

I did up to six o'clock was this. I proved that in the Liberal Convention of 1893 a reduction of the tariff was promised on the lines of providing merely for the revenue and of giving the North-west farmers and the farmers generally exceptional advantages, in case the Liberal party came into power. I then proved that the leader of the Government went west, accompanied by some of his colleagues, and that at Winnipeg, at Moosomin, at Regina, at Moose Jaw, Edmonton and Prince Albert promises were made on the same lines, only more definite; and I quoted a passage from a speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture which amounted to a definite promise that if the Liberals came into power agricultural implements would be placed on the free list. Those words are in "Hansard." I quoted also from the campaign sheet of 1895-96, which I have here bound with other precious documents issued by the Liberal party, where they expressed an opinion adverse to the present tariff on agricultural implements. I also showed from the "Farmer's Sun" that the farmers throughout Canada were disappointed. I showed by quotations that the hon. member for Winnipeg and the hon. member for Lisgar stated openly and in public in Winnipeg, that they were disappointed; and now I shall proceed to quote statements made by my hon. colleague the member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to show that he was also disappointed. In fact, he told the Government—what? It is a most extraordinary thing that with the tones of the Finance Minister's speech last night in his ears, knowing that nothing has been done for the farmers or for the farmers of the North-west, the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia sits complacently in his seat, happy and smiling. On that occasion to which I refer, however, he told the leader of the Government that his policy had not left his supporters in the west a leg to stand on. Lest that mere description should be considered too vague, I will quote the language of my hon. friend, and I ask the attention of the Finance Minister to this statement, because some personal references are made by the member for Eastern Assiniboia to that hon. gentleman. This is what the hon. member (Mr. Douglas) said at Wapella:

The tariff had, in a word, been a disappointment. The change was made on the basis of a 10 per cent reduction. We didn't get the changes we wanted. He (Mr. Douglas) had done most of his talking on the subject, not on the floor of the House, but in committee.

What committee? If it was in committee, it was in Committee of the Whole, and was in public. But I think he refers to some secret conclave they had. I may tell the hon. member that it is not a parliamentary proceeding to conduct business that should be conducted on the floor of the House in camera and in secret with the Ministers.

Mr. DAVIN.

The Government must have a revenue, and he did not want any Administration to do that for the farmers which we condemn them doing for the manufacturers. He claimed that he made no promise of free implements, &c. What he wanted was justice.

So, when the hon. gentleman attends an open conference with his party he does so on a good Conservative's advice. That shows the modesty that may be in a bosom like that of my hon. friend. A Latin writer penned that well-known and hackneyed line, which may be familiar to the hon. gentleman:

Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?

Dwells such dire anger in celestial minds?

How can such complacency as the following fill the bosom of a divine?

He had made the strongest speech he had made in the House on the excessive rates on implements, &c. He had told the Government he would rather kick them in their own shanty than outside. When Messrs. Fielding and Paterson met with these manufacturers they (the manufacturers) said, "You are making a general reduction of 25 per cent? If that is so, we ask you for an advance on the implement duty to put us on a fair basis," and to compromise the matter they had allowed them free raw material, and the machine men had promised to make a \$5 reduction in the prices of machines.

Do you see, Mr. Speaker, what is admitted? The hon. gentleman has no confidence in the Ministers, who, instead of giving a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, have given increased protection to the manufacturers.

As soon as he saw the new tariff he wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and asked for an interview. It was granted, and he told the Premier he had come to talk on agricultural implements and coal oil. He had said to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, "Sir, I want to tell you this, you haven't given the members from the North-west a leg to stand on, because this is a large question to our people, and we have not now an argument to meet them with.

In the town of Grenfell the hon. gentleman spoke on the same subject, and used this language:

The farmers did not ask for special favours, but justice. He was not satisfied with the present tariff, and according to Mr. Fielding's budget speech the Government themselves were not satisfied with it. But it was the best that could be done under the circumstances. At least, that was the Government's explanation of it. The old tariff was placed upon a rate of 35 per cent. This was a considerable reduction, but the Bill was, upon the whole, a disappointment to the Patrons of Industry.

Now twelve months have elapsed, and I never saw a man in my life who evidenced complacency more than the hon. Finance Minister, who in his speech last night showed perfect delight in the present tariff, in fact, I thought he was well satisfied with everything. No changes in the tariff have been made, that is to say, no changes have been made to carry out the promises made by