

tion away—to fight outside competition, then the protection may be withdrawn. In regard to this very article in this motion, what do we find? Why, Mr. Speaker, the truth about it is this: The Conservative party has done a great work for Canada and for these manufacturers. Before the Conservative party came into power in 1878, the implement manufacturers were in a sickly, in a poverty-stricken, in a helpless position. But after the Conservative party protected them, they not only made implements as good as were made in any other part of the world, they not only made them cheaper—which is one of the ends protection aims at—but they grew rich, and they grew able to fight the world in outside markets. My hon. friends on the opposite side of the House have again and again pointed out how these very manufacturers we are dealing with now, are able to send their goods to Australia, to the United States, to Great Britain, and to compete with all-comers in those markets, and we rejoice at it. I do not mention that in envious tones, or with a view of doing any harm to these manufacturers. On the contrary, I glory in it, because it is one of the results of a sound and wise policy on the part of the protectionist Government that was in power for so long, and with such great and happy results from this country. I take no stock in what the Prime Minister said on the 12th of October last, in Montreal. It was like one of the extraordinary statements we get from him from time to time. He said that the Liberal party in 20 months had done more for the country than the Conservative party had done in 20 years. Well, that was like some of the boasts I met with in a very interesting book, "Tartarin de Tarascon." When I read the extraordinary gasconading statements of the leader of the Government as to the giants he has fought and killed, and the great game he has brought down, I am reminded of the incomparable Tarascon who went out to fight great game and to shoot lions and panthers, but he only succeeded at last in bringing down a donkey. I take no stock in that kind of statement. I am here to-day as a protectionist and I move this motion and claim support for it on three grounds. First and foremost, is it to be tolerated for one minute that the farmers of the North-west should have held out to them by members who are now sitting on the Treasury benches, that if they got into power they would put those implements on the free list, and that then these hon. gentlemen can get into power, partly by the votes of those men, and when they cross over to the other side of the House, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce, now leading the House, crosses to the other side, when the leader of the Government crosses from this to the other side, when they taste the sweets of office, they can turn round and, to use a

Mr. DAVIN.

vulgar illustration but a very expressive one, make fat bacon at the whole North-west. Is it to be tolerated for a minute? Do you mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not bound as a North-west member to express the opinions of the farmers of the North-west, most all of whom are protectionists? But whether protectionists or not, they claim to have their disappointment, their indignation, their scorn, their contempt for men who behave in that way, expressed in this House, and expressed in strong language. Now, I ask again: What is protection? It is putting up a duty that will enable the native manufacturer to struggle on to strength, and wealth, and power, as these very implement manufacturers have progressed, and in doing that, not only give you good implements manufactured within the country, but keep the prices of those implements in the country, give employment to men, and supply a home market for the farmers. One of our mottoes in 1878, was that the workshop should be close to the farmer. I have here pamphlets that were circulated in 1878: I have the principles that were laid down then when we were asking to be returned to power. We wanted to protect the native manufacturer, not simply for the purposes of enriching him, but for the purpose of getting cheaper goods, goods manufactured in this country, increasing the home market, and thus adding to the wealth of the farmer, giving him not merely a market across the Atlantic and across the international boundary, but giving him a market at his own doors. Because my own language was that we wanted the factory near the farm, and our own tall chimneys darkening our own blue skies, the tall chimneys of the factories of Canada. What happened? The Conservative party were in power for eighteen years; and all you have to do is to look over the Trade and Navigation Returns, to look over the records of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, and to look over anything that gives a record of the progress of Canada for those years to agree to this proposition, that no country on the face of the earth, no country in history ever progressed more than Canada did during those eighteen years under the beneficent policy of the Conservative party. We had a party opposing the Conservative party, denouncing their policy in the most unmeasured terms, throwing out professions in respect to other matters on which I do not wish to enter now, and by a fluke that party attained power, still holding before the people the idea that if they got into power they would do certain things, and among them that they would give the farmers of the North-west agricultural implements free of duty. I have in a volume near me the official report of the great Liberal convention that was held in 1893, of which Mr., now Sir Wilfrid Laurier, said that since the great Liberal meeting of