

1894, represented by my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Foster) as Finance Minister, that they would not adhere to it if they won the election that was supposed to follow in 1895—it was supposed that at that time that it would be held in that year. I argued that there was no such thing known up to that time as a Government winning on a policy that they had propounded in Parliament and carried before the people and going back on that policy, and he says I am inconsistent now because I say in regard to this Government that it should carry out its pledges made before it went to the country. Why, he should see that my argument means that these gentlemen are bound to carry out their pledges. What I said was that there was never such a thing known as a Government having propounded a policy in Parliament and having gone to the country upon it and won, going back on that policy. I had known instances before it was added to by this Government, I had known instances in the history of England where a party, though propounding a policy in opposition, had failed to carry it fully out, not indeed a formal policy, but had failed to carry out many pledges. But they were reprobated as I reprobate this Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a word? The comment I made was made a little too soon. I should have read this paragraph before making it:

But, he said, it was not uncommon for men in opposition to propound opinions and propose measures in regard to which, on getting into office, they became silent.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear. Is that not what I say now; and is this not what these renegades say? Is not that parliamentary? If you will read in the speeches of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think you will find it used. If not, I will fall back upon the word "gang" or "crew," which, I think, was a favourite expression of his. If my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) is through with the "Hansard" containing Mr. Cleveland's motion, I would like to see it, as I cannot see it here.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will send the hon. gentleman the "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do you think that farmers of the country have paid on agricultural implements on which we here demand relief? They have paid, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, \$93,474. That is on agricultural implements, pure and simple.

Sir CHARLES HUBBERT TUPPER. That is, if they pay the duty, as hon. gentlemen opposite say.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, if they do. I am arguing on the theory of hon. gentlemen

Mr. DAVIN.

opposite. Here we have the item of "harvesters, self-binding and without binders." The whole duty paid under this item for the year ending 30th June last was \$40,647, of which \$25,980 was paid in the west. On hoes the amount paid was \$365, of which more than half was paid in the west. On horse-rakes, the duty was \$2,760, of which \$1,887 was paid in the west. On mowing machines the duty paid throughout Canada was \$18,000, of which \$8,700 was paid in the west. And so on. This shows that we in the west are deeply interested in this matter.

Now, in regard to the hon. gentleman's amendment, if he will tell me that there is any chance of its doing any good, I will help him. I will take it as an instalment. I do not refuse to vote for people on the opposite side, if I can help forward the end I am aiming at. The new members in this House must know that I have treated the Government side in a different way from what they have treated me. I have not shrunk from supporting them, if I could do anything for the farmers. Now, I will not cavil at the hon. gentleman's motion. If that will carry, if that motion that we will have 10 per cent—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Be reduced to 10 per cent, instead of 20 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I will vote for that motion, and next year, if the farmers are not content with that, and I do not think they should be with the promises they have from the Government, we can press further. But, with the hope of making some progress, I will vote for my hon. friend's motion, reducing it to 10 per cent, and I hope his own Government will now support him.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not intend to say anything on this motion, but after listening to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), I cannot refrain from noticing the peculiar position that he took with regard to this question. He moved an amendment to the motion, which amendment is, to have agricultural implements reduced to 10 per cent; but, instead of supporting that amendment by some argument, he used up nearly all his time in trying to convince the House that the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) was inconsistent, that he had not been sincere in his advocacy of the interests of the farmers of the North-west. The hon. member did not bring any argument to show that the western farmers required this reduction, or that they were suffering for want of it, or that his own party had been unfair to the people in leading them to believe that they would get such reduction upon coming into power. There was not a word in the interest of the western farmer, but his whole time was taken up in trying to prove the inconsistency of the hon. member for West Assinibola. He finished up that admirable speech