

to this extent that they have, in one combination now gobbled up all the smaller concerns. And while I am not accusing that combination of having raised or even kept up the prices of machines because of the combination—on the contrary, I believe that, on account of the improvement in modern methods of production, they are producing a better article for less money—still, in view of the fact that they have so long enjoyed protection and in view of the fact that such sweeping reductions were made in the raw material used in the manufacture of these machines, they should be able to stand now pretty nearly on an equality and be able to compete with their American rivals across the line. Because of this, and also because the farmers of the western country have been promised that this would be the result of the Liberals coming into power—that they would receive free agricultural implements—and because scores and hundreds of those electors have been deluded to give support to the Liberal candidate on the strength of these promises, I most heartily give my support to the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia.

Mr. CRAIG. I am rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should speak about good faith on the part of the present Government with regard to agricultural implements. If we examine their history since they came into power, we will find that they have not kept good faith on any question. Now, what is meant by good faith? I understand it means keeping their pledges. I think if we examine the pledges they made before they came into power, we will find that almost all of them have been broken. Especially is this the case with reference to protection. The cry of the Liberal party before they came into power was, Death to protection. Protection was to be uprooted root and branch. Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that that has not been done. For my part, I do not blame the Liberal Government for not doing it; I commend them for it. I might blame them in a theoretical way for not keeping their pledges, but, in reality, I give them praise for not keeping their pledges, because, in breaking their pledges, they have benefited this country. We have heard about the feeling of satisfaction with which the tariff of the present Government has been received in the country. Well, I know, from conversation with business men that this feeling of satisfaction arose, not on account of the changes that were made, but on account of the changes that were not made. There was a feeling of apprehension abroad in the country when the Liberal party first came into power, that they would carry out their pledges, that when they talked about rooting up protection, they meant what they said; that when they

Mr. ROCHE.

talked about doing away with all protection, and when they called the manufacturers of this country robbers and all sorts of hard names, and said they were going to take away this protection from them, the people thought they meant it, and they have been gratified to know that they did not mean any of these things at all, that they were only election cries, that these were only appeals made to their own party, and perhaps to moderate men of all parties, so that they might get into power. Now, I may say here that I am not going to support this resolution, because I do not blame the Government at all for not keeping faith with anybody on this question, but I commend them for it. I think that while they have not kept faith with the country, while they have broken nearly all the pledges that they made so far as the tariff is concerned, yet in so doing they have done a great benefit to the country.

But at the same time I think something might be said about the duty on agricultural implements. We find that the Government did not make any reduction on that duty at all. But what did they do? They made raw material lower by reducing the duty on raw material. Now, it would be a very interesting question to discuss as to why they did this, why they discriminated in favour of the manufacturers of agricultural implements. I do not know. I do not pretend to be on the inside and to know all the reasons. But I do know that while they reduced the duty on a few articles, they did not reduce the duty on agricultural implements, but in reality, by making raw materials lower, they increased the protection to the makers of those articles. I think that is rather an inconsistent position for them to take. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one article in which they did reduce the duty, and which they have made free at the present time, and that is the article of binder twine, in which my constituents are somewhat interested. I find that that is placed on the free list. Now, in the town of Port Hope, which I have the honour to represent, they have a factory for manufacturing binder twine, one of the best in this country, I am told, with the most modern and improved machinery. That factory to-day is standing idle, and the prospects are that it will stand idle. The men who have been working in the factory and who worked there up to last fall when the factory was closed, are very anxious to know whether the Government is going to impose a duty on binder twine in order that they may have some prospect of getting employment again. Well, it does not look so by the tariff which was brought down. I regret very much that the Government have not looked on this matter in a favourable light. I think they might well have considered this question. Why should they take the duty off binder twine and make that article absolutely free, while