

them for the way in which they have been robbed by this duty.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot believe that the produce of the farmers is increased in price by the manufactures. Farmers believe that all our surplus produce goes to the British market and is disposed of there. While our small fruits and vegetables are more easily disposed of in the proximity of manufacturing towns, our beef, mutton and cheese go to the old country, and it cannot be pretended that the home market rules the price of the exported article. The farmers know too much to hold that opinion. There is no hon. gentleman who presses his arguments more strongly against the farmers than the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig), who at the same time pretends to be their friend; and it is high time we should let the House understand that the farmers understand their own business, and that our prices are ruled by those prevailing in the British market and not by the prices in the Canadian market.

Mr. CRAIG. Every one will agree with the hon. gentleman that the price of our exports is ruled by the price they can realize in the foreign market. I am not, however, talking about our exports, but as to what our farm produce can realize at home. It would be very interesting to obtain a correct statement as to the proportion of the farm produce that is consumed in the home market. I contend that a large part of it is so consumed—I am told seven-eighths. The hon. gentleman may talk about seven-eighths not amounting to anything; but it must be remembered that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) is engaged in the business of raising cattle for export. I have always considered that our farmers have much common-sense; I am practically elected by them, and I represent their views.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are an equal righter, not a farmer.

Mr. CRAIG. It is true I believe in equal rights to the manufacturers and the farmers, and that we are all bound together as regards our interests. One simple statement I have made proves what I have said, that you may take any farmer and he will pay more for a farm near a prosperous manufacturing town than elsewhere; and that proves the proposition, that the farmers are greatly benefited by manufactures, and I do not believe they are so selfish as to oppose the granting of moderate protection to our manufacturers.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) has talked a good deal about the home market for farmers, but he has not taken into consideration the fact that while the home market may benefit the farmers in the east, there is no home market to benefit the farmers in the west, and we have to export our whole product. The hon. gentleman said

that 10 cents would pay for all the nails a farmer used.

Mr. CRAIG. I did not say anything about nails.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Farmers use many dollar's worth of nails in a year for fencing. We had hoped that the Government would make a greater reduction than has been proposed if any change is to be made it should be to reduce the duty 10 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. In respect to this important matter as regards the farmers of the North-west, I hold that faith should be kept with them and that the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite should be carried out. I agree with the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in regard to the desirability of reducing the duty, but I do not agree with him in the statement that the farmers of the North-west are not interested in the home market. If my hon. friend will look at the returns, he will find that both the North-west and Manitoba are interested in the home market. However, what we are interested in at this moment is nails. We all expected in the North-west Territories, that the Government would put nails on the free list, and, therefore, I move that this item be struck out of the tariff. I want to see these things placed on the free list. I want to see faith kept with the farmers. I want, in some detail of the tariff, to see hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches in the novel position of keeping a single promise they have made. Therefore, I move that this item be omitted from the tariff.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You cannot get a seconder.

Mr. ROCHE. I will second it.

Mr. HEYD. Before that motion is put, Mr. Chairman, it would be just as well for us to get back to the realm of common-sense, and leave aside these buncombe resolutions. I had the pleasure of introducing a deputation of nail men to the Government in order that they might ask that their grievances should be redressed, and which grievances they would be subject to if the duty were left at 35 per cent ad valorem. They urged that the competition from the United States was so keen that 35 per cent would not enable them to continue the manufacture of nails, and I presume it was in consequence of this competition that the Government has made the duty 3-5ths of a cent per pound. As we have a wire nail industry in the city whence I come, I am in a position to say that they are satisfied with the tariff as the Government now proposes to make it. There is one disadvantage in raising the tariff, and that is that it might stimulate the industry of making nails in this country, so that the wire nail-makers would eat one another up. That would