

of the tariff, if hon. gentlemen look at the tariff as it stands to-day and compare it with the tariff as it existed prior to their advent to office, and make the calculation, after the reduction in the tariff including the free and dutiable goods, with all the preferential tariffs given to free trade countries, you will find that it amounts to the enormous sum of about one seventieth of one hundred per cent. You may go further : instead of being a free trade policy, which my venerable friend in front of me was always very fond of, hon. gentlemen will find that some of the articles even under the preferential tariff are higher to-day than they were under the old protective tariff. Hon. gentlemen may say that that is a bold statement, but I ask them to take the tariff of twenty-five per cent under the old Act, and add the ten per cent, which they did prior to the reduction of twenty-five per cent, and they will find that we have a twenty-six and a quarter per cent tariff, or $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent more under the preferential clause and ten per cent more under the general clause of the new tariff than under the old arrangement. Is it any wonder, under such circumstances, that our various manufactures are increasing and are prosperous to-day ? I venture the assertion, and I say it with full deliberation, that if the pledges made by the members of the present government to the people of this country had been carried out in their entirety, the same prosperous conditions would not exist to-day. I see before me two or three hon. friends from the North-west and Manitoba who complained of the ruinous protection given to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, which they contended was weighing down the energies of the farmer. Did the present government take off any duties which would affect the manufacturing interest that existed in this country upon these particular articles ? It is true that they reduced some specific duties and made them ad valorem. It is quite true also that they reduced the duties upon some of the minor articles, such as spades and that kind of thing, but they did not reduce the duties upon those articles which cost the most and which was represented to the farmers as being ruinous to them—I mean the duty upon reapers, threshing machines, &c. Take the agricultural im-

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

plements manufactured to-day, threshers and reapers; they were twenty per cent under the reduction which was made by the late government. That duty has not been lowered. I will tell hon. gentlemen what they did, as every hon. gentleman who is listening to me knows. They gave a stronger grade of protection to the manufacturer by leaving the duty as it was and reducing the duty upon the raw material out of which an article was made. They encouraged the manufacturer by increasing the protection, so that if he was a robber before he must be a superlative robber now. He is taking more out of the farmers of the North-west at the present time than was taken out of them by that protective tariff, when Sir Richard Cartwright said that the manufacturers were 'robbers great and robbers small.' My hon. friend suggests that there are some articles which they did put upon the free list. They put barbed wire on the free list ; it is dearer to-day than when it had the duty on. They put binder twine on the free list ; and by the manipulations of the government with their friends the contractors, when they sold the binder twine to them at about four and a half cents, I think it was, or at any rate at a very small rate per pound, and refused to let the country know, when they were asked in this House and in the House of Commons the rate at which they had disposed of it to these favoured contractors. They refused to give it the information, and why ? Because they said it would interfere with their trade and their selling it to the farmers at such a remunerative rate as they were entitled to under the circumstances. That was the reason given. They sold to the farmers in the North-west at a price ranging from ten to thirteen cents per pound. That is one of the effects of free trade.

Hon. Mr. PERLEY—Seventeen cents now.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—There may be a reason for that. The reason given by the hon. Minister of Justice in this House may have some force, but it had no force then. When I pointed out that fact to the Senate last session, I was told the increased price had been caused by the war in the Philippine Islands, that the manila which was imported from that part of the world and out of which the binder twine was