

our farmers for the lower prices they got for their products. I would begin with horse rakes, which were selling at \$23 in 1896, and cost \$24 now. Ploughs cost \$14 in 1896, and \$16 now. I am now speaking in the presence of a manufacturer (Mr. Frost), and am about to give the prices of the goods he makes.

Mr. FROST. You have made a mistake in your prices of ploughs.

Mr. CLANCY. No, I have not. The prices I have given are authentic, and not on hearsay. They are as authentic as if I had gone to the hon. gentleman's shop, and got them from himself. Bob-sleighs, which sold for \$25 in 1896, cannot be had under \$27 now. Harrows were sold at \$22 in 1896, and are selling as \$25 now. Farm carts \$35 in 1896 and \$38 now. Farm wagons \$45 in 1896, \$50 now. Mowers, \$45 in 1896, \$50 now. I wonder if my hon. friend will correct me in that. Cultivators, \$28 in 1896, \$36 now. Seed drills \$60 in 1896, and \$65 now. Binders, of which the hon. gentleman is a large manufacturer, were selling for \$110 in 1896, on the best terms, that is when payment was made in October, and they cannot be had under \$120 now.

During the campaign in 1896, the hon. gentleman made a speech in which he declared that the lowering of the duties on iron would have the effect of giving the farmer just as good implements and at cheaper rates. What has become of that pledge? I challenge my hon. friend to cite a single case in which he can say that the statement I have made is not absolutely correct. He knows perfectly well that binders have advanced \$10 in price, and he knows that his party had pledged themselves to make them cheaper. That is the way by which these hon. gentlemen have enriched the farmers. For every article the farmer has to sell since these hon. gentlemen came into power, he is getting less than he did at any time in the preceding twenty years, and on the other hand, he is paying more for every article he has to buy. Even post-hole diggers, one of the list they selected for reduction are higher than they were before under the general tariff, and they do not come in to any extent under the preferential tariff. There is not an article, from a pound of nails to the harvest implement, to which 10 per cent, and in some cases more than 20 per cent has not been added to the price since these hon. gentlemen's advent to office. That means that the purchasing power of the dollar of every farmer and labourer has been reduced to 75 cents. When the farmer sells his products at lower prices than he did before, he has to add to the loss the discount that must come afterwards in the purchasing power of every dollar he received. Instead of this being a period of prosperity for the farmers, there never was a period when they were less prosperous, notwith-

standing the fact that there has been a great expansion in trade throughout the country. I am sorry that I have to make some remarks with regard to pledges made by some hon. gentlemen opposite who are not present. I would shrink from talking in this House about a man's private business. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) smiles at that, but I mean what I say. I do not think it generous to open such discussions. But when an hon. gentleman invites it by his public speeches, when he makes certain declarations upon such a subject and then fails to live up to them when he becomes a minister, he invites a discussion of these matters. The Minister of Customs in a speech he made a few days ago, declared that the Liberal party had made certain pledges, that they had laid down their platform in 1893 and were bound to carry out these pledges. Now, here is what the hon. gentleman said in Harriston, according to the *Globe* of the 14th of February, 1896:

I do not say and I do not claim that in all cases the amount of the duty is added to the article by the manufacturer who manufactures that article in the country, but it would be more than folly for any man to say that under a system of protection the man who purchases home-made goods does not pay more than he would have to pay if there was free competition. What is protection put on for? It seems to me that it is a waste of time to talk about it in any other respect than that.

Again, speaking at Massey Hall, Toronto, the hon. gentleman said, according to the *Globe* of the 6th of February, 1895:

What I want you to consider when you go home is whether the law passed by the Tory government and placed on the statute-book that made Paterson rich, has made you not rich, or some of you even poorer than you were before. Whether this is a just law or not, and one that should be continued.

And he made the case still stronger when he spoke at Brantford, according to the *Globe* of the 23rd of March, 1895:

Had the national policy acted fairly and justly upon all classes and upon all kinds of manufacturer? If it had not, then it had been an unjust law. If it had not imposed equally upon all alike, Dr. Montague had said that the national policy had made him (Mr. Paterson) rich. Was it a matter of reproach for him to try and do away with the policy that had made him rich at the cost of the great mass of the people of Canada.

That was not a reproach, but the reproach comes when the hon. gentleman takes his position as a minister and continues a tariff which, according to his own statement, has made him rich while injuring others. Now, I will turn to the articles that the hon. gentleman got rich on. Confectionery, under the national policy that, according to the hon. gentleman, made everybody poorer, and Paterson rich, was, in 1896, 35 per cent, or $\frac{1}{4}$ cent a pound. How much was it altered when the hon. gentleman became a minister? None at all. On biscuits,