

and here was the time to offer it. We have listened to what has been said by the leaders of the Opposition and by their followers who have spoken, and so far as I am able to see, wherever we may look for relief we cannot look to them. Whatever measure of relief we have received we have received from the present Liberal Government; and whatever measure of relief we hope to receive we must look to the present Government for, because we have the definite announcement of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster): that as it was the policy of that party when in power to place the interests of the manufacturers first, so it is the policy of that party in Opposition, and will continue to be their policy.

Now, we have nothing against the manufacturers. We wish the manufacturers of this country to prosper; but we wish to have some share of prosperity ourselves. We wish to have the tariff adjusted so that the industries and interests of the farmers will be considered just as well as the industries and interests of the manufacturers. This is what was not done under the late Government, and so far as we can see now, there is no prospect of its being done should the present Opposition obtain office with their present principles. Under the circumstances, although the new tariff is not, in all its particulars, satisfactory to the members from the west, I for one feel bound to support the resolution on this occasion, as being the best offer made through this House to the people of the western country.

I think the importance of the customs tariff to the people of the country has been exaggerated in the arguments that have been brought forward in regard to it. In the western part of this Dominion, I can assure this House, we do not look upon the customs tariff as the most important issue. I do not wish to minimize its importance at all. We look for a square deal under that tariff, as under every other part of the legislation of the Government. But let it be understood that there are other questions which affect the interests of the people there, and which will affect them in the future, more than the customs tariff, whether it is high or low, a revenue tariff or a protective tariff. The tariff on what we have to buy is not our principal burden. The great burden is the tariff on what we have to sell. It is not the customs tariff—it is the railway tariff which is the great burden on the western country. That is the great question in that country. I think it only fair to put this matter squarely before the House on this occasion, when we talk about what the tariff or the changes in the tariff will do or will not do. It is well to understand that they are not and cannot be expected to do everything for us, and that the part they play in the western country is small compared with the part played by the question of transportation.

With reference to the duty on coal oil, which was six cents a gallon, and is now five cents a gallon, it is an open question whether that change of a cent in the duty will make a difference of a cent in the price. Admitting that it will, when we pay fifty cents a gallon for coal oil in the North-west, it can easily be understood that the reduction of a cent a gallon does not cut much of a figure in that part of the country. If you were to take off the whole duty, it would not make much difference in the price, as long as the freight rate of nearly twenty cents a gallon remains. I mention this to show the difference in the effect on the price as between the customs tariff of five cents a gallon and the railway tariff of say twenty cents a gallon. But we can pay twenty cents or thirty cents freight, and the duty on coal oil, provided we can sell the products we raise at a fair market price. It is the high cost of delivering the produce of the North-west in the markets of the world which is the great drawback in the North-west. For instance, a farmer buys a self-binder, and pays \$20 duty on it; but that self-binder he uses, we will say, for five years in cutting one hundred acres of wheat. That is five hundred acres, yielding, say twenty bushels to the acre, making in all ten thousand bushels of wheat. The duty on the self-binder with which he cuts that wheat was \$20, whereas a difference of one cent a bushel on the freight charges on that wheat would amount to \$100, or, in other words, would pay the duty five times over in the five years, or once each year. That is an illustration of the difference between the effect of the duty upon imports, and the freight rates. No matter whether the duty on the machinery is high or low, it is a small matter compared with the freight charges on the farmer's product.

Now, whatever the Government has done or may do in the matter of the customs tariff, I say that they have done well so far as they have gone, in giving us free binder twine and free fence wire, and in reducing the duties on the smaller articles required by the agriculturists and also on larger machinery. In all these things they have done well; but if this tariff is framed for the purpose of developing the North-west, it will need to be followed up by something much more radical in order to secure that development. I have heard several times in this debate, the question of the development of the west alluded to. It appears that it is considered an important question. As one of the representatives of the west, I say—and I think every one of the others will back me up—that the question of the rates of transportation is the great question in the west, and the one which we wish this House to consider when it considers the question of the development of that country. There is no part of the country that can stand a high customs tariff better than the western