

my disposal. But I discovered that we were not getting anything. I have a newspaper in Winnipeg, and my newspaper, had been standing by the old Liberal platform—and I thought I was on fine ground. I remember some of the leaders saying to me; "What is this you are doing, Richardson? You are not standing by the party." I used to produce the old campaign literature—you remember the pink books, Mr. Speaker—and I used to say: "Why, there it is in your own literature; surely I am on right ground." "Oh", they would say; "that is not playing politics at all; what counts is not what we said in our platform, but what we are doing now." The result was that I got into such a position that there was nothing else for it; I was hounded clean out of the party and for twenty years I remained in private life. Perhaps the country profited by that, I am not here to say although it cost the public treasury tens of thousands to defeat and keep me out of public life. Now I find myself in the position of standing by this Budget, and as a result of the predicted avalanche in favour of free agricultural implements, in the West I may probably be landed in the wilderness for another twenty years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, but anyway, I am going to take chances on it.

Mr. BUREAU: Safe chance.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Last Sunday I was visiting my old homestead out in Lanark county, the spot where I was born. I was reclining in the heat of the day under the shade of an old apple tree, and I had a vision. Afterwards, when I came to myself, I set it down, and I had it type-written. I am going to read it to the House, and although it will take a little while, still we are having a good time anyway and the House might just as well hear it:

Scene in the office of the General Manager of the Massey Harris Co. on a sultry afternoon in the summer of 1922.

Manager seated in mahogany chair smoking and looking a bit worried as a general election is on and the Opposition for the sixth consecutive time is talking free agricultural implements.

Knock.

Enter a bulky figure with broad, beaming face and glad hand. "I am Andrew R. McMaster, member for Brome."

"Have a chair."

McMaster. "As you know I was the financial critic of the Government in the late Parliament and (with a knowing and self-complacent wink) the prospective Finance Minister in the new Government."

Manager. "Better have a couple of chairs."  
McMaster. "I came to see you at the request of our party. Some of our friends tell me that you are misled about our tariff position, especially on agricultural implements, and I decided that it was well to have a talk with you."

Manager. "Frankly I was not very seriously alarmed because I have followed political events pretty closely for 25 years, but with those western radical Liberals pawing the turf, and ready to vote against any combination in support of their principles, one can never tell what might happen."

McMaster. "Yes, I admit that the western bronchos are a bit dangerous, but our party is well seasoned, it has a record and is duly impressed with a sense of responsibility and stability."

Manager. "How about that old resolution of yours in favour of free machinery, etc.?"

McMaster. "Did you read the same carefully and study its construction? If you did you would commend its beautiful indefiniteness. Firstly, it was perfectly safe to describe the Budget as unsatisfactory, as it is designed for 8,000,000 people, most of whom think differently. Secondly, it is always safe to charge extravagance. Everybody is guilty of that. Then I think that was a perfectly heroic touch in the third place to ring in and denounce the High Cost of Living. Such a master stroke could not help but appeal to the masses. Of course you and I know it was bunk, but in politics one must not be overly scrupulous. Fourthly, while it was a platitude, there is always a mass of brainless creatures, who might be caught with an innocuous declaration about the absence from the Budget of a definite promise of downward revision. To be sure I purposely overlooked the promise of investigation and complete revision a little later in addition to the very considerable reduction accorded. Fifthly, I trust you read clauses two and three together—

I do not believe the members of the House have read clauses two and three together. It is well worth their while to get them and compare them because they are unique when you read them together. I have tried to give a little analysis here, and in addition to this analysis, I would prefer that members read the clauses for themselves.

I trust you read clauses two and three together and noted carefully that prime touch about free food, and free machinery used in the development of all the natural resources of Canada (which resources include, of course, mining, timber, oil, fishing, etc., as well as agriculture), and the succeeding clause calling for the removal as speedily as may be expedient and just to all interested, of the duties on "all other necessities of life,"—

I think the members had better let that soak in.

—all other necessities of life being of course, auxiliary to such necessities of life as diamond drills, augers, gimlets etc. Can't you detect the joker? It was to laugh. Not a single member of the House exposed the artful dodge at the time. It is true the clause about removing the duties when found expedient and just to all was subjected to a hostile barrage but we escaped in the country pretty well.