

on the raw material, which be it repeated is tantamount to a bounty to the foreign implement maker who gets his raw material at first cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want, unnecessarily, to interfere with the hon. gentleman's speech, but I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that he is reading it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Probably the hon. gentleman is referring to his notes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Owing to the large number of figures employed in discussing this question and a desire to be strictly accurate, I feel obliged to make copious notes. Another way to cheapen implements and every thing else and to put money directly into the farmer's pocket, is for the Government to see if something cannot be done to secure lower freight rates.

Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, president of the Grand Trunk, recently announced that the company paid last year \$375,000 for duty on coal. That amount capitalized is about three times the amount of aid, which according to report is to be given by the Government to construct the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Now, it is quite clear that it is not the Grand Trunk but the settler of Canada that pays this \$375,000. If the duty were taken off coal the settlers would save that vast amount.

The dilemma in which the Government found itself was whether they should kill these deformed infants outright or wean them gradually. They have decided upon the latter alternative. As a North-west member, representing a purely agricultural constituency, I cannot refrain from expressing my great regret and disappointment that such articles as agricultural implements, coal oil, lumber, and other necessities have not either been placed upon the free list or very greatly reduced. I know that my constituents, and the settlers generally of the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, will share in the regret and disappointment to which I have given expression, as they have been fondly hoping for years that the principal commodities and necessities of the farmer would be either placed upon the free list or reduced to a minimum. While in justice to myself and my constituents, who trusted me to accurately and honestly represent them, I have felt bound to present the views I have offered, I would not like to set myself up against the united wisdom of the entire Cabinet, for no one recognizes more thoroughly than I do the magnitude of the task they have had to face; the heroic style in which they have grappled with it, and the pretty thorough manner in which the pruning knife has been applied. However, as a representative of a purely agricultural constituency and in view of the pledges I gave and of the confidence which I flatter myself my constituents repose in my integrity. I

am bound to say that if it were not for the very general sweeping reductions that have been made if it were not that I see in the changes a strong trend towards ultimate free trade; if it were not that I regard the changes as an instalment only; if it were not that I recognize the tremendous difficulties that beset the path of the Government in rescuing the country at one stroke from the effects of a long in-grained policy of protection, and placing it on a free trade basis; I am bound to say, however, regretfully that I would be forced to oppose the Government if I took cognizance only of the failure to gratify western expectations and demands upon two or three important articles. When, however, I find hon. gentlemen opposite proclaiming that the new tariff is a death blow levelled at protection, and that this that and the other industry is killed, I am greatly encouraged in my purpose to support the Government, for according to my way of thinking, and I doubt not that the west will agree with me, the sooner that many of these so-called industries which cannot exist without the nursing bottle, are slaughtered the better for the country. I don't want any better material with which to campaign in the west than the fact that dozens of these little misshapen, atrophied, pap-fed industrial monstrosities have been sent to the land of Kingdom Come by the operation of the new tariff. If I wanted to buttress myself with an additional reason for supporting the Government I might add that it would be furnished in the prospect of a return to power of the high priests of protection sitting opposite, and I could not justify a vote which might tend to bring about a consummation so devoutly to be deplored. If hostile critics of the Liberal Government were to say that so far as the west is concerned it is chastising us with whips, it would certainly not be stretching the metaphor too far to say that if the Conservatives were returned to power, they would promptly resume the grim occupation of chastising us with scorpions.

Mr. KLOEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in reference to the trade policy of the present Government, and at the outset I shall say, that there never has been a time in the history of Canada when our fiscal policy required greater attention than at the present time, and greater caution before interfering with existing conditions. During the last campaign the exponents of the Liberal policy made many promises to the people, and indeed I may say that they made very different promises. One time they pledged themselves to "free trade as it is in England"; another time "tariff for revenue only"; another time "tariff reform" and then they went on to explain, that the farmers were robbed and that the manufacturers were spoon-fed long enough. In the light of all this, it is strange that the Liberal Government should have