

I think that is the most unique thing I have ever seen in any amendment ever put before this House—that when it is found 'expedient' and 'just to all', those duties will be removed. That really deserves applause. The eloquent hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), I think, called attention to it, or some other hon. member did. We might pause and think over it for a moment, because an amendment that says that the duties will be removed when it is 'expedient' and 'just to all' is the most beautiful thing I have ever seen presented to any Parliament or to any one.

You see my dear Mr. Manager, if duties are not removed until a Canadian political party finds it expedient and just to all interested, the tariff wall could easily be continued for as long a period as the historic Chinese wall has braved the elements without crumbling. Kindly join me in an explosion of laughter.

Manager. "But so far as resolutions are concerned at least your party has a disturbing record on the agricultural implement duty, whilst the other historic party seems to me more safe and reliable from our point of view."

McMaster. "Jehosophat! Apart from resolutions have you examined the parliamentary record since the celebrated Liberal platform of 1893 calling for the obliteration of every vestige of protection from the tariff together with free agricultural implements, was promulgated? I have, and the examination almost produced a fit of apoplexy. In 1894, the Conservative Government reduced the agricultural implement duty from 35 to 20 per cent. Notwithstanding this, our leaders continued to denounce the tariff and promise free implements if returned to power. Clifford Sifton, the western Laurier leader in the campaign of 1896, which brought our party into power, ranted over the West telling the farmer that your company sold in Glasgow, Scotland, for \$70 the self-binding harvesters for which they charged the Manitoba farmer \$165.

Mark the figures.

He told them they were being bled until they were white in the face, and that if they only understood it they would not stand it. Then when the Laurier Government was formed, Sifton, who was an undistinguished country lawyer, became a member. There immediately sprang up between him and your predecessor, Sir Melvin Jones, a close personal friendship and Sir Melvin who, strange as it may appear, was also one of the leaders of the then comic opera Liberal aggregation, showed Sir Clifford that he was all wrong about agricultural implements and, although you may not know it, the proposal was seriously put forward among members of the party to increase instead of wipe out the tariff as promised. It was set forth that the tariff was already too low and that to increase it would mean ruin to the industry in Canada.

Now mark.

The matter was finally compromised by reducing the duty to 17½ per cent when the revision was made, but an arbitrary valuation was placed on the implements which made them cost

[Mr. Richardson.]

the farmer more than under the conservative duty of 20 per cent. It is said of Sir Clifford that he was after money and office and he got both. I wonder if to-day he is satisfied.

I want to emphasize this point about the reduction of the tariff. They reduced it to 17½ per cent, but the valuation of the binders at that time for dutiable purposes was placed at \$80, and the so-called Liberal party then increased the valuation, putting an arbitrary valuation of \$100, and when the farmer paid the duty, he paid one dollar more than he had paid under the duty which was in force under the Conservative regime.

Mr. EDWARDS: \$1.50.

Mr. RICHARDSON: \$1.50. The hon. member for Frontenac corrects me and he has the figures. Wasn't that wiping out the duty on agricultural implements with a vengeance? Let us continue:

Manager. "You surprise me but go on, I am deeply interested."

McMaster. "The next move that put our beloved party in the hole was in 1907 when the Conservatives moved in parliament to reduce the duty on agricultural implements to 10%. I hate to confess this but our party opposed it to a man, and what is worse Mr. Fielding, the Finance Minister (a fine man too) told parliament that 17½ per cent was a low revenue duty and that to lower it might drive the agricultural manufacturers out of the country, thereby involving ruin to the industry. Since then, as you know, the Union Government cut the implement duty to a point which makes the average a trifle over 12½ per cent. I regret that others of our leaders, including the Beloved Chieftain, talked along similar lines to Mr. Fielding. I tell you (with a sigh) our party is pretty badly compromised on the issue. So you see that on this question 'Grit Codlin's your friend and not Tory Short!'"

Manager. "But your party at least poses as the historic abolish, every-vestige-of-protection-from-the-tariff party."

McMaster. (Smiling even more broadly than normally) "I trust there is no covert sarcasm intended in that word 'poses!'"

Manager. "No offence, my dear sir, no offence—A cigar? No, well that I had in mind was that your leaders usually talk free trade."

McMaster. (Aside) "That's a sore touch. Would to God they always did. I say would to God they did, but such is not so. I have already quoted Sir Clifford who once publicly declared at Perth that the tariff had been permanently solved by the Liberals and removed from the list of Canadian political issues. You see for yourself that Mr. Fielding is no out and out free trader. Every now and again some old liberal spills the beans. Even the Grand Old Chieftain looped the loop on us occasionally, and you surely remember the words of our beloved D. D. who, as our leader, declared in Parliament 'that while not a very high protectionist he could not help but know that protection had done much for the country'. Selah! And there you are. No, no, I am afraid that inasmuch as the Liberals when in office from 1896 till 1911 only cut the tariff 71/100 of one