

large majority settled that for the moment we were not to have free agricultural implements, but in the details of the schedules each item is presented to the committee separately for separate consideration, I take it, or the reading of the items by the Chairman is surely a gross waste of time and has no conceivable purpose whatever. While we have voted on the principle and the principle has been settled, nevertheless there may be inconsistencies or incongruities which may very well be settled in committee, and that I conceive is the reason why each item is presented separately.

Now our simple, and, it seems to me, logical and extremely supportable position, is that there is no good reason why ploughs, which are the primary and fundamental implements of agriculture should be put under a handicap in regard to the tariff as compared with cultivators, seed drills, horse rakes, manure spreaders, and all the other articles mentioned in the previous item. My hon. friend did not deal with that point at all. He simply seemed to indicate that we ought, having voted on the question of implements being free or not free, to leave the details to be settled without any further discussion or any consideration of them at all. I have only to repeat that that is really an argument against the Committee stage of legislation and is not worthy of what is usually the extremely logical mind of my hon. friend from Frontenac. I do not wish to say more on the subject. I have spoken at greater length than probably I should have done, and it is with the desire that the discussion may not be unduly protracted that I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Maharg) has moved the amendment. I shall vote for the amendment because it seems reasonable and logical, and as we could not get the whole loaf we propose now to take a small portion of it. This position is entirely defensible from my standpoint.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not intend to boast about my logic in this House when it comes to a question of reasoning, but it does seem to me that the man who took the position in this House that he would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Brome because it was giving him what he thought he ought to have and who, failing to get that, voted for the Budget because, although it did not give him all he wanted, it gave him some consideration, is in a position to come here and logically say: I voted for the Budget because it gave me something. It did not

go as far as I wanted it to go and therefore I am here to ask you to make this further reduction of 2½ per cent. That man would be taking a consistent position. But the man who last night voted against the reduction of 2½ per cent or 5 per cent cannot logically come forward now and ask for the reduction he opposed yesterday. That is my position.

Mr. PEDLOW: Before the Committee rose this morning I raised a point which has been under discussion ever since, and that is the elimination of ploughs from the category included in item 446, cultivators, harrows, horse rakes, etc. I find on looking up the schedule that has obtained up to the present that this item included ploughs, and I should like to know why it is now eliminated. The minister's explanation does not quite satisfy me and I would like to have some further light on the subject. I know that the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for Maple Creek who has moved the amendment are also of the opinion that there is no valid reason why ploughs should not be included in the same list as cultivators, harrows, horse rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders and weeders and complete parts thereof. These were all included in the same list a year ago and there is no reason why they should not be in the same class to-day. I should also like to know the reason for the small variation of 2½ per cent in the duty to be collected on ploughs in excess of the duty proposed in regard to the other items.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think I explained fully this morning the reasons why we had to differentiate in the reduction in the articles to which reference has been made. I explained that there were varying competitive conditions. There is a great range of ploughs, drills, etc., and—

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to know whether—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Just a moment, please. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the importations of ploughs for the last fiscal year from the United States amounted to \$2,500,000, whereas the importation of all the other implements embraced in the item amounted to only \$860,000. I say again what I have already said two or three times, that we gave this matter our most careful consideration and reached certain conclusions as to the amount of reduction which it is possible to make. Having reached these conclu-