

it only leaves half a cent per pound to the manufacturer. What is the effect of that? Instead of \$40,000, there are \$99,000 duties collected, and that extra \$59,000 goes into the treasury of the Dominion and not into the hands of those who cleaned the rice. That is what we want, we want every industry kept in its proper position, and we want the treasury to get all the money to which it is entitled, and which should not go into the pockets of the manufacturers.

With respect to the statement that we have given something for nothing to Great Britain, I asked hon. gentlemen opposite what they would do. Is it not a fact that, when the Intercolonial Commission sat at Ottawa, a resolution was introduced before that commission asking Great Britain to put a duty on the imports of foreign breadstuffs in order to protect the colonies? Lord Jersey was there as a representative of the British Government. What did he say? He told the commission that only 17½ per cent of the trade of Great Britain came from the self-governing colonies, and if he took in the Crown colonies, the proportion did not exceed 25 per cent. Of breadstuffs, only \$29,000,000 came from the colonies, while over \$140,000,000 came from foreign countries, and Canada some ten years ago only supplied 3·2 per cent of the breadstuffs imported into the British Islands. I believe to-day that she supplies something like 5 per cent of the breadstuffs that Britain requires. Is it to be expected that Great Britain would impose a tax upon the food of the people of that country for the sake of a paltry 5 per cent of breadstuffs from Canada. Why, Lord Jersey told them plainly he could not be a party to any such arrangement.

Now, the preferential part of the tariff with Great Britain is nothing new. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) introduced a resolution into this House that the duty upon British goods should be reduced, and hon. gentlemen opposite voted it down. I believe that the only way we will ever get any advantage in the British market is the way the Government of to-day have taken, that of giving preferential trade to Great Britain. We can now ask Britain to give us some advantage, if possible in her market, but it required a considerable amount of audacity for a Canadian Government to go to the British Government and ask them to abolish those treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause without having taken some steps to show that there was an absolute necessity for their abolition. The Government of Canada has to-day taken a position that is looked upon all over the British Islands favourably by all classes of the community. We have been told that that is not surprising because we are giving something for nothing, but that something which we are giving for nothing is something that will yet redound to the benefit of Canada to an

enormous extent. I believe it is the entering of the thin edge of the wedge and which will bring about a condition of prosperity in Canada such as we have not seen for the last twenty-five years.

Then hon. gentlemen opposite speak about agricultural implements. Well, is it not a fact that these have been reduced to a considerable extent to the farmer.

I have here a list that shows the benefits that the farmer is getting from the present tariff. My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Clancy) asked what the farmers would say in respect to those duties. We have been told by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that there was no reduction in agricultural implements. On the contrary, there is a greater reduction under the present tariff than that there was under the tariff that was passed in 1894. The late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) seems to have wakened up from his Rip-Van-Winkle sleep. In 1895 he told us that the farmer paid none of these duties. The farmer, according to the hon. gentleman, took his wheat to the mill and had it ground, and carried home his flour, without paying a tax. And he built his house of timber grown in his own country, and so paid no tax. And even this farmer's agricultural implements were to be made out of timber. The hon. gentleman did not know that the country was in a progressive condition until he was awakened out of his dream by the present Finance Minister when he described so graphically the progress made in this country in all sorts of manufacturing. And now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tells us that there is no relaxation of duties in favour of the farmer, that the only relaxation that was given under the tariff of 1894 when agricultural implements were reduced to 20 per cent. But that reduction was entirely nullified by the fact that the Government employed an agent (Mr. Hawthorne), the manager of one of the biggest hardware manufacturing industries in Canada to go to the United States and learn the prices at which they were selling goods. The result of that gentleman's mission was that the invoice prices of goods coming from the United States were increased for duty purposes from 15 to 30 per cent, thus neutralizing the reduction of the duty. Here is a list of implements on which the duty was 35 per cent and is now 25 per cent: Axes, scythes, hay knives, forks, rakes, land-rollers, straw cutters, root cutters, pulpers, fanning mills, potato diggers, hay tedders, hay loaders and horse forks, scufflers and hoes, post hole diggers, picks, corn planters, corn cutters and ditching machines. Then there are such machines as threshing engines, separators, horse-powers, and windmills, all farmers' machinery which have been reduced from 30 per cent to 25 per cent under the new tariff. Many of these implements are of as much