

but taking the figures of the minister himself. The hon. gentleman might easily have found articles in far more general use, instead of going to this obscure list. Take farm rollers, hay tedders, fanning-mills, post-hole diggers, and so on, and what do the whole importations amount to? Only to \$26,535. This was the whole importation. I would ask the Minister of Finance what difference it made to the people of this country, that he reduced the duty on these articles, and what difference it would have made if he had even doubled the duties? It would not have been a drop in the bucket; it would not have been one grain in a sand hill. I will take the same number of articles that the hon. gentleman gives, just to show some of the things that he might have mentioned. From every platform in the country in 1895-6, it was declared by Liberal politicians that the farmers were bled white by the manufacturers, that they were the slaves of the manufacturers. These are the articles I will choose:

Cultivators, grain drills, harrows, binders, horse rakes, mowing mashines, ploughs, reapers, farm wagons, freight wagons.

Did the hon. gentleman reduce these? No. And why? Because \$1,540,000 worth of them came in, as against the enormous sum of \$26,535 of the others. Evidently this is a mere pretense of a deduction in duty. In my opinion these questions should be discussed fairly. If the government of the day have made substantial concessions by way of reductions, if their pledges have been fairly fulfilled, no one should be so unreasonable as to make a demand that they should be fulfilled in every detail. But the hon. gentleman, when he made this change, made one that had no substance in it. It was merely an attempt to show the farmers that the government had protected their interests.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The farmers think so.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), entirely underestimates the intelligence of the farmers. I have no doubt, in spite of the facts, my hon. friend would go upon the platform and endeavour to make the farmers believe that their interests have been protected. I have no doubt as to the hon. gentleman's courage, and, I was going to say, his desire to persuade them.

Now, let us see what is the result of the operation of the hon. gentleman's tariff. He took off and he put on. We are told there has been a reduction. I propose to deal now with what is called the general tariff, and to deal with what is now the preferential tariff, but which, formerly, as laid down by the hon. gentlemen themselves was a reciprocal tariff. Under our system, if we take off the tax in one place, we do not thereby relieve the people to that extent, but we simply shift the burden. What is the rule followed out

by the hon. gentlemen themselves? When you take off the tax in one quarter you must put it on in another, for the simple reason that, to use the words of the Finance Minister, you must have revenue. Now, what were the principal items the hon. gentleman dealt with? First of all, he took off \$549,977 from Indian corn; he took off \$102,300 from binder twine; he took off \$126,885 from barbed wire fencing; he took off \$85,000 from coal oil, and from iron manufactures of all descriptions, \$405,098; making in all, \$1,126,260. But, let us see whether the hon. gentleman put any on. Why, Sir, he put on rice \$17,322, that is a necessary of life. He put on sugar \$393,203, also a necessary of life; he put on tobacco, \$1,051,466; he put on cotton goods, \$169,958; on woollen goods, \$236,860, or \$742,529 more than he took off. Now, let me call his attention to the fact that under the general tariff his words are entirely fulfilled when he said there would be no reduction in the general tariff. This does not cover all the reductions, nor does it cover all the increases. I have stated the large items that are affected by the tariff as set forth by the hon. gentlemen themselves by way of reduction and by way of increases. The result was, taking both sides of the ledger, applying the rate of 1896 to the year 1899, that when the hon. gentleman had completed his tariff, the general tariff stood, independently of any manner in which it might be affected by the special tariff, \$500,000 higher than he found it. I will show my hon. friend how it affected the poor people. The first thing the hon. gentleman did was to take \$15 off seed beans, and put \$17,322 on uncleaned rice; the next thing the hon. gentleman did was to take \$19,304 off farming tools and put \$169,958 on cottons; next he took \$42,980 off iron and steel wire, and put \$236,060 on woollen goods; next he took \$126,885 off barbed wire fencing and put \$393,203 on sugar. I wish to call attention to the fact that on sugar there is no reduction under the preference. Then, the hon. gentleman took \$102,300 off binder twine, and he put on the poor man's tobacco \$1,051,446. That is the way this is distributed. But, the hon. gentleman went further. He took \$405,080 off iron goods, most of which was in the interest of the manufacturers, those people who were over-protected, who were bleeding the people white, and the hon. gentleman made them a present of this sum. I am not complaining of a reduction in duties that goes to help any interest in this country. I think it has been the policy of the Conservative party in the past, and I hope it will always be the policy of any party having the conduct of the affairs of this country, to make every article free that can be made so in the interest of the whole people and not of a section. But the hon. gentleman took \$549,977 off Indian corn, and he made a present of that to the Americans.

Mr. CLANCY.