

carried into effect, will raise the duty on binders from 12½ per cent to 15 per cent; on mowers from 12½ per cent to 15 per cent; and on reapers from 12½ per cent to 15 per cent.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the hon. gentleman quoting the duties into Canada from the United States?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes. I have the trade agreement under my hand from which I am taking the figures.

Mr. McMASTER: I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is quite accurate.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will not support this amendment because if I do I shall be voting to increase the duty on weeders from 15 to 20 per cent, on manure spreaders from 15 to 20 per cent, on farm wagons from 20 to 22 1-2 per cent, and on windmills from 17 1-2 to 20 per cent. I will not support it because it would impose a duty of 20 per cent on traction engines, which are now free, it would increase the duty from 8 cents per hundred pounds on cement to 12 1-2 cents, and would place a duty of 50 cents on flour, which is now free. These seem to me to be nine good and sufficient reasons why hon. gentlemen on this side can honestly vote against the amendment proposed; they are reasons which, it seems to me, should appeal particularly to the hon. member for Red Deer. If that hon. gentleman could stifle his conscience for a number of years when the Government he was supporting made binder twine and cream separators free but kept on a duty on the whole much higher than at present, then surely hon. gentlemen on this side can justify their position in refusing to vote for the amendment which, if carried into effect, would increase the duties on these articles. I do not know just how to take the hon. member for Red Deer when he says he is giving hearty support to the motion, which proposes to increase the duty on these things. I hope this is an indication, even though rather belated, that the hon. gentleman is beginning to see the light of reason and intends to step aside from his free trade follies and fallacies and come down to a sane consideration of tariff measures. His attitude towards this amendment is certainly one of the most startling things I have seen in this House since coming here. The hon. gentleman who, in season and out of season, has declared for free trade and the abolition of all duties, to-day gets up and announces his intention

to support an amendment which would have the effect of increasing the duties on agricultural implements as I have stated.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Does the hon. member contend that the adoption of the pact would in any way bind the Parliament of Canada to keep to the duties therein set out? It would not curtail our fiscal freedom for a moment.

Mr. EDWARDS: I fail to see how the hon. member can excuse himself in the way he is doing. He says that the object is to obtain free access for our natural products into a market which is already overstocked to a greater extent than our own with the very surplus farm products for which we cannot find markets.

Mr. CLARK: What are we selling there?

Mr. EDWARDS: Various things.

Mr. CLARK: Natural products?

Mr. EDWARDS: Some, but very few. Speaking from memory, I think we imported into this country last year nearly two million pounds of butter from six or seven different countries; but we exported at the same time about fourteen million pounds of butter to thirty-five different countries. We circled the globe to find markets for this surplus product. Now, if this amendment is intended to have no effect, as the hon. member would now give us to understand, what is the sense of proposing it? What is the object in moving an amendment which distinctly and specifically lays down certain things, if it is not to have any effect? I am astonished that an hon. gentleman who has had the experience of the hon. member for Red Deer, and who has the ability, which is undoubtedly his, of debating a question, should light upon something so meagre as this, and advance it as an argument.

May I call attention to another matter? Speaking from a party standpoint, I am rather glad that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has moved this amendment and that it has been seconded by the official leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). It is a very good omen. The member for Shelburne and Queen's, advised very largely by the present leader of the Opposition, in 1911 proposed a similar arrangement. He and the leader of the Opposition, more perhaps than any one else in this House at present, were responsible for defeating the Laurier Government in 1911. Speaking from my