

to talk and gesticulate until I was afraid he would drop dead from apoplexy. He was always denouncing the tariff. I do not think you were there at the time, Mr. Speaker. He was always denouncing the tariff in the bitterest manner, but he always voted with his party. You can always do all the denouncing you like as long as you vote right, and Senator Edwards, in the letter addressed to the Citizen, complained that the Liberal party was going to the eternal "bow-wows" because the leader had pronounced himself a protectionist. The senator concludes the letter by saying that if he were a young man and not suffering from an infirmity he would be delighted to come back into the House of Commons to fight the tariff issue. The Right Hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) will remember all about it, because he was present in the House. We had Senator Edwards as a member of the House in 1896, and I am sure he did not denounce or oppose the protection Government of the day. It is all very well to talk and move resolutions, but as the Scotchman says: It is not what ye shall be saying or what ye shall be thinking but what ye shall be doing. The question is: How did you vote? I do not recall that Senator Edwards ever voted against the Government or against protection. If he wished to distinguish himself he could probably assist in having the duty removed from cement because I understand he is very deeply interested in this cement combine.

With regard to the tariff investigation, the Government promises thorough investigation and analysis of the fiscal question. I take it that the members of the Cabinet are quite sincere in this promise. I would however remind the Government that we have had many experiences in fiscal investigations which have been fizzles or mockeries. Every man in this House and every thinking man in the country realizes the powerful influences which would be brought to bear, and which are perhaps even now at work, to prevent anything like a really scientific and reformed fiscal system being established. Whilst free trade is the ideal and scientific fiscal or economic system, it would seem to me futile for any class of thoughtful Canadians, in view of the world conditions as they exist at this moment, and in view of our limited population, to insist upon the immediate introduction of that policy. Indeed, many thoughtful Canadians who are strong free traders in

principle even feel that any ultra-radical changes in the present fiscal system, under the remarkable conditions which exist, might be fraught with grave danger. The fact that a protection system has been in operation in Canada for forty years, that under it a large industrial population has been created, makes it, in the eyes of such old free traders as I have in mind, extremely dangerous to propose any sudden or ill-considered radical change, even if our fiscal policy is not fundamentally sound, as most people will generally admit. But whilst a tariff may for fiscal and general economic reasons be necessary in Canada at present, it is still more necessary that the tariff should not be used, as it has been in the past, for the purpose of making fortunes for the owners of manufacturing plants, or, still worse, for cheap financial grafters who know just enough to be able to capitalize tariff advantages and realize on them through the issue of watered stock. The use or abuse of the tariff in this way is the main reason for such hostility to the policy of protection as it exists on this continent. But there is no intrinsic reason, if a government or parliament is honest, why a tariff policy cannot be operated without its opportunities being diverted to the benefit of the selfish or the crooked. Canada has surely progressed enough in economic intelligence to make a continuation of the "hogs and the chestnuts" era no longer possible. After living nearly 40 years in the Northwest I know what Protection, especially Protection on agricultural implements, has done to the western farmer. I vividly recall the hardship that was for many years involved in the notes which the farmers, by the thousands, gave on agricultural implements; these notes generally bore 12 per cent interest per annum after maturity. Usually these notes included a lien not only on the implement purchased but actually on the farmer's homestead. I recall the fact that farmers paid \$165 for implements which cost the manufacturer, loaded on the car outside his factory, not more than \$42. I believe that to a very considerable extent much similar conditions still exist. I regret to confess that so far as the agricultural implement industry is concerned I fear the tariff makes very little difference as the business is largely in the hands of an international interlocking combine or monopoly which exploits the farmers of both the United States and Canada. Other measures must be adopted to enable the western farmers to get their machines