

and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. PERRY. Allow me to congratulate the House that the end of the debate which has occupied two weeks is in sight. Let me also congratulate the Government on that fact, for if the debate was continued a few days longer the Minister of Finance would not have a majority to carry his motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. Hon. members on this side of the House have made no attack on the tariff in detail; they have attacked the National Policy as a whole, and they are prepared to stand by the position they have taken in that regard. Some hon. gentlemen opposite are, however, willing to attack one article and another article of the tariff. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) is not, however, willing to attack the National Policy structure in any particular. The hon. gentleman declares that if one item is attacked, the whole structure may fall. I do not understand how he reconciles this view with the view adopted by his leader, who appears to be willing to take two bricks out of the structure. Let me tell the hon. member for Inverness that when those bricks are removed he had better be some distance away, otherwise the whole structure may fall on him. It will be interesting to know how hon. gentlemen opposite will make their speeches and votes harmonize; they must reconcile their votes and their acts with their constituents. The hon. member for Inverness stated that the farmers, including the poorer classes of farmers, are well protected under the National Policy. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by protection to the farmer. I am not very well acquainted with the hon. gentleman's county, although I travelled over it a few years ago, but I know how the farmers are protected in Prince Edward Island, and I suppose the farmers receive the same protection in Inverness as in Prince county. I find, on referring to the returns, that the farmers are protected on agricultural machinery to the extent of 35 per cent. The farmers of Inverness probably have not much farm machinery, including haycutters and binders, but in Prince Edward Island such is not the case. There we have more farming implements and machinery than any other portion of Canada with the same population, and this machinery is protected by a duty of 35 per cent. I find also that the ordinary stoneware used by the poorer classes is protected by 35 per cent. Forks and hay rakes, which are used by farmers, to which the hon. gentleman refers, are also protected by 35 per cent. I find also that the richer classes are better off than the poorer classes in this regard, for china and silver and gold plate, used by the rich, are only protected to the extent of 30 and 20 per cent respectively. That, I suppose, is the protection meted out for the benefit

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

of the farmers, to which the hon. member for Inverness refers. Jewellery is only protected to the extent of 25 per cent, while spades and shovels, used by farmers and labourers, are protected by a duty of 46 per cent. Forks and hay rakes, which are used by the poorer classes, and are not used by lawyers, merchants or doctors, or even by the hon. member himself during many years, are protected by 33 per cent. Hay-knives that cost \$3.15 each pay a duty of \$2.59, which is equal to 79 per cent. That is the protection meted out to the farmers, and yet the hon. gentleman declares that under the National Policy the farmers are well protected. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in this view. I do not intend to detain the House by entering into statistics, for in discussing hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars it is quite easy to go astray. The hon. member for Inverness, the Minister of Finance, and the supporters of the Government all declare that we must have a National Policy, and that the country cannot do without the large revenue. Let hon. members look for one moment at what is done with the revenue. I find that last year the advertising and printing in Conservative newspapers in Canada cost \$236,975. The public have a right to know why this large amount was paid to those papers. The Montreal "Gazette," for example, received last year \$17,376. I suppose there is a reason for that expenditure. I presume the owner of that paper is a supporter of the Government, and that it is necessary to subsidize that organ. The Monoton "Times" received \$12,271. The Halifax "Herald," another good Tory paper, received \$9,505. The St. John "Sun," another good Tory sheet, obtained \$13,875. The Quebec "Chronicle" received \$4,277, and at the bottom of the page I find, Regina "Leader," \$4,512. The total payments amounted to \$236,975, this sum being paid to these and other newspapers throughout Canada, all being Tory newspapers, no doubt. It is interesting to take the newspapers of Prince Edward Island, and inquire how the Tory press has been subsidized there. We find that the Charlottetown "Examiner" received last year for advertising \$147. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a very small amount for a newspaper in Prince Edward Island which is the Government mouthpiece in that province. The "Examiner" also got for advertising, last year, \$1,184.50, which is a little better. The Charlottetown "Herald," another Tory paper, got, for printing and advertising, \$885; and the Summerside "Journal," another Tory paper, received \$1,118.85; or the Tory papers of that province got altogether, last year, \$4,035.65, which is 75 per cent of the amount that the Government is willing to spend in repairing, and, I may say, building the wharfs and piers around the whole coast of Prince Edward Island. The Tory press of