

than we can produce at home. I rejoice in the step taken towards lowering the duties between Canada and the mother country, and I rejoice at the adroitness with which the present Government have tackled that question in view of all the difficulties that surround it. I think we may hope for great things that shall result to the country's good. I can fully understand why hon. gentlemen opposite have a great deal to say on this question, because virtually this was a tid-bit with them in former years, and the Government of the day has literally scooped the whole thing out and left them nothing to talk about along that line. We desire, then, to leave these matters with the Government and hope that the measures which have been taken will do much to strengthen the hands of the producers in the North-west and to give us new encouragement and new strength to cope with difficulties of climate and general living.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with much interest to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken as representing the Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia. I think it must strike every one as strange that those gentlemen's campaign speeches should have consisted largely of a general cry that the people of the North-west were being ground down by an exorbitant tariff which was unbearable. But the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has told the House that members of the Opposition must feel pretty uncomfortable because they have been scooped out and nothing has been left them on that line. If we have been scooped out, it must be because the tariff, according to that hon. gentleman, is substantially the same protectionist tariff which was in force under the Conservative Government. While I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in that regard, I think the general proposition and statement made here that nine-tenths of the tariff is the old tariff is true, and it indicates that hon. gentlemen opposite have been afraid to adopt that policy which, when in Opposition, they declared they would adopt. They do recognize one fact, that it was not the policy of the Liberals when in Opposition that returned them to power, but that it was the mistakes of the Government of that day, who adopted a policy in respect to separate schools in Manitoba which did not meet with the approval of the Conservative party, nor of the people of Canada. I must say in addition—and I do not wish to say it in any hurtful sense—that the late Prime Minister had surrounded himself by Ministers, some of whom did not receive the full confidence and support of the Conservative party. For these reasons, and not because the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite commended itself to the country, the Conservative party went into Opposition and the Liberal party were placed in power.

Mr. DOUGLAS.

Now, the first thing that has struck me in connection with this tariff proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, is its omissions. They have told us nothing about their policy on the export duty on logs and pulp wood, a question that is agitating the people of the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, and a question upon which the future prosperity of a large portion of these provinces depend. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying, that in face of the conditions at present existing, the true policy for this Government to adopt is to impose an export duty upon saw logs and upon pulp wood. I believe that such a policy would restore a large measure of prosperity to portions of Canada that are not prosperous to-day; portions of Canada that have been deprived of the wealth nature has given them. I believe that the Government would be consulting the best interests of the entire Dominion by adopting such a policy. Then, Sir, we were told that the Government might have another policy, some time in the future, about coal; and they foreshadowed that they are going to put a duty upon anthracite coal, an article from which the late Government removed the duty. Sir, this Government have not been able to give us any evidence that would justify the re-imposition of that duty upon anthracite coal.

We heard a great deal on the stump from hon. gentlemen opposite, and we heard a great deal from the Prime Minister, as to what the Liberals were going to do when they got into power. The Prime Minister told the people: We will enlarge the free list and give the manufacturers free raw material. Sir, have they done so? Can they point to a single instance in which they have given free material to the manufacturer, to enable him to produce more cheaply? No, Sir, they cannot. They have discovered since they came into power that the Conservative Government had already done that for the manufacturers of Canada. A protective policy looks after two important features, first, to make the raw materials of the manufacturers free of duty where these raw materials are not manufactured in this country, and second, that the necessaries of life for the people should also be free of duty, when these necessaries are not produced within the Dominion. The late Government adhered to these two ideas closely, as a necessary portion of their policy of protection; and, Sir, the new Government, in spite of all their pledges about raw material have commenced their career by putting a duty of 92½ per cent upon uncleaned rice, which is the raw material of the rice manufacturers of Canada. That, this Government has done without any justification whatever. I find that there were over 13,000,000 pounds of uncleaned rice imported last year at a cost of \$108,000, or 81 cents per hundred pounds, and this Government in their wisdom have put