

my opinion, is as much entitled to receive his raw material free of duty, if the necessities of the revenue will permit, and, if not, to have as low a rate of duty as is consistent with the raising of the revenue, as is the manufacturer of those machines. On this question, I am aware, the Conservatives have proved to be the true tariff reformers. They reduced the protection given to the manufacturers of those machines from 35 to 20 per cent with a promise of still further reduction if deemed necessary. This, however, was declared by our Liberal friends to be entirely inadequate, and so far as my own constituency is concerned, it was ornamented from end to end with such placards as: "Vote for the Liberal candidate and free agricultural implements." The people were educated by such means to believe that free agricultural implements would be the natural consequence of the Liberals attaining power. The Winnipeg "Tribune," the organ of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) contained article after article practically in the same strain. And when during the first session of this Parliament, a motion similar to this now before us was introduced by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, the hon. member for Lisgar, in company with his Liberal confreres from the west, opposed the motion on the ground that it was ill-advised and ill-timed. Wait, said that hon. gentleman, until the Government has had time to form their tariff policy and present it to the House; time enough to condemn the Government when they have proved recreant to their pledges. Well, the House and the country waited until another session came and the tariff policy was propounded. And what then did we find? Instead of finding that the protection heretofore enjoyed by the manufacturers, those bloated monopolists, those robbers, those "scoundrels great and scoundrels small," as they were so endearingly called by our Liberal friends, we find that it was materially increased, the protective duty being left as it was and a sweeping reduction made of the duties on the raw material entering into the construction of those machines. This caused a profound feeling of disappointment among that western people, a sense of disappointment not at all confined to one political party. Possibly it was felt most keenly by those poor deluded people who, by the hundred, were drawn away from their own party by those pledges, and who are now realizing how they have been hoodwinked. This was participated in also by the Liberal members from the west, and when, a few months ago, the meeting of the Liberal Association of Winnipeg was held, as has been stated, the hon. member for Lisgar and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) at that meeting expressed their disappointment. They declared that the whole tendency of the Government was

to raise rather than to lower the duties, and they instanced several cases which proved that, while the Liberals were very good free traders in theory, when it interfered with their own interests and the interests of their friends, they proved to be the best of protectionists in practice. They instanced the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) in regard to the duties on agricultural implements, and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) with regard to coal oil, and others. But, notwithstanding this, those members from the west voted for the Liberal policy that was produced last session on the ground that the very few concessions that were made, the very small reductions in two or three articles entering into common use on the farm, marked the entering of the thin edge of the wedge of free trade, and formed only an instalment, to use their own words, of what was to come; and from the pledges they had received from the members of the Government, they felt confident that their promises would ultimately be fulfilled.

Another session has come. And what have we had in the interim? We have heard from the gentlemen who originated this tariff policy, who prepared the brief and handed it over to the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), and that gentleman is here now as the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). And that hon. gentleman has declared that this tariff policy was to remain as it is at present for the next ten years. That hon. gentleman was endorsed by the Ministry, several of whom appeared on the platform and spoke on his behalf. And after the Budget speech we have had from the Finance Minister yesterday, I fear that the members from the west who are depending on the Government meeting their wishes in regard to the duty of agricultural implements are depending on a broken reed. It is true that there exists a prejudice in the minds of many farmers in favour of American-made machinery. Whether this prejudice has any right foundation or not I am not personally aware. Many farmers prefer Canadian-made machines, while many others prefer the American. So far as I am concerned, I think it is only right for our farmers to give the benefit, all other things being equal, to the Canadian manufacturers. That was the design of the National Policy—to lead the people to patronize home industries and keep the money in our own country. If it is the case that American machines are better and can be sold cheaper than the Canadian made article, I hold that it is not the duty of the Government to hamper the farmers in this respect by an unusually high tariff. I recognize also that the manufacturers of those Canadian machines have had their business built up through the wise protective policy of the Conservative party. And a very thankless lot they proved to be. They have had their manufacturing establishments built up