

come that they will be required to do without the support they have enjoyed for so many years past. Why should such a state of things be perpetuated? Looking at the matter from a western standpoint, we regard the manufacturing interests, especially those of machinery in this light: If our manufacturers cannot, to-day, after eighteen years of special advantage, give us as good and as cheap an article as we can get elsewhere, we feel that we are not justly dealt with when we are called upon to support them any longer.

Now, there are many things in the tariff Bill which we would be disposed to accept as a fair instalment of what the Government is likely to do, and we shall be able to return to our people, I hope, with a good deal of encouragement arising out of what has been done in their favour. Yet there are a few things which we must bring under the notice of the Government, and we are not, I am sorry to say, in a position to adopt without dissent all that has been done. One point to which we take exception is the duty on agricultural implements. If we hold, as we do, that the protection principle has not done the west any great service, then we regret that the new Government, in the new tariff, should do more for the manufacturer than the old Government did, because the duty remains the same as under the old Government on agricultural implements, but they have increased the privileges of the manufacturers. I understand why it is that they have conceded to the wishes of the manufacturers. To-day they find themselves not able to compete with the Americans in the production of machinery of the best grades. They needed some reduction on steel and iron to put them on an equal footing with their American competitors. Now, we would like to go back to our people and be able to say that under the new tariff the oppressor has not been strengthened, that his privileges are not greater than they were formerly, I would be better pleased to be able to say that the duty remains unchanged. But we shall be obliged to state that the manufacturer of agricultural implements has greater privileges under the new tariff than he had under the old, without any consideration being given to the consumer. Well, there is a way out of this difficulty. We have been reminded by the members of the Government that this is not an ideal tariff. If it can be shown that an injustice has been done, they will be ready and willing to repair it; if a change is necessary, they will take it into their serious consideration. We would like to get out of the difficulty in this way. A large business in machinery is being done by the United States in the west, and when the duty is imposed upon the machine, it is not the duty upon the invoice price, or the commercial price of the American machine, but is a duty imposed by the customs-house officer according to his judg-

ment in the case. A machine that can be bought in the United States for \$65 or \$80 is valued at \$100, and the people of the west have to pay a duty on \$100 instead of a duty on \$65 or \$80. Now, I would like to throw out a hint this afternoon, that if the Government will see fit to alter their law in reference to the valuation of those articles, and allow them to come in, not at a reduced price, but upon the price at which they are sold to people in the United States, it would very largely assist the farmers of the North-west in procuring the machinery which they specially desire. I want also to say here that the preference is largely in favour of American machinery. That may have arisen out of the way in which the manufacturers have dealt with the people during the past years, and I mention here especially the Massey-Harris Company. No better campaign literature could be used in the North-west Territories than the will of the late Mr. Massey. It opened the eyes of the people: they felt that while they were struggling with difficulties, paying to that company, in many instances, not only 12 per cent, but sometimes 24 per cent, that while they had been subject to great hardships, and hundreds of our settlers had been turned out of home, many being obliged to leave and go elsewhere, this company had made the money, and oppressed the settlers of the West. This question of machinery, therefore, has caused considerable dissatisfaction; the duty upon smaller implements has been reduced, but this is of more importance perhaps to the farmers of Ontario and of Quebec than it is to us. Scythes, hay knives and such articles are not very largely used. It is true the duty has been thrown off various smaller implements that are a necessity, and hence a ground of encouragement. There is, however, another question that we wish to bring under the attention of the Government in the hope that they may yet, remedy the matter, that is the question of coal oil. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not in the position of one who has a by-election hanging over him, and I am not in the position of one who has clamoured for coal oil to be put on the free list, when speaking to the people. But I feel that something ought to be done in this matter to relieve the people of the North-west generally. This is a question of rates rather than of duty, the duty is a small matter, but the rates upon coal oil are a very serious matter. Now, I will read in your hearing the rates as given by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the figures that are here given can be fully substantiated. Freight rates per gallon from Petrolea, Ontario, to the following places in the North-west: To Winnipeg, 7·24 cents; to Portage la Prairie, 8·23 cents; Brandon, 8·88; Moosomin, 9·43; Broadview, 10·25; Regina, 10·99; Moose Jaw, 11·28; as near as we can make it; these are the figures of the Canadian Pacific Railway.