs. Those of us who were here in the first session of this Parliament remember the discussion on the issue of these Warrants, and I do not believe there was a single legal gentleman, who might be said to be well up in his profession, who tried to justify on constitutional grounds the conduct of the Government in this respect. They all said it was a matter of expediency, and that the Government being in such an awkward position, they were bound to raise the money in some way or other. I distinctly remember that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) justified the Government on the ground of expediency, and he stated, that if it were shown that a single cent had been spent corruptly he would vote against the Government. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the Government was in a tight place, and that they had to issue Governor General's Warrants, but he did not want it to be taken as a precedent for others to follow. I believe that the Government made a great mistake in adjourning the meeting of the House until the 19th of August, because after they had decided on issuing Governor General's Warrants, it would be better for them to prorogue Parliament until October or November, when they would have had time to mature their fiscal policy and lay it before the House. They would then have avoided this long delay and this uncertainty, which during many months have interfered greatly with the business of the Dominion. Then, Sir, the Government was embarrassed at the close of last session. They had promised a very great deal to the people; they had told the people that the protective tariff was a villainous system, and that it had robbed them; and in their emergency they hit upon the plan of appointing a commission to interview manufacturers throughout the country. They did this, although they had led the people to believe that they knew all the time what was the best for the country, and that they were ready at any moment with their fiscal policy. Well, Sir, this commission went first to Toronto, and they interviewed the pork packers. I remember very well that Mr. Fearman, who is a large pork packer, told the Finance Minister that that was the time of the year when they had to buy their supplies, and that if the tariff was to remain in a state of uncertainty, they would not be able to pay the farmers so much for their pork as they otherwise would. The Minister of Finance was not quite so generous to the pork packers as he was to the coal men, but perhaps there was not the same occasion for it, and so he threw out no hint to them as to what the tariff in this particular line would be. Mr. Fearman also told the Finance Minister, that he had

tried the pork packing business for two years under a free trade policy, and that he found at the end of these two years, that he was a poorer man than he had ever been in his life before, and had to sell his factory and take the machinery out of it. Then, the tanners interviewed the commissioners, and the tanners told them, that they were all Liberals, that they had always been Liberals, that they were free traders, but that unless the Government did something to prevent the Americans selling leather in this country at less than cost, they would have to close up their tanneries. I am glad to see that neither in the leather nor the pork industries, have the Government reduced the duties. Then, the furniture manufacturers waited upon the commissioners, and I shall read to the House the opinion of a gentleman who said he had been a Liberal all his life time, and had voted for Mr. Mowat for twenty or twenty-five years. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) knows a good deal about Woodstock, and he will probably know Mr. James Hay, to whom I refer. Mr. Hay said:

He could remember when elm was not used in the manufacture of furniture, but only as staves for barrels. Now it was utilized in every factory in Canada. The material was bought from the farmers, and largely increased the price of elm. "The results have, to my mind, justified the use of the National Policy," said the speaker. "I have been a Reformer all my life, and have voted for Sir Oliver Mowat for twenty or twenty-five years; still I think, and I would advise that the policy be not upset. There are a large number of unemployed in this country. It would be a mistake to increase that number. If there was one reason, when Mr. Mackenzie's Government went out of power, why the duties should be increased, there are twenty reasons to-day why more duties should be maintained at a reasonable figure. I think, also, the National Policy has been the means of drawing together the different parts of Canada."

That is the opinion of a gentleman who has been a Reformer all his life, and who I dare say at the inception of the National Policy was strongly opposed to it. However, after Mr. Hay had had an experience of 18 years of the National Policy his opinion was that it was a benefit to the country, that it afforded employment for labouring men and for mechanics, and that it drew the different parts of this country closer together, and tended largely to the development of our natural resources. Now, I think the evidence of this witness ought to weigh somewhat with the Government, and I am glad to see that it did, for so far as I know there has been no reduction in the duties on furniture. They listened to Mr. Hay, possibly because he was an old Reformer, and they had more faith in him than they would have in a wicked Tory. He gave his evidence:

Witness went on to point out that the introduction of the National Policy forced the Singer