

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

SPEECH

OF

GEORGE H. BRADBURY, ESQ.,

MEMBER FOR SELKIRK, MAN.

ON

THE WAR BUDGET

In the House of Commons, Ottawa, on Tuesday, March 9, 1915.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): I assure the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) will pardon me if I do not attempt to follow him in all that he has said. But I wish to refer to one or two of his remarks which have been in line with remarks made by other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. He spoke as if the policy "made in Canada" was not a desirable policy to advocate at this time.

Mr. TURGEON: I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I approved of Canadian-made goods, price being the same; but I pointed out the condition in which we are when the Minister of Finance says: Do not buy Canadian goods; I want the revenue.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not think the hon. gentleman has improved the matter. What he said was this: To advocate the policy of buying goods in Canada would be to deprive the Minister of Finance of revenue which he expected through his policy. Now, I wish to say to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House that the "made-in-Canada" policy is a policy intended to stimulate the great industries of this country and to give work to hundreds of thousands of men that are idle on the streets of Canadian towns and cities to-day. There is no doubt in my

mind that it is a wise policy. If the Canadian people in days gone by had dealt more directly with their own great industries we should have had a greater industrial Canada than we have to-day. Under the wise protective tariff inaugurated by the great Conservative party in 1878 Canada has prospered. That tariff was denounced by the Liberal party for the eighteen long years when they were in Opposition, but when they attained office they took this policy as their own, and Canada prospered under the protective tariff. The principle of buying goods manufactured in Canada is in keeping with the policy inaugurated by the Conservative party and carried out during all the time it has been in office.

To one who knows anything about the two great political parties of Canada it is interesting to listen to the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The remarks of the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) are usually very moderate and very fair, and in listening to the hon. gentleman's speech the other day I was surprised that he had the temerity to make the statements and the charges that he did. He tried to fix on the leaders of the great Conservative party on this side of the House the stigma that rests upon the Liberal party: that of not implementing pre-election pledges. In view of the un-

savoury record of hon. gentlemen opposite in the matter of pre-election pledges, I would have thought that no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would have dared to mention the subject. During the course of his admirable speech the hon. junior member for Halifax said:

They promised time and again by their leaders that if honoured with the confidence of the electorate, they would carry on the public services for a much less sum; and they professed much regard for the sanctity of public pledges given by political leaders. In their election handbook of 1911, I find this:

He then proceeded to read what I presume to be a paragraph from that handbook, as follows:

If there is one thing more clear than another in the government of a democratic country it is that political leaders should be held to a strict account for their pledges and platforms. These form the basis of the contract between them and the electorate. These undertakings are solemnly given. They are not actionable in Courts of Law, and therefore all the more should they be held cognizable in the great moot court of the people, and their terms rigidly exacted.

On the basis of that item the hon. gentleman attempted to build the argument that the leaders of the Conservative party had made the pledge that if they were returned to office they would reduce the expenditure of this country. Later he said:

Is not the conduct of the Government in the circumstances open to the gravest censure? Was not this a fitting season for the Government to practise economy and implement its pre-election pledges? The present Government party, when in Opposition, promised, if elected to power, a reduction in public expenditure. Let us see if they have observed faithfully their pledges in this respect.

I desire to say that the hon. gentleman cannot quote any statement contained in the platform laid down by the Conservative party previous to their return in 1911 asserting that if returned to office they would reduce the public expenditure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Go to Hansard and you will find it.

Mr. BRADBURY: I have looked at Hansard. I do not think the hon. gentleman can find any such statement; I venture to say that it does not exist, because no such pledge was given. What the leaders of the Conservative party said was that if they were returned to power they would handle the revenues in such a manner as to avoid waste. They condemned in the strongest possible terms the extravagance of the late Administration and the manner

in which the public revenues were squandered under Liberal rule. But not a line was written or a word uttered by the leaders of the Conservative party pledging themselves to reduce expenditure. Why do I say that? Because the Conservative party realized that with the development and expansion of our growing country the expenditures were bound to increase. They realized that great public buildings would have to be erected in different parts of the country; that our waterways would have to be improved; that steps would have to be taken to develop the resources, commerce and industries of our country. The Conservative party complained not so much of the amount of money expended by the Liberal Government as they did about the manner in which the public funds of Canada were handled by them.

Mr. LAW: Did the hon. gentleman read all the manifestoes issued by the Conservative party during the election of 1911? There were several.

Mr. BRADBURY: I think I read all literature that could be rightly called part of the platform of the Conservative party. No hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can produce a pamphlet issued under the authority of the Conservative party in which a pledge of that kind was given to the people.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did the hon. gentleman read a certain manifesto in which the first paragraph was that the expenditure of \$74,000,000 by the Liberal Government was extravagant beyond all possible defence?

Mr. BRADBURY: No, but if I had read it I could readily have understood it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I can show my hon. friend a copy of that manifesto, which is signed by his leader.

Mr. BRADBURY: I could well understand the leader of the Opposition at that time using such language, because every man who sat on the opposite side of the House previous to 1911 contended that the expenditures were extravagant and that the finances of the country were handled in an outrageous and wasteful manner.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can send you a library on that point.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. junior member for Halifax advocated that the expenditures on public works should be cut down.

On page 387 of Hansard he is reported as saying:

Instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of \$20,000,000 for public works, they might have asked for \$10,000,000 or less, and, if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year. I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure.

Then our hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) made this statement about the Civil Service:

We could reduce the number of officials, reduce them largely, and not interfere with the public service. We could cut the cost of public works in two and not interfere with the public service. . . . I understand that they are spending some \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 in Halifax. I venture the assertion that if the money was properly expended you could do all that is necessary for the development of trade in the city of Halifax for \$5,000,000.

I do not think the junior member for Halifax would agree that the work in Halifax could be completed for \$5,000,000. But what I want to point out is that we are to-day passing through perhaps the most critical period in the history of Canada. When we have thousands of men idle in the streets of most of our great cities, I claim that one of the most unpatriotic things that this Government could be guilty of would be to stop public works in this country or cut them down to such an extent as would limit the work that should be provided for the mechanics and labouring men of our cities. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) condemned public expenditure just as strongly as the junior member for Halifax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that public works expenditure should be cut out; I said to reduce it to what it was in the year 1912 or 1911.

Mr. BRADBURY: The language I read is very plain, it is in Hansard. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant to say, I am only quoting what he did say. The hon. member for St. John said that this was not a time to go on with large public works, while the people of this country were spending every dollar they had in charity. Mr. Speaker, the workingmen in this country do not want charity, the working men want work, and it is the duty of a patriotic Government, as far as possible, to give them that work. I think when the

hon. gentlemen face their constituents they will find it difficult to explain to them the language which they have used in this House as regards cutting out public works in this country, which meant, if it meant anything, that the public works should cease and thousands of men be thrown out of employment. Let us see what one of the outside leaders of this great party has to say about this question. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Toronto Globe, and every one who knows anything about the Liberal party recognizes that the editor of the Globe has a good deal to do with the leadership of the Liberal party.

The Globe is the mouthpiece of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; in fact, its editor is looked upon as the outside leader. When there is any trouble in this House we generally find the editor of the Globe—

An hon. MEMBER: Reverend.

Mr. BRADBURY: The reverend editor of the Globe sitting in the gallery encouraging hon. gentlemen by his smiles, and perhaps even by his enthusiastic applause. Therefore I think I can refer to him as the outside leader, without being offensive. Here is what he said on the 10th of last month. The editorial is headed: "When to Spend Public Money," and is as follows:

The time to spend public money freely is when private enterprise is on the ebb. If governments and public bodies enter upon huge programmes of public works when a building boom and a rush of railway construction are in progress the inevitable result is to attract to the country far more workers than it can provide employment for under normal conditions, and so to intensify the depression which follows boom conditions.

This is precisely what is happening in Canada to-day. The Estimates introduced by the Minister of Finance make provision for carrying on public works begun in former years, but the financial situation is so difficult that practically no new works are to be begun during 1915 at the very time when the need for employment is greater than ever before in the experience of the building trades throughout Canadian cities.

It would be peanut politics to attempt to make party capital out of the situation. No Government in Canada, Liberal or Conservative, has ever deliberately curtailed expenditures upon public works in good times so that it might more freely provide employment during seasons of depression. In all probability this failure to take thought of the morrow has been the result of the belief of politicians that hard times dog their opponents only, and that the remedy may well be left for their opponents' consideration. The interests of the nation should be placed above party, however, and the Globe would like to see a healthy growth of public opinion in favour of husbanding the resources of the Dominion, the provinces, and the municipalities in boom periods so that public works may be undertaken at seasons of the greatest need. The

work carried forward at such seasons would be done more cheaply and more thoroughly than under conditions of abnormal activity and would render unnecessary the spending of vast sums on maintaining willing workmen in idleness....

And yet, in the face of this pronouncement by the *Globe*, hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to induce this Government to lessen its expenditure and to reduce work in this country to a minimum, thereby throwing tens of thousands of Canadians out of employment. The reverend gentleman who wrote that article described the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite as "peanut politics," and I comment that description to them. No more unpatriotic move could be made by any man or body of men in Canada than to endeavour to induce municipalities or governments to curtail expenditure in these trying times. I believe it to be the duty of every great city, every municipality, and every government in Canada, to spend every dollar they honestly can on legitimate works, for the purpose of providing labour for our people. We cannot afford to lower the standard of our workmen, by making them subjects for charity.

My friend from St. John would allow the people of Canada to dole out charity to the mechanics and working men; but the *Globe*, the Liberal organ, holds that it is peanut politics to preach a doctrine of that kind. The *Globe* says further:

There are many organizations engaged in the study of social conditions—Conservation Commissions, Unemployment Commissions, Social Service Commissions. They could do nothing more calculated to fill up the valleys of depression than to secure that public employment shall be at the minimum in Canada when private employment is at the maximum, and that the stress of hard times shall be lessened by the construction of public works during seasons of depression.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to have it so arranged that the public works shall be at the minimum, that the public expenditures of Canada shall be cut in two. One hon. gentleman went so far as to say that one large item of \$5,000,000 in connection with the Hudson bay should be cut out altogether. In view of these statements it is hard for me to know which party to believe, the Liberal party in this House or the Liberal leaders out of the House. It reminds me of the story of the gentleman who was visiting a neighbour's house and was charged by a vicious looking dog which went at him as if it was going to eat him. The host came out and said, "Oh, don't be afraid of him, can't you see he is wagging his

tail?" The visitor replied, "Yes, but I do not know which end to believe." It is the same to-night, I do not know which end to believe, whether I should believe the junior member for Halifax and the hon. member for St. John, and the other members who have advised the Government to cut down expenditures and leave the workmen to the charity of the people of Canada, or those who advocate a wise continuance of public works.

I think that a party with such an unsavory reputation as far as its pre-election pledges are concerned ought to hesitate before making any such statement as that which was uttered by the hon. junior member for Halifax. I have criticised the attitude taken by the hon. junior member for Halifax regarding the cutting down of the Estimates for public works; and I wish to quote his words now. Speaking of the Estimates of the Public Works Department, the hon. junior member for Halifax said:

Can the Minister of Public Works himself submit to the House any fair defence for his request to Parliament to vote practically \$20,000,000 for public works expenditure in 1914-15? I do submit, and in fairness, I think, having in view the circumstances prevailing throughout Canada this year, and throughout the world for that matter, that instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of \$20,000,000 for public works, they might have asked for \$10,000,000 or less, and, if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year. I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure. Many of these projected works were without justification, the necessity for others have at least temporarily passed away by reason of the declining business of the country. Expenditures for these purposes should have been reduced to the minimum this year and next year.

The hon. member for St. John, taking the lead from the hon. junior member for Halifax, followed along the same lines. He had been advising my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) to cut down the expenditure on public works. The minister asked him across the floor of the House if he would be willing to have the Estimates cut down for his own county, and his reply was:

I would not be worthy of my position as a member of this House if I did not answer "Yes" to that question. I would not be worthy of the confidence of the people of my constituency if I were so cowardly that I would not dare to stand up in my place and give an answer to

that question in the affirmative. Therefore I say that in these times of stress and trouble the amount proposed for St. John harbour of \$1,500,000 might very well be cut down during this year to \$750,000. The work could go on, and a great deal of work could be done for that money.

When he was making these observations, I interjected a question across the floor of the House, asking him if it was not wise for the Government of this country to spend money when times were hard to provide work for the working people of this country. His answer was:

That is right, if you have the money in the Treasury. But is this the time to tax the people of this country, when, as I have said every dollar, every cent, they can spare is being given to charity.

To emphasize what I said before: The artisans and working people of this country are a self-reliant, independent class of people. They are not looking for charity, they do not wish to be pauperized, they want to be provided with work, and it would be an unpatriotic act of this Government, or of any provincial government, or of the authorities in any city in Canada, to follow the advice given by the hon. member for St. John, to reduce their expenditure on public works at this time, if they could possibly secure the money to go on with these works. A more unpatriotic position could not be taken by hon. gentlemen representing great cities, such as Halifax and St. John, which cities must have thousands of men out of employment, than to ask the Government not only to cut the Estimates, but if necessary to eliminate them altogether and to stop all public works.

I wish Mr. Speaker, to devote a little time to making a comparison between the records of hon. gentlemen who occupy so serenely the Opposition benches to-day, when they were in power with the record of the Conservative Government now in office. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) had the temerity to chide the Conservative party for having violated its pre-election pledges. I wonder where the Liberal party stands in that respect. Let me refer to some of the promises made by the Liberal party before they came into power in 1896, and how well they implemented them. It will be remembered that just previous to the election of 1896, and many of us are old enough to remember that campaign, these hon. gentlemen, having been for eighteen long years in the cold shades of opposition, travelled throughout Canada and in every city, every village, and every concession, preached to the farmers the

doctrine of discontent, trying to make them believe that they were the men who were paying the taxes and were being bled white by this awful protective tariff, and promising what they would do to relieve the situation if they came to office. I quote from one of the planks in the Liberal platform of 1893:

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion; we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

That is an admirable declaration for a political platform, and one which if lived up to would have redounded to the credit of the Liberal party. But what was their record when they came to power? In 1896, when the Liberals assumed office, the public accounts show that the national debt of Canada stood at \$258,000,000, and in 1911, when they went out of office, they had managed, not to decrease the national debt, but to increase it to \$340,000,000, or an increase of \$82,000,000 during the fifteen years they were in power. But that does not tell one-half the tale. The Conservative Government had been in office for eighteen years, and it had laid the foundation of Canada's greatness, so that prosperity was in full tide when the Liberals came to power, and with a buoyant revenue the Liberal party that was pledged to reduce taxation and expenditure took out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country, in the ten years immediately preceding their defeat in 1911, \$311,486,000 more than the Conservative party took in any ten years previous to 1896. Therefore, when you add this to the \$82,000,000 of national debt, which they heaped upon this country, you can form some idea of the manner in which the Liberals implemented their pledge of economy to the people of Canada. I believe the Liberals never intended to carry out that pledge; it is quite clear to-day that the pledge was made to catch votes, and in that they succeeded. But the Liberal party stands before this country guilty of having violated every pledge they gave to the people of Canada previous to 1896. But that is not all. These gentlemen opposite have now the temerity to charge the Conservative Government with having increased the public debt since it came into office. True, this Government has increased the public debt, but let us see why. I find, on looking over the official returns, that on the 31st of March, 1912, the first year the present Government was responsible for the expenditure, the public debt stood at \$339,-

919,460, and on the 28th of February just past, the debt had risen to \$401,891,909, or an increase of \$61,972,000 in the last three years.

But, Mr. Speaker, how was this debt increased and what was the cause of the increase? The increased debt under the Conservative Government, was incurred entirely for the purpose of taking care of liabilities left to it by the Liberal party when it went out of office. It was a legacy, Sir, left to this Government, and this Government was in honour bound to accept and provide for it. I shall give to the House a statement of what it has cost this Government to care for some of the undertakings that the Liberal Government rushed into so recklessly, previous to their defeat in 1911. In order to care for these liabilities left them by the Liberals, it was necessary to provide no less a sum than \$178,000,000. For the fiscal years 1912-13 and 1914-15 we find the following expenditures on works which were in progress when the present Government came to power; on the National Transcontinental railway which was undertaken by the Liberal Government against the advice of the Conservative party; the present Government expended \$56,000,000, and on the Hudson Bay railway \$9,000,000.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Does the hon. gentleman object to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. BRADBURY: I will answer that question in a minute or two. On the Quebec bridge, which was undertaken by the Liberal Government, the present Government was obliged to spend \$10,000,000. It is a monument to the shame of the late Government that a great undertaking like the Quebec bridge should have been permitted to be placed in the hands of incompetent men, and that it should have cost not only the loss of \$6,000,000 to the people of Canada, but the loss of 80 lives of our citizens through the neglect of the men constructing and managing that bridge. That makes a total of \$75,000,000.

Then there was the implementing clause in connection with the sale of G.T.P. bonds. The bungling finance of the late Government necessitated the providing of \$4,994,416 to pay the difference between the price at which the bonds were sold and their par value. This was something to which the late Government committed this country through incompetence or something worse.

Then, there was the caring for the balance of the issue of £14,000,000. Six million

eight hundred thousand pounds of Grand Trunk Pacific bonds had to be provided for. The present Minister of Finance, in order to save the country an additional loss of \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000, took up the bonds at par, and paid \$33,093,333. Therefore since coming into office this Government has had to provide these enormous sums in order to pay the liabilities left on the hands of this country by the late Administration. Mr. Speaker, had it not been for these liabilities which the Government had to meet, had it not been for the war, the national debt of this country would not have been increased by one dollar. In fact, it could very easily have been reduced, and would have been reduced. This, Sir, is my answer to hon. gentlemen opposite who try to make capital out of the fact that the national debt of this country has been increased by the present Government.

How do our hon. friends opposite stand in regard to the pledge which they gave to the people in 1896 to reduce the national expenditure of this country? They stand on that count just as they stand on every one of the pledges which they gave to the people previous to 1896. Every pledge that they gave was ignored and violated by the Liberal party. The people of this country at length awoke to a realization of the class of men who were in control of the destiny of this country up to 1911.

These hon. gentlemen who are criticising the public expenditures of to-day, who are advising the Government to curtail them, are on record as having promised the people that, if they were returned to power in 1896, they would reduce the public expenditure of the country, although at that time it was very small in comparison with what it has reached at the present time. In 1896, one of their pledges was:

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt, and the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878.

The Conservative party had been in power since 1878, and that was what was worrying the Liberal party.

We demand strict economy in the administration of this country.

The right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition made this pledge:

If we get into power, we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie; and say that, although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

Then there was the pledge of the late Minister of Finance, Sir Richard Cartwright:

For my own part I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of \$10,000,000 or \$38,000,000 altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say, it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,000,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.

I could go on reading pledge after pledge made by these hon. gentlemen to reduce the public expenditures of this country. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that a public pledge given by party leaders to the people of this country on the verge of an election is just as sacred and should be lived up to just as carefully and as scrupulously as a promise or pledge given in any business transaction.

But what has been the record of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question? In 1897, the first year in which the right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition, was responsible to the people in this country, the current expenditure was \$38,349,760. That is the amount at which the right hon. gentleman found the expenditures of the country when he took office. The capital expenditure was \$3,523,000, which makes a total of \$41,872,760. In 1902, five years afterwards, the Liberal Administration, with its promise to the people to reduce expenditures still warm on its lips, had increased the current expenditure to \$50,759,392, and the capital expenditure to \$10,078,638 or the total to \$60,838,030. The expenditures still kept going up until 1911. It was a growing time, and the Liberal party was spending the people's money like a drunken sailor throwing away his money recklessly. In 1911 the current expenditure had risen to \$87,000,000, and the capital expenditure to \$35,000,000, or to a total of \$122,000,000. But in 1912, the current expenditure for which the late Government was responsible, had risen to \$109,000,000, and the capital expenditure to \$46,000,000, or to the total of \$155,000,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite criticize Conservative ministers for having brought down an estimated current expenditure for this year of \$140,000,000. This is the record of the Liberal party as to the manner in which it has implemented its pledge to reduce the expenditures of this country.

I would like for a moment to draw the attention of the House to the percentage of increase in expenditure. The total disbursements under the late Government in-

creased by 178 per cent in the fifteen years it was in office. The increase per head was 85 per cent. Let me give a ten-year record, which is worth placing on Hansard. The ten-year record of expenditure under the Conservative party previous to 1896 shows that it had expended on public works in this country \$423,358,000; whereas the late Government, pledged to reduce the expenditures, during the ten years after it had come into office, had spent \$919,748,517, or an increase of \$496,390,517. The per capita expenditure in 1896 was \$8.80, and in 1911, \$16.40, just double what they found it on assuming office.

This is the record of the Liberal party, showing how it implemented its pledge that if returned to office it would reduce the public expenditures. I do not know that I should have taken up even a moment of the time of the House in reviewing this question—for the people are thoroughly conversant with it—had it not been for the taunt thrown across the floor, the charge made that the party now in power deserves censure for not having implemented its pre-election pledges.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman has not attempted to answer that.

Mr. BRADBURY: I have answered it by denying it, and by showing that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot prove it. The onus of proof lies upon the hon. members who made the charge.

Mr. MACLEAN: You have answered it simply by referring to the pre-election pledges of hon. gentlemen on this side a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. BRADBURY: These pledges given a quarter of a century ago were given by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who still leads that party. And I hope he will live long to lead it. He is still with us and is still responsible for the policy of the Liberal party.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY: I find that these hon. gentlemen have a record on the question of the tariff. They went up and down this country for years denouncing protection. And I will read just one or two of their pledges, for it will be of interest to the younger members on the other side of the House, who do not know what their friends were committed to in days gone by. Sir Richard Cartwright said:

I say our protective system was a huge mistake in so far as it was honest at all; and in so

far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. . . Their ideal is protection; ours is free trade. We will never desist until this country is freed from the incubus that has been weighing it down for fifteen long years.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition spoke in the city of Winnipeg on one of his western tours. I remember well his coming to my own constituency, and speaking in the town of Selkirk, bringing with him the late Hon. D. C. Fraser, then member of this House for Guysborough; and I remember very well that at this meeting this is what he said:

The people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master who takes away a very large portion of your earnings, the earnings for which you toil and sweat for privileged masters, for those who use protection which I claim is bondage. If the Government take away from you any portion of your earnings, be they large or small, to give them to somebody else, that Government is as much a robber towards you as is the highwayman who puts a pistol to your head and says: your purse or your life. I denounce this policy of protection. Protection cannot be defended on any fair principle.

I also wish to call the attention of the House—because it affects my own province—to the utterance on behalf of the Liberal party of that day, by a leading member of the Liberal Government and the pledge he made to the people of the West:

Return us to power, and we will give you free trade as they have it in England. That is the Liberal policy. We will no longer tolerate the policy of the Conservatives which robs you for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers. We will at once and for ever wipe off the statute book the villainous protection policy which has stunted the prosperity of the whole country and taken the heart's blood out of the people of Manitoba. Free coal oil, free clothing, and free implements you will have if the Liberal party are returned to power.

This is the statement of Hon. Mr. (now Sir Clifford) Sifton, a man who was the right-hand man of the present leader of the Opposition when at the head of the Government, and the strongest of his ministers from the West; in fact, he was known as the dictator of the Liberal policy; and this is the pledge he gave, speaking for his party. And what did they do when they came into power? One of the first things, Mr. Speaker, was to take into the Senate two of the greatest sinners, perhaps, so far as the West is concerned—Sir Melvin Jones and Hon. Mr. Frost. That is the way they carried out their pledge to give the farmers free implements. And for long years they did not even touch the duty on farm implements. At length they made up their minds that they must do something, that the farmers of the West could not be

fooled all the time, and on the eve of an election they reduced the tariff on agricultural implements from 20 per cent, where the Conservative Government had left it, to 17½ per cent. And the farmers were told by Sir Clifford Sifton that 17½ per cent was only a revenue tariff. This is the manner in which they fooled the farmers of the West into supporting them. They managed for fifteen years to pull the wool over the eyes of the farmers of the West by their promises to do something year after year. But the day came when the farmers had their eyes opened. As soon as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had the temerity to attempt to impose the reciprocity pact upon the people of this country, as soon as he attempted to make Canada an adjunct of the United States, the farmers of Canada turned him out of office.

What was their success in dealing with the tariff, in eliminating "every vestige of protection," as they promised to do? On every platform in Canada these pledges were made by responsible men and repeated by those irresponsible, that if the Liberals were returned to office they would eliminate every vestige of protection from the tariff. But in fifteen years of power, they succeeded in reducing the tariff just about two per cent. Why, Sir, the greatest reduction ever made in the National Policy tariff was made by the Conservative party itself, made by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). And he is not a free trader. This party does not pose before the people as being a party of free traders. We believe in the National Policy; we have advocated it in season and out of season; we believe in fair protection to farmer and manufacturer alike; there is no hypocrisy in the position we occupy before the people. But hon. gentlemen opposite declare themselves to be against protection. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) on all occasions since being placed in opposition has preached the doctrine of free trade—a beautiful theory but utterly impracticable in this country, and proven impracticable in the world generally. History tells us that when Cobden introduced free trade in England, he declared that within a few years the world would adopt free trade. And to-day we find that the world is protectionist everywhere except in Great Britain.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY: "Hear, hear," says the hon. gentleman—

Mr. CLARK: What is the matter with Great Britain?

Mr. BRADBURY: Great Britain has prospered in spite of free trade, by reason of her great marine power and by direct taxation. My hon. friend will not tell me that free trade prevails even in Great Britain. He knows that it collects a large part of its revenue to-day from tea and other commodities of that kind, which we allow to come into this country free for the poor people. The hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Opposition benches had control of the affairs of this country for fifteen years. In that time they became the close and intimate friends of the great manufacturing industries of this country. But today, when they are in the cold shades of Opposition, there is nothing too hard or too cruel for them to say about the manufacturers. We will have the same old story from the Opposition benches before many years have passed that was preached by the Liberal party before 1896; the policy of blue ruin is starting to show in the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we will have it proclaimed from every platform that the country is going to the dogs because they are not ruling its affairs. But it will take a good deal of persuasion on the part of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition and his eloquent friends to convince the people of this country that it will be a safe proposition to restore the Liberal party to office.

I wish now to refer to a few more of their many violated pledges, although time would not permit me to discuss them all. One plank in their platform was very interesting and very important in the West, that was the cry: The land for the settler and not for the speculator. Here is the plank in their platform:

Public land for the actual settler.

The sale of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only and not to the speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

I want to say without any reservation that when that plank was put in the platform of the Liberal party it did more to win hundreds of votes from settlers in Manitoba even than their anti-protection plank, because there was a growing feeling that the lands of this country were being exploited by large speculators and that the poor settler was not being taken proper care of. How did the Liberal party implement that pledge? Did they keep the land for the settler or did they hand it out

to the speculators, their special friends? You will all remember how they handled the Saskatchewan land deal. This notorious transaction has been spoken of in every part of Canada. Some 250,000 acres of land that is to-day the choice land of the Saskatchewan valley was sold to political friends for \$1 per acre. This was divided up so that the boys would get a share of the rake-off on these lands. You all remember that the Premier

of Saskatchewan was charged by 4 p. m. a paper in Moosejaw with having received \$12,000 as his share in this land transaction. This was on the eve of an election, if I remember aright. He immediately took proceedings in court, bringing an action for libel claiming \$25,000 against the paper. The case was hung up until after the election was over and then his attorney withdrew the case and paid all the costs. That does not look like the act of an innocent man. But he was not the only one. It is rumoured on pretty good authority that a Government official in a high position received \$25,000 of this stock; but he was timorous and returned the stock, and then three weeks afterwards repented and tried to get the stock back but did not succeed. This is the manner in which the Liberal party of Canada started out to implement their pledge to keep the land for the settler. Here was a magnificent area of land, 250,000 acres in extent, which in all fairness ought to have been divided up among the poor settlers who were looking for good land—settlers who, on account of transactions of this kind, have been crowded on to poor lands, some of them utterly unfit for settlement, while the good lands near the railways have been given away to Liberal friends, the speculators. This is one instance of how they implemented that pledge.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was not that land which was sold to the Saskatchewan Land Valley Company sold on the condition of actual settlement?

Mr. BRADBURY: Mr. Speaker, it was, and the condition was such a liberal condition that any man or set of men could have fulfilled it. However, it makes no difference what the condition was, we had the actual settlers in that country who wanted land, who were hungry for land; but they were crowded away from the centres and from the railways on to the poor lands in the different provinces—and here were men who secured this land, 250,000 acres, for \$1 an

acre. These lands to-day are worth from \$40 to \$50 an acre.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not true that before the Saskatchewan Land Valley Company got this land and began to bring in settlers there was a territory over 60 miles in length along that railway on which there was no settlement, although the railway had been built for a number of years, because the general impression was that it was not good land, or land which was fit for settlement?

Mr. BRADBURY: The answer to that is very simple. It may not have been thrown open to homesteading at the time and consequently no homesteaders could get on it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is entirely mistaken; the land was all opened to homesteading.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not want to deny the hon. gentleman the opportunity of asking questions. What I have said was stated many times before.

Mr. CARVELL: And denied many times.

Mr. BRADBURY: We have the proof of the pudding to-day; we know what has taken place, and we know that a more glaring and outrageous scandal never was perpetrated on the people of Canada than the sale of these lands to this company; and the proof of it is that much of the stock of this company was divided up amongst a bunch of political friends. But I pass from that.

What has their policy been in connection with grazing leases? The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) criticised the Government the other evening for having given away or sold cheaply some grazing lands for the purpose of raising horses. The hon. gentleman is young in this House and young in public life, or he would not have referred to this matter; for what does the record show? It shows that one outfit or one combination of political friends secured nearly four hundred thousand acres of grazing lands on irrevocable leases for twenty-one years at the nominal rent of one cent an acre, I think, and they were given the right of purchasing ten per cent of that land at one dollar an acre. That is how hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to assist the poor people of this country, the farmers' sons who are looking for homesteads, and many of whom are to-day being crowded out of their own districts and forced to go farther west or farther north to lands many of them utterly unsuited for cultivation.

Then, we have the irrigation land deal. A few of the friends cleaned up a million and

a quarter of a million on that. Then there was the Blairmore townsite, a notorious case at the time. Many hon. gentlemen in this House will remember the man who got this townsite for something like \$480—a townsite that was worth to the people of Canada at least two or three hundred thousand dollars. Hon. gentlemen opposite gave this townsite to a political friend. The man has since died, so I will not go any further into that. Then there was the exploitation of timber lands. I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) wax eloquent the other evening over the high price of lumber on account of this extra tariff. If the party that he has followed so long and so ably and faithfully had conserved the timber resources of the Northwest Territory and of Manitoba, we might to-day have been in a position to give to our people cheaper lumber than we can now give them. These timber lands are held by a few men, Liberals, who got them for a song.

Then, there was the exploitation of the fisheries. You all remember what they did with our fisheries. They gave all the fisheries north of lake Winnipeg—a kingdom in itself—to their political friends for the nominal sum of \$10 a year, with the right to fish in Hudson bay—a most glaring outrage. I think, in view of the fact that our fisheries are one of the most valuable assets we have in Canada to-day. After this matter was exposed in the House the leases were cancelled, as they ought to have been. The pity is that the policy of restoration did not go farther and force some of these men who had received our timber lands and our coal lands in the manner they did to restore at least a portion of them to the Crown.

Then, we have the St. Boniface land deal, engineered by one of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway. The evidence shows that \$161,000 was cleaned up on that deal. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had the temerity to throw a challenge across this House regarding the manner in which pledges are kept, and I am giving these few examples to show the people of Canada how hon. gentlemen opposite implemented, when in office, the pledges they gave to the people of this country. They have not shown, nor can they show one pledge given by the leader of this side of the House that has not been kept.

I want to refer for a moment to another pledge given to the people of this country—the pledge in regard to prohibition. Perhaps no question is receiving such earnest

attention from the people of Canada to-day as the question of prohibition, the question of curtailing in some way the sale of liquor. On the eve of an election, when this was a live question, the right hon. gentleman saw his opportunity and pledged himself to give the people of Canada a plebiscite, and to make good that plebiscite if it was carried by the people.

I want to refer for a moment to one or two of the pledges the right hon. gentleman gave. In 1895, just the year before the election of 1896, the present leader of the Opposition held a large meeting in Carleton Place, and spoke as follows:

The Liberal party has pledged itself in convention at Ottawa that whenever in power they would take a plebiscite on the question as to whether the people want a prohibitory liquor law or not. The answer is not in my hands, it is in the hands of the people, and according to their answer such legislation they will have at the hands of the Government.

That was a fair and distinct promise given to the people of Canada. If you vote for prohibition, the right hon. gentleman in substance said, I, as Premier of this country, will implement that pledge.

Mr. WILCOX: What was the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. BRADBURY: From a very admirable speech by a gentleman named Mr. Bennett, which is found on page 4305 of the Hansard Debates of April 25, 1900.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it ancient or modern history?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is ancient history, like a good many of the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman went to the city of Winnipeg. He found the prohibition question a very live one in Manitoba, as it has been since and he took the opportunity of renewing his pledge there. He said:

He pledged his honour that as soon as the Liberals came into power they would take a plebiscite of the Dominion by which the party would stand, and the will of the people would be carried out even were it to cost power for ever to the Liberal party.

No promise could have been clearer, no stronger words could have been used; and yet, when the voice of the people of Canada voted in favour of prohibition by a majority I think of something like 13,000, the Government closed their ears. The book was closed and nothing was done. But there is a little history in connection with that matter. Every one who took any interest

in that question at that time will remember that the different provinces of Canada, with the exception of the province of Quebec, voted largely in favour of prohibition. I forget the exact figures, but the majority for prohibition was one hundred thousand or more. The result of the poll in Quebec could not be ascertained for days and weeks. There was a feeling throughout the country that the ballot boxes were stuffed, and an investigation proved that to be absolutely true. Let me just read what was found to prevail at some of the polling stations. In Quebec Centre, poll 23, 105 votes were polled when there were only 101 names on the polling list. They polled a splendid percentage between them.

Mr. WILCOX: All against prohibition?

Mr. BRADBURY: All against prohibition. At No. 1 poll, West Quebec, there were 114 votes polled and 115 on the list; at No. 2 poll, 111 polled and 114 on the list, and at the Lachine poll, Jacques Cartier, there were 108 votes polled and 111 on the list. I only quote these few figures to show that the suspicion of the temperance people who were earnest and anxious for temperance legislation at that time was amply justified. I do not believe there is any province in this country which is more interested on this question to-day than the province of Quebec. They have made great strides since those days and they are in line with the people of Canada on the question of prohibition. Some of the strongest legislation that has been passed by any of the provinces has been passed by the province of Quebec during the last few years. They have made wonderful progress in regard to this question. But they were under the tutelage at that time of men who did not want prohibition put up to the Government of that day. While the promise was given, it would have been a calamity in the eyes of some of the leaders of that day for any Government to have introduced prohibition. But the day is coming, and it may not be as far away as some think, when this will be a live question again in this country and the records of hon. gentlemen opposite will stand out before the public as a warning, and will show whom the people can trust on great questions of this kind.

If this were only the record of the Federal Government, led by my right hon. friend, it would not be so bad. But we found the Manitoba Liberals very apt

pupils of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition. They took hold of this question right on the eve of an election. They said to themselves: This is a good election cry; it is something we can sweep the province with; and Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, in 1892, advocated prohibition and said to the people: We will have a plebiscite, and if you vote for prohibition you will get it. What was the result? There were 45,573 voters on the lists in Manitoba at that time; 18,637 voted for prohibition and only 7,115 against. Did they get prohibition? Why, the Liberal leader took the same position in Manitoba as the Liberal leader has taken in the Federal House here. Mr. Greenway simply pigeon-holed the result and allowed the matter to stand as it stands at the present time. Although he had two and a half times as many votes in favour of prohibition in Manitoba as had been cast against it he still refused to act. The province of Ontario was in the same position under a Liberal Government. But another election was coming on in Manitoba at a time when the Greenway Government was discredited and was in a very tight box. The people of Manitoba are an easy people, at least they were once very easily fooled and cajoled by the Liberal leaders. In 1898 Mr. Greenway again submitted the question of prohibition. This time prohibition was carried by a majority of 9,000. Still there was no prohibition. The leaders of the Liberal party never implemented the pledge they gave to the people. It would seem that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to-day and the great Liberal leaders of Canada had been close and apt students of the German historian Bernhardt, who had taught that no pledge or promise should be kept unless it redounded to the interest of the party or state that was affected. That is what caused this great war that is going on to-day. The British Government, in its own defence, and in defence of its honour, determined to keep the promise it had given to the Belgians to protect the neutrality of their country. If the Liberal party of Canada had had control of a situation of that kind they would have had no difficulty in getting out of the responsibility as they have got out of other pledges that they have given to the people of Canada. I have devoted all the time I intend to give to this phase of the question.

MR. CARVELL: Hear, hear.

MR. BRADBURY: I think I have convinced even the hon. member for Carleton,

N.B. (Mr. Carvell), that it is not safe for the Liberal party to charge this side of the House with not implementing its pledges. I now wish to discuss one or two phases of the present Budget as referred to by our hon. friends on the other side of the House. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, during his discussion of the subject said:

But the general tariff to-day, as amended is such as to diminish the value and destroy the purpose of the preferential tariff to Great Britain.

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, that nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken from the Opposition benches has dealt with. The fact is that when you go into this matter you find that the changes in the tariff have not materially changed the preference given to the British manufacturer. The British manufacturer occupies the same position relatively that he did before. The proposition before the House increases the general tariff by $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and makes only 5 per cent of a reduction in the British preferential tariff which still leaves the preference in favour of Great Britain $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent better than it was before. Just an illustration; take item 453 in the Customs Tariff and you will find that on machinery the British preferential tariff was 15 per cent and the general tariff $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That is what it was before this change took place. That gave Great Britain a preference of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Now the new tariff adds 5 per cent to the British preferential tariff rate and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to the general rate. That makes the duty, under the British preferential tariff, 20 per cent and, under the general tariff, 35 per cent, giving a preference in favour of Great Britain of 15 per cent or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent better than it was. The same thing applies to item 567 which deals with clothing. Under the old tariff the preferential duty was 30 per cent and the general rate 35 per cent, giving Great Britain a preference of only 5 per cent. The new tariff, which we designate as a war tax, although that is disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite, adds 5 per cent to the British preferential tariff and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to the general tariff. The result is that we find that the duty on clothing from Great Britain is 35 per cent, while the duty under the general tariff is $42\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The preference given to Great Britain in that case is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent better than it was.

It is very difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, how hon. gentlemen opposite make

out that the British preference has been destroyed, in view of the fact that the British preference as a whole is as great to-day as it was before this Budget was brought down, and in some things it is greater. The tariff has not touched mowers, or reapers, or binders, or binder twine, and all these things are just in the same position as they were. And yet we have the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and other hon. members waxing eloquent over the manner in which the farmers of this country are being taxed.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman mind telling us how many reapers and binders and mowers were imported from Great Britain?

Mr. BRADBURY: Reapers and binders are not imported from Great Britain, but the duty of 7½ per cent that is applied to all other items is not applied to these items. The Government of this country did not place an extra duty on these implements.

Mr. CARVELL: Ask him about ploughs.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will tell my hon. friend something about ploughs before I finish. We had in this House a few years ago the Minister of Finance of the late Government, a very eminent man, a man who was looked upon by the Liberal party, and indeed by Conservatives, as one of the big men of Canada; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Fielding. Let us see what position the Hon. Mr. Fielding now takes with regard to this Budget, and let us compare it with the position taken by his Liberal friends in this House. If Mr. Fielding were in the House now, sitting beside his old leader, I venture to say the criticisms that have been offered to this Budget never would have emanated from the Liberal party. I quote from the Journal of Commerce, of which the Hon. Mr. Fielding is editor, and in its issue of Friday, February 12, 1915, dealing with the Budget, it says:

Increased taxation is not at any time welcome, and therefore Mr. White's budget is not likely to be regarded as a thing of joy. But taxes which at another period might evoke sharp criticism may be accepted under present conditions with something like equanimity.

While expenditure had increased, the revenues were no longer flourishing. The war, no doubt, added to the diminution of income. But even if there had been no war, additional taxation would have been inevitable. Whether the money was required for one purpose or another, the situation to the Finance Minister was the same. He had to raise more revenue.

I commend this to hon. gentlemen opposite.

If there are any who are disposed to criticise his method they would do well to reflect whether

any better and more convenient way could have been taken. The exemptions that have been made show the minister had a commendable desire to avoid, as far as he could, the placing of additional burdens on those least able to bear them. Some of the minor taxes may prove more irritating than profitable, but they are not unjust. The addition of five per cent to the tariff on British goods, and seven and one half per cent on other goods, is the main feature of the Budget. If the question were one of permanent fiscal policy, these additions would, of course, be open to grave objection. But they are imposed to meet what we all hope is a temporary condition, and if those who for the moment may profit by them distinctly understand this, and govern themselves accordingly, there will probably be little objection to this portion of the Budget.

Altogether, Mr. White seems to have made the best of a troublesome situation.

This is the opinion of the late Liberal Minister of Finance in reference to the Budget, and he was once looked upon by his own party as one of the greatest men in Canada; in my opinion he was the greatest finance minister the Liberal party ever had. These are his opinions; this is his advice to his party, and, comparing Mr. Fielding's remarks with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite who are making this carping criticism on the Budget, the comparison places them in a very awkward position before the people of Canada. We had the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), a few nights ago in this House, in his wild heroics, raising his hand to Heaven and declaring: keep your umbels and disloyal hands off the British preference. Just imagine the hon. gentleman waxing eloquent over this matter, and this in the face of the advice of the great Finance Minister of his own party, which warns him to be careful in his language, and points out to him that there was no better way to deal with the situation than that in which the present Finance Minister has dealt with it. But, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) does not deceive any one; it does not deceive the electors in the West and it does not deceive the members in this House. So much for the British preference. Some hon. gentleman a few moments ago spoke of ploughs, and the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) and the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) have both referred in this debate to the increased duty on ploughs. The hon. member for Medicine Hat said:

I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press of Tuesday, February 23—

The Free Press is a very dangerous authority to quote on a question of this kind.

—containing the report of an interview with Mr. H. W. Hutchinson—

Mr. Hutchinson is a life-long Liberal, a man no doubt anxious to cast suspicion upon any act performed by the Conservative Government and ready to raise agitation or ill-feeling amongst the farmers, so as to make them dissatisfied. This is the man whom the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan) quotes in this House as an authority.

—vice-president and managing director of the John Deer Plough Company—

an American institution. Then the hon. member for Medicine Hat goes on to quote the following language from Mr. Hutchinson:

The prairie farmers will, of course, be called on to pay the duty. We have been already notified by Canadian manufacturers that prices will be increased to us and we have already begun to prepare a new price list for the sale of our commodities. On every walking plough there will be an increase in the price paid of from \$1 to \$2; on every sulky plough an increase of \$4; on every drill an increase of \$5.

Later on the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan) quotes Mr. Hutchinson as saying:

On every gang plough an increase of \$6; on every wagon an increase of \$7, and on every disc plough an increase of \$8.

This is a quotation by the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan) from an interview given by Mr. Hutchinson, the agent of an American manufacturing concern, and the inference he intended to leave on the House was that the Canadian manufacturers had increased their prices on farm implements. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on examination it will be found that the Canadian manufacturers have not increased the price of these goods since this tariff came down. If there have been any increases—they are very small, and I will cite them to the House later—they were made months before the tariff was thought of, and just in the ordinary regulation of the prices of the different machines. I have here a letter from the Cockshutt Plow Company, and the Cockshutt Plow Company owes it to itself to make this explanation.

I hold no brief for this company; but I am glad to be put in possession of facts that warrant me in saying in this House that the Canadian manufacturers were too patriotic to take advantage of the circumstances in order to increase the price of those ploughs, when they might have done so. This letter, which was written after the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) spoke, reads as follows:

Mr. McCoig has, I notice, been making a statement in the House from our "Private and Confidential" lists in which he states we have advanced our prices for this season. Mr. McCoig being an implement man knows that each year a price list is issued (ours appearing in December) with such changes as are rendered necessary by the cost of production.

This list that was complained of was made up in December, 1914.

He saw fit to give only the increases and not the decreases.

As a matter of fact the ploughs that he named were advanced about 50 cents each, and not on account of the tariff, but to meet increased cost. These ploughs he referred to are a type that are sold in Eastern Canada and are not suitable for prairie use, and not one single type of these ploughs suitable for Canadian trade is made in the United States. As an implement man Mr. McCoig knows this, or else he does not know his business.

He goes on to say:

The Maple Leaf gang he refers to was not advanced in price—last year it was quoted without straightener. This year it is quoted with straightener at \$1 more, so here also he is mistaken.

That explains the dollar increase in the cost of the gang plough.

The Ontario Footlift gang plough to which he refers is a new and improved design, and appears in our list for the first time, last year's pattern having been discarded.

He also in his speech infers that on May 1, our prices will again be advanced 5 per cent. How does he know? Who told him? We certainly did not, and we have already publicly stated our prices had been made for the season and would stand, so Mr. McCoig is wrong again.

This is an answer to the hon. gentleman who has been trying to make it appear that the Canadian manufacturers have been taking advantage of the situation in order to raise the prices of their ploughs to the farmers.

Let me give some of the reductions that have been made: Grain binders, 4.5 per cent; corn binders, 1.7 per cent; S.D. hay rakes, 4 per cent; hay tedders, 3 per cent; seed drills, 1.3 per cent; No. 2 cultivators, 1.6 per cent; No. 5 cultivators, 10 per cent; No. 3 disc harrows (16x16), 8 per cent; lever drag harrows, 3.4 per cent; two-way sulky ploughs (2B), 7 per cent; two-way sulky ploughs (1B), 13 per cent; gasoline engines, 7 per cent to 13 per cent, according to size.

The increases are: Reapers, 5 per cent; land rollers, 3 per cent; 16-tooth cultivators, 3 per cent; footlift sulky plough, 6 per cent. On 21 types of walking ploughs listed, 9 were increased 5 per cent; 1 was increased 5½ per cent; 1 was increased 10 per cent; and 10 remained the same.

That is a pretty fair answer to the statement made by the hon. member.

I hold in my hand the Cockshutt Plow Company's list for 1915, which is red-inked, showing the reductions that have been made. Some of the items that affect the farmers of the West are as follows:

Grain binders: No. 3 binder, 5 foot with sheaf carrier, \$5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 6 foot, with sheaf carrier, \$5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 7 foot, with sheaf carrier, \$5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 7 foot, with sheaf carrier and pole truck, \$5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 8 foot, with sheaf carrier, \$5 decrease.

That reduction runs through the whole list. I am authorized to say that the list as it stands to-day is lower than it was in 1914, and that it will not be increased.

Mr. MACNUTT: Is that decrease made to the farmers or to the dealers?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is made to any man who wants to purchase those implements. You can buy them or a dealer can buy them. That is a complete answer to the statements made in the Winnipeg Free Press interview which was used by my hon. friend the member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan). I am satisfied that that hon. member would not have read that interview in this House if he had understood the situation.

There is another article affected by this tariff, namely, cement. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a record on this. My hon. friends, the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who I am sorry is not in his seat, have devoted a good deal of time to endeavour to make the people believe that they are being injured by this tariff to the extent of the increased duty.

Mr. TURRIFF: So they are.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. member says, "So they are." The hon. member waxed eloquent against the great merger that was permitted to be formed. There is an old saying, "What the gods wish to destroy they first make mad." If the hon. member had reflected on the attitude of his party towards that merger when it had an opportunity of preventing it, he would have hesitated before making such a statement. I had the honour of having a seat in this House when the merger was formed. I was sitting on the opposite side, and I called the attention of the late Minister of Finance to this merger and warned him of what might happen. I received a very unsympathetic reply, and no action whatever was taken to control the operations of the merger

of which the hon. member is complaining to-day.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think the hon. member for Assiniboia supported that legislation.

Mr. BRADBURY: I am quoting from Hansard of 1912-13, volume 1, page 400. I asked the question:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the cement merger that has taken place, by means of which the Canada Cement Company, Limited, has taken over ten of the largest cement companies of Canada with a capital of \$30,000,000 and that on account of this merger the prices of cement to the consumer has been very much increased?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to take action to protect the public against this merger, which threatens to be a huge combine, thereby increasing the cost of cement which is almost a necessity to-day in great works?

Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance): The Government are aware from information in the public press, that a number of cement manufactories of the Dominion have been consolidated under one large company. Whether this consolidation has unduly enhanced the price of cement is a disputed point.

The law provides two methods of dealing with combinations which unduly enhance prices.

Then, the former Minister of Finance goes on to point out that the citizens can take action, but that he, or the Government responsible, refuse to take any action. Why? You have not far to go to find the reason—the promoters of the cement merger were leading Liberals. The late Senator Cox, the present president of the company, Senator Edwards, Senator McKay—all leading Liberals—are the men who created this merger. If this is a combine, the Liberal party are entirely responsible for it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What year is that Hansard?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is 1912-13.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: The hon. gentleman has made a mistake in the date.

Mr. BRADBURY: Yes, I have given correctly the date of the book from which I am now quoting, but I had a mistake in the date in this way: I am quoting from quotations made in a speech of my own of that year. But it was on the 16th of November, 1909, that I called the attention of the House to this matter. And what was the attitude of my hon. friend from Assiniboia at that time? Though he sat in this House then, he never raised his voice against this merger. And the hon. member for Edmonton, who was a trusted member of the Government of that day, had nothing to say. These hon. gentlemen, like others on that

side, when in office were great friends of the combines and mergers; but since leaving office they have changed their attitude and are now trying to fool the farmers again.

Now, I wish to deal with the cement question as affected by the present tariff. The hon. member for Assiniboia says:

Now my hon. friend comes forward and puts an extra duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on cement. . . .

Is he saving it to the farmer or to the town or villages that are using cement for paving, or to the business man who uses cement in putting up buildings? Is he saving it to any user of cement? No, Mr. Speaker, he is not, he is handing over a bonus of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars to the greatest combine and merger that we have in Canada today.

This is the merger which he himself allowed to be created, against which he did not raise his voice, though I was trying to prevent it in 1909. I wish to make the same statement about cement that I made about ploughs and farm implements a few moments ago. I am assured by the president of this cement "merger-combine," as my hon. friend called it, that there is no intention to raise the price in Canada. They have facilities to produce a surplus of two million barrels a year; they can control the situation to-day; and they say they have no intention of increasing the price of cement to the people on account of this tariff.

What was the situation? In 1894 the tariff on cement was 40 cents a barrel, including a duty on bags. In 1897, the duty was 43 cents a barrel. In 1905, under hon. gentlemen opposite it had been increased to 53 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a barrel, and in 1906 it was reduced to 51 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a barrel. Now, the reciprocity pact which these hon. gentlemen were so anxious to foist upon the people contained a provision, which, had it gone into effect, would have reduced the duty on cement to 46 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a barrel, including the duty on bags. In 1913 the duty was reduced by the Conservative Government—the present Government—to 43 cents a barrel. It has always been the pleasure of the Conservative party to reduce the duty on commodities to assist the farmers and poor people of this country. The present increase in the tax makes the duty on cement 53 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a barrel—puts it back where it was in 1905 under the Liberal Government; and in view of their own record, I do not think hon. gentlemen have any reason to complain. On account of this awful war, we have had to increase taxation, and so the duty on cement is raised until it is one-quarter cent a barrel less than it was under the Liberals in 1905. In 1912, it will be

remembered we had a cement famine—cement was needed all over this country. The present Finance Minister took advantage of a clause in the Customs Act to cut the duty on cement in two. And at once he and every hon. gentleman on that side including the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia, attacked the Government for doing it.

Mr. TURRIF: No.

Mr. BRADBURY: I can produce the record.

Mr. TURRIF: No.

Mr. BRADBURY: I take the hon. gentleman's word. I have not his record, but I have that of the hon. member for Edmonton. The hon. member for Edmonton charged this Government with having been actuated by a desire not to help the farmers but to influence an election. That was the position taken by the Liberal party. It happened that there was an election in Saskatchewan. But people in the West and all over Canada were in need of cement, and thousands, and ten of thousands, of men without employment because cement could not be had. And when the Government cut the cement duty in two these hon. gentlemen were unpatriotic enough to denounce this Government for having done what it could to assist the farmers, declaring that the Government was not doing it for the good of the people but to influence an election. I do not think, in view of the record of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question, that they have any ground to stand upon nor any warrant for the charges they make that the present tariff will be an imposition upon the farmers. I have no hesitation in saying—and I am speaking by the book—that the price of cement will not be increased one cent a barrel in this country by reason of this tariff. The farmers of Canada will not refuse to pay their share of the war tax.

I have taken up a great deal more time than I had expected, but there are some things that I feel I must deal with. The hon. member for Edmonton makes a great noise about the stamp duty on letters. He makes this statement:

Then \$300,000 is expected on insurance premiums, \$7,000,000 from increased postal rates, and \$3,000,000 from railway passengers. It appears to me that the ordinary man who uses the postal facilities is bearing an unduly heavy share of this burden of taxation, while the great financial interests are bearing an unduly light proportion.

Then he goes on, lower down:

While the ordinary man who posts a letter pays \$7,000,000, the man who rides in a railway train pays \$3,000,000. The principle of direct taxation is sound, but this is not the way I would do it.

What are the facts? We want to be fair in regard to these questions. Any man who knows anything about the postal system of Canada knows that the great business houses of Canada, the banking institutions, insurance companies and other great corporations, pay the largest proportion of the postal revenue. I venture to say that not 50 per cent of this postal tax will be paid by the ordinary man in Canada; it will be paid by the large corporations such as the banks. I have one bank in my mind now which is paying out \$150,000 a year in postage. These are the institutions that are going to bear the burden of taxation in this as in nearly all other matters. That goes to show how unfair the criticism from the opposite side of the House on this question has been. If these gentlemen had taken the advice of their ex-Finance Minister they would not have found themselves in the awkward position they are placed in to-day, on account of their unpatriotic criticism of the present attempt to handle a difficult question.

I cannot close without referring to another matter which affects my own province, that is, the question referred to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). During their speeches both of these gentlemen condemned the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to correct my hon. friend. I did not condemn the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. NESBITT: I did.

Mr. BRADBURY: Perhaps I had better qualify my statement. The hon. gentleman objected to the expenditure provided for the Hudson Bay railway this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of \$5,500,000.

Mr. BRADBURY: He advised the Government to cut the \$5,000,000 estimate down to \$1,000,000. His friend behind him went one better and said:

The first item I am going to speak about is the expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway. I know that my hon. friends on this side of the House promised to build that railway, but I have come to the conclusion, or almost come to the conclusion, that political parties are justified in certain instances in not keeping promises which they should never have made.

This kind of reasoning is exactly what caused this war that is going on today. My hon. friends while on this side of the

House had this virtue, that while they promised to start the Hudson Bay railway they never did. They sent out surveyors and got reports on the road which, however, did not assist the late Government in keeping its pledge to complete this road. But the fact is that they did not have courage enough or honesty of purpose enough to implement the pledges they had given to the people because they had pledged themselves in 1908 that if they were returned to power the farmers of the Northwest could take their grain to the Hudson Bay ports within three years. That was a distinct pledge given to the people of the West, and I say they did not have honesty or fairness enough to implement that pledge. My hon. friend says they did not start the building of the road; but they did start to build a bridge across the Saskatchewan which cost a large amount of money, and the road was in that condition when the Conservative party came into power. I shall quote what the hon. gentleman did say, I want to be fair:

When we come to the Hudson Bay railway and the terminals at Port Nelson, while I have always been in favour of the construction of that railway, yet we ought to pause, and instead of proposing to expend, as the Government is doing, \$5,000,000 during this year on that railway and terminals, the Government, in fairness to the people of Canada, ought to cut that amount down to the sum of not more than \$1,000,000.

That is his proposition. But I find that the hon. member for North Oxford was a little stronger. When Mr. Sharpe asked: "Did they not let the first contract?" my hon. friend from North Oxford said:

Not that I know of. At any rate did not build any of the road. The Government are asking this year for a vote of \$5,500,000 for the Hudson Bay railway. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) the other evening said that that could be cut down to \$1,000,000 without hurting anybody. I say it could be absolutely wiped out, and that if the Government of the day would pull up the rails and sell them to somebody else for whatever they would bring, they would earn the lasting gratitude of the people of this country. In my judgment the Hudson Bay railway has no more chance of earning money than Stefansson would have if he built a railway upon one of those islands where he is lost. They do say that there are some fish in Hudson Bay.

This, Mr. Speaker, coming from a man who occupies the prominent position in his party that my hon. friend does, the man who was sent to Ontario during the reciprocity pact discussion to tell the manufacturers that they had nothing to fear—"We do not intend to reduce the duties, you are all right"—sent there by his leader, a man chosen for the most im-

portant committees in the House, I say the hon. gentleman must have been—

Mr. NESBITT: Would my hon. friend repeat what he said about my being sent to tell the people in Ontario. I do not take back anything I said about the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. BRADBURY: I am glad you do not.

Mr. NESBITT: But I want to know what the hon. gentleman says about my having been sent to tell the people of Ontario. Just repeat that.

Mr. BRADBURY: What I said was that during the discussion in this House, as every hon. gentleman remembers, the hon. gentleman had been in Ontario, in his own constituency, I think, and he told the manufacturers that they had nothing to fear.

Mr. NESBITT: That is not what you said. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. You said that I was sent by somebody. Now, who sent me?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will tell the hon. gentleman before I get through. The hon. gentleman stated to these people, to the manufacturers, that they had nothing to fear. He said: "The present Government, if reciprocity comes into force, are not going to lower the duties." When these words were read by an hon. member to the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition in this House, then the leader of the Government, and the right hon. gentleman was asked if the hon. member for Oxford had been authorized to do this, the answer was that he was only speaking or only announcing the policy of his party.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman is only quibbling. I asked him a straight question. He said a few moments ago I was sent by somebody. Now, why don't you repeat what you said and not try to quibble?

Mr. BRADBURY: I object.

Mr. NESBITT: You have talked long enough without taking up any more time. Why don't you state what you said? You know it was not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: The truth cuts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Selkirk has the floor and is entitled to a hearing and attention.

Mr. BRADBURY: In connection with the building of the Hudson Bay railway and in connection with the position that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to take through their quasi-leader from Oxford, I want to say that there is not one man in the West who dares enunciate this doctrine west of the lakes, not one. I want to say that the Hudson Bay railway was promised by the Liberal party. In 1908 the present leader of the Opposition gave the people of the West to understand that, if his party was returned to power, the Hudson Bay railway would be completed within two or three years at the most, that the grain from the West could then be taken over that road to the markets of the world. The conduct of the Liberal party with respect to this railway is just in keeping with their attitude on every great question that affects the people of this country. They are one thing in one province and another thing in another province; one thing with one class of people and another thing with another class. It is a double-faced policy, and I might say a double-barrelled policy, which will affect some hon. gentlemen opposite who come from the West in a manner that will not be satisfactory to them.

Mr. TURRIF: Don't worry about us.

Mr. BRADBURY: My hon. friend will have his own troubles. He will have lots to worry about without my worrying for him.

Mr. TURRIF: I will take care of them.

Mr. BRADBURY: I want to say just a few words about the railway situation. The railway situation in Canada has been made anything but a pleasant one, by reason of the reckless legislation of the right hon. gentleman and his friends on the other side of the House. Just on the eve of an election the right hon. gentleman guaranteed bonds to the extent of thirty-five million dollars to induce and assist the Canadian Northern to become a transcontinental line. I hold that that was one of the most reckless projects ever undertaken by the late Government, except perhaps the building of the transcontinental, which was a huge mistake, a blunder that has cost the people of this country hundreds of millions of dollars. If we had the millions of money that have been wasted in the building of the Transcontinental, we should not have to borrow

one dollar to conduct our share of this war. If the late Government had not encouraged the building of the Canadian Northern round the shores of lake Superior, creating another transcontinental line, we should not, perhaps, be in the awkward position we are in to-day. The policy of the Conservative party was the only sane policy for this country. If that policy, which included the extension of the Intercolonial railway, the purchasing or taking over of the Canadian Pacific railway lines around the shores of lake Superior, and giving running rights to all roads, had been carried out, we should then have had one road coming through that barren country instead of three, and our railway situation would not be as it is to-day, a burden upon the people and a yoke around the necks of the farmers of the West. The building of that Transcontinental railway has robbed the farmers of the West of the opportunity of securing a fair reduction in freight rates, a reduction to which they were justly entitled, and which they expected to get when this railway was foisted upon the people of this country. I should like to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that they are responsible for the position that the farmer of the West is in to-day in regard to freight rates. We could have had a much greater reduction in rates if our systems had not been duplicated. And if I know anything about the signs of the times and about the railway situation, the day is not far distant when the Government of Canada will be forced, in defence of the people, to take over as government undertakings one or perhaps two of these great Transcontinental systems. That has been made necessary by the reckless spending of public money, by the reckless use of Government guarantees by hon. gentlemen opposite. When my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was criticising the Government for going on with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, I noticed that his friends from the West all sat smiling; they did not cheer; but they did not contradict him. They allowed it to go out to the country that their opinion was that this road should be stopped and the rails pulled up. But the farmers of the West will have something to say about that. I should like to ask some of these gentlemen from the West whether they are in favour of this road? Is my hon. friend from Assiniboia in favour of the Hudson Bay railway or not?

Mr. TURRIFF: Since my hon. friend has asked me the question I am quite ready

to answer. There is no doubt at all that it was the late Government that undertook to build the road. My hon. friends opposite had promised to build the road for 20 years, but had done nothing. I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from St. John, and would say that the Hudson Bay railway, in common with all other enterprises, might well be given less money this year, until an equilibrium is obtained between our revenue and expenditure.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. gentleman has not answered the question I asked. I asked whether he was in favour of building the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY: The fact that the Hudson Bay railway was not started by the late Government although they had given a pledge is no surprise to anybody who knows how the Liberal party has implemented other pledges it has given to the people of this country.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the railroad was not started by the late Government?

Mr. BRADBURY: The building of the railway was not started by the late Government. Surveys were made by the late Government and a bridge was under construction. The late Government was committed to the whole of this project both by promise and by money already expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The contract was actually let.

Mr. BRADBURY: But you did not carry out your pledge to give this road to the people within three years of the election of 1905. What is the difference between the two parties? The present Government has been in power only about three years and this railroad is fast nearing the Hudson bay. We are assured of the completion of the road in 1916, and our western crop in the fall of that year will be able to go over that road to the European markets. So, as a western man, I say it is most unpatriotic for the Liberal party to denounce the proceeding with the construction of this road as we are doing at the present time. If we adopted the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John, and backed up by my hon. friend from Assiniboia to cut down the expenditure by four-fifths, what would happen in the West? We have nearly three thousand men working on that road to-day;

two thousand of them would have been turned on the streets without work. That is in line with the whole action of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. They spent the revenues of this country lavishly, and now because the Government of the day is trying to care for the situation, trying to prevent our working men and artisans from becoming paupers and subjects for charity, as my hon. friend from St. John suggests, hon. gentlemen opposite are criticising the expenditure that we propose to make at the present time.

In conclusion, let me add just a word in regard to the distribution of seed grain in the West. It has been a great boon to the farmers.

I want to say to the Government that I believe they could extend their activities along the line of assisting farmers in the northern part of Manitoba, and I suppose the same condition prevails in other provinces. We have a large acreage of very difficult land that is settled by thousands of people. In the northern part of my constituency I suppose I have 15,000 or 20,000 people settled on land that is very difficult to bring under cultivation. I have suggested to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), and I do it again here from my place in the House, that some active assistance should be given to districts of this kind in the matter of cultivation. I claim that the Government could very well devise some means by which a certain acreage on each of the homesteads where poor people are settled could be cleared and broken up with large power machines so that the people might be put in the position to become producers in a short time. I believe it will pay the Government to render some assistance in the way of providing stock in some of these districts. The northern part of Manitoba is a dairy proposition. We could make it one of the finest dairying districts in Canada if those poor people had a start. I commend it to the serious consideration of the Government and I would ask them to see if it is not possible at a very early date to assist the settlers in that district in such a way as will enable them to become self-sustaining producers. Unfortunately, in some of these districts, we are forced to resort to relief work during the winter months. I hold it is a mistake to have to dole out relief, year after year, to the settlers. We ought rather try to make these people self-

sustaining by giving them something they can make a living at. By selling them a few head of cattle on deferred payments perhaps you would enable them to get into a position to make a livelihood and to pay back the advance in a few years. The Government would not lose one dollar on the investment and the farmers would be a great deal better off.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the crisis that exists in the Empire to-day, notwithstanding that Canada is doing its full share in providing both men and money to assist in the defence, notwithstanding that the Opposition has made pledges both inside and out of this House to assist the Government in every way possible in doing what is necessary for the defence of the Empire, we find that these hon. gentlemen have raised every obstacle possible in connection with this Budget. The quibbling argument advanced by men on the other side of the House that this is not a war tax is unworthy of the hon. gentlemen who make this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is not permissible to say that the conduct of another hon. member is unworthy. It must be assumed that what he does is done with a proper motive.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will qualify that by saying that the statements made by the hon. gentlemen are entirely worthy of the hon. gentlemen who made them. The attempt is made to create the impression that the taxes that are levied are not war taxes because the dollars that are going into the revenue are not going directly into the war fund. Every hon. gentleman knows that the interest on this borrowed money has to be met, seven or eight millions of dollars. Every man in this House knows that we are making provision and ought to make provision, if we are doing our full duty to the men we have at the front, for perhaps a large pension list, and in this way I say that every dollar of this money going into this increased tax may be considered just as much a war tax as the money we are borrowing from Great Britain. I believe that when these hon. gentlemen have the chance of meeting their constituents they will find that the opinion of their constituents is that they made a huge mistake in taking the attitude they have taken in this House regarding the Budget that is before the people at the present time.