

sell machinery at a lesser cost to the foreign farmer who competes with the North-west farmer, the result of which is that it costs the latter relatively a great deal more to produce his grain than it does his competitor, and both sell in the same market. What is the result? Evidently this policy is not one which is conducive to the best interests of that class of men whose interests the Government ought to consult.

Now, I thought that we had placed before the country two clear and distinct policies, and we were in hopes, many of us, that we were going to the country in a short time to challenge the verdict of the people upon the question as to which was the better policy in the interests of Canada. But it appears, Sir, that there are a large number of gentlemen in this House who say that they do not know what the Liberal policy is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I notice that that statement is received with cheers by some hon. gentlemen on the back benches opposite, thereby showing their own ignorance. I shall be very happy to present to any one of those hon. gentlemen a copy of the political platform agreed upon by the Liberal party of Canada when they met in convention two or three years ago. The policy of the Liberal party was laid down at that time in terms very clear and distinct, and if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble not to read each other's speeches, not to read what Mr. A or Mr. B, who sits alongside of them says about the policy, but to read the policy itself, they will find it formulated in language so clear that nobody but one whose mind is wilfully perverted, can misunderstand it. Sir, during the progress of this debate, several hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Railways, the Controller of Customs and others, did me the honour to cite certain remarks I had made at different times in the maritime provinces, for the purpose of showing that I held a somewhat different view as to the policy of the Liberal party, from the views held by my leader and others. Sir, I am absolutely satisfied to spare the House the annoyance of reading any of my speeches, because the speech of mine which the Controller read, puts it as plainly and as lucidly, and more so, than I could put it to-night. I stand by every word of the speech he quoted in the House. The Minister of Railways in referring to what I said, stated :

Now, however, a new policy, a tariff for revenue purposes only. * * This policy of a tariff for revenue purposes only was explained by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who said, in a speech delivered in the maritime provinces, that there were three kinds of tariff, a free trade tariff, a tariff for revenue purposes, and a revenue tariff.

He meant a protective tariff, a mistake, I suppose, of the printer.

He spoke of what a revenue tariff was, compared it with a protective tariff, and he instanced as a revenue tariff a tariff such as that in force in England, and it is such a tariff and such a policy that we are dealing to-night. I venture to tell hon. gentlemen, that when the country comes to understand what a revenue tariff is, as explained by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and as it will be explained to the country from one end to the other before the general elections arrive, a tariff for revenue will occupy the graveyard with other departed ones.

But when the hon. gentleman was challenged by me directly in his speech as to whether I had said anything indicating that we were going to adopt the tariff which the English people have in force, "Oh, no," he said, "you did not say so, but I deduce that from your remarks." Notwithstanding my disclaimer, half a dozen of the lesser lights of the party, when they get up to speak, still, parrot-like, repeat the old story that the policy of the Liberal party is a policy which favours the adoption of a system of taxation similar to that which prevails in England. It seems to me it has been a put-up job, if I may use a vulgar expression, to repeat, in one way or another, this statement, with a view to induce the country to believe that our policy is not what we have declared it to be in solemn conclave, not what the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford declares it to be, not what he and my leader have, time and again, stated it to be, but some policy which hon. gentlemen opposite wish it to be. It is perfectly plain to my mind that hon. gentlemen opposite know that our policy is so true, is so thoroughly defensible, so commends itself to the good sense of the people that they dare not challenge the verdict of the people upon it. They are bound to twist it, to make it something else, to say it is not what we declare it to be, it is not what we have formulated, it is some other thing which they desire it to be. We decline to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to force a false issue on the people. We are going to the people on the policy formulated at our great convention, and enunciated by our financial representative and by our leader.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). And as often repudiated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not only are we prepared to go to the people upon this policy, but if we get fair-play, we will win upon it, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it.

Mr. FOSTER. You will get all the fair-play you want.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I admire your pluck, but not your prudence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Although our policy is not to adopt the tariff and system of taxation which exists in England—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.