

they would successfully negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. They declared that the Conservatives in office heretofore had never been sincere in their attempts in this direction; they declared also that the Conservative public men did not stand in high favour with the American public men; that the Liberal party had always been more friendly disposed towards the Americans than the Conservative party, and if given an opportunity they would send a commission to Washington who would undoubtedly succeed in negotiating successfully a reciprocity treaty with that country. Indications do not point in that direction at the present time; on the contrary, the very best evidence we have that these hon. gentlemen know in their inmost hearts that there is not the remotest possibility of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with that country that would be fair to Canada, is the fact that they are, to use their own expression, discriminating against the United States. They thundered their eloquence against the Canadian Senate, and declared that if given an opportunity they would reform that institution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that that is one pledge they seem in a fair way of fulfilling; they are reforming that body politic about as quickly as the law will permit, by placing as many Reformers in that institution as there are vacancies; but I do not think that is the kind of reformation that they promised the electors of Canada. While condemning their opponents for having, as they said, abused the Superannuation Act and superannuated a lot of officials unnecessarily, in the few short months they have been in office they have brought down already a long list of superannuated officers, and if they keep up their present pace, they will soon have the Civil Service depleted of all save the younger element. They railed against that portion of the Conservative policy which provided for a fast Atlantic service, and told the farmers of the province of Manitoba that their hard earned dollars were being wrung from them in order to carry a few passengers between here and the old country in a little less time than heretofore; they declared that to subsidize such a line of steamers would be directly prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian farmers. What do we see to-day? This portion of the Conservative policy has also been adopted by that party, and to-day a contract is signed for a fast Atlantic steamship service. They waged bitter warfare against what they were pleased to term the grinding monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, its high freight rates, and declared their opposition to having the construction of a road through Crow's Nest Pass handed over to that monopoly. But we see to-day that members of the Government are hand in glove with that so-called monopoly, and are about to hand over, I believe, if rumours be correct, the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass

Mr. ROCHE.

Railway to that company. When they were in Opposition they ridiculed the idea that the duties imposed by the Conservative Government upon wheat, peas, barley and other products of the farm, were in any respect a benefit to the Canadian farmers. They stated that the old country markets ruled prices the world over, and that those duties might as well be abolished for all the good they were doing the Canadian farmer. But the best evidence that those hon. gentlemen were not sincere in railing about those duties, is the fact that they are retained in their new tariff. If, as they declared, the duties on agricultural products were of no benefit, why did they not abolish them entirely. To be sure they have reduced the protection afforded to the farmers heretofore to a certain extent. The duty upon wheat has been reduced from 15 to 12 cents a bushel, and I suppose that was done to compensate the millers for their reduced protection on flour from 75 to 60 cents a barrel. So what they took away with the one hand they appeared to give with the other, but all at the expense of the farmers. It is a well known fact that the price of wheat in the province of Manitoba, many times during these past two or three years, has been above an export basis; that many times the price in Manitoba has been greater than that across the boundary line, plus the duty. And still they have reduced the duty upon wheat from 15 to 12 cents per bushel. There were two items of especial interest in Manitoba that have been mentioned already in a number of speeches, that is the item of agricultural implements and coal oil. The Liberals told the Manitoba farmers that that was essentially an agricultural country, and why should they be taxed to keep up those bloated manufacturers of the east? They tried in this way to set one class of people against another, one province against another, cultivating the idea that the manufacturer was the natural enemy of the farmer. But notwithstanding all those professions, we find to-day that the manufacturer of agricultural implements is in the enjoyment of higher protection than he had under the old tariff, for the raw material that enters into the composition of his machines is allowed to come in at a reduced duty, the manufacturers get the benefit, but the farmer does not, and the protection of 20 per cent is kept on just as it was. One would imagine to hear the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) last night when he spoke on agricultural implements, that he held a brief in favour of the manufacturer of American implements. He was trying to impress this House and country how much superior American-made machines were to Canadian-made machines. I think the hon. gentleman took a very unpatriotic stand in that particular line, for there are a great number of men more practical than either he or I who hold a contrary opinion. Dur-