

he will not reduce the price of his material to the ultimate consumer on that account. I very much fear that the tack industry will be gone under this cut.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Representing as I do an agricultural constituency, a constituency of consumers, I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down and some of his friends have calculated, as various items of this tariff have come up, the very small amount in which the reduction on each article was going to benefit the consumer. But he must bear in mind that the consumer consumes all these articles, and that a very small reduction in the price of all of them mounts up to a good deal in the aggregate. Our farmers in Canada, and in the North-west, particularly, having no advantage of that home market to which our hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) alluded, have to figure on the export price for their produce; and every dollar they can save on any item in the tariff just counts so much in their annual income. We who are supporting the Government feel inclined to approve of reductions in this tariff. We do not think that in many cases the reductions are enough; but we do not wish to upset the balance of trade entirely in Canada at present. We wish to be reasonable, and, while desirous of giving the manufacturers a fair show, we must on behalf of the farmers of the North-west protest against the arguments adduced by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. It is true, a farmer may save only a few cents a year on wire nails, a few cents on coal oil, a few cents on this, that, and the other thing; but these few cents added together, and taken into consideration along with the price he gets for his products, make a considerable item in his income every year. A prosperous set of individuals makes a prosperous country, and when we consider the large number of those engaged in agricultural pursuits in proportion to those engaged in manufactures, the interests of the farmers should be considered in this House. I was rather amused at the ingenious argument of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) in regard to the home market. I would like to ask how much more the farmer in the neighbourhood of Peterborough gets per pound for his butter or per dozen for his eggs than any other farmer in Canada. The price is ruled by the export price; and when the hon. gentleman takes into account the very small export of manufactured goods compared with the export of agricultural products, I would like to know if his theory is correct where the money is to come from to provide a home market for the farmers. The condition advocated by the hon. gentleman would be like a man with his family going on a quarter section, raising produce

and cattle, and eating up everything themselves. On behalf of the farmers, I must protest against all these arguments that we are constantly hearing. As the old Scotch proverb says, many a little makes a muckle, and the farmers' interests must be looked after in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how much the farmer in the North-west consumes of 16-ounce-to-the-thousand shoe tacks in the year, and how much difference it makes in his living expenses whether these shoe tacks have a duty of 35 per cent or $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. He has grown eloquent as to the immense saving this would be to the farmer. Two seats behind him there sits a gentleman who this evening declared that the makers of agricultural implements were now getting their iron \$9 a ton less than before this tariff came in. That gentleman made a very enthusiastic and rosy speech. He has saved \$9 a thousand on his raw material, and he makes the agricultural implements which the farmer of the North-west uses. They cost money—\$100, \$115, \$125. If the farmer of the North-west could only have had at the other end the advantage of the saving which my hon. friend gets on his raw materials, that would have been something; but on 16-ounce-to-the-thousand shoe tacks he does not get much.

Mr. CLANCY. It is quite evident that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) is not a farmer. If he were, I am quite sure the farmers would repudiate him as a spokesman for them. It is pretty evident that the hon. gentleman knows very little about farming when he supposes that the condition of the farmers is such that they are driven to a saving on an ounce of shoe tacks. It is paying a very poor compliment to the farmers of one country to suggest that they are to be beggared by this sort of thing. A great number of these gentlemen have a particular aptitude for talking about small things. In the elections they talked about many small things, such as wire nails and binder twine. The farmers are just as anxious to save as other people; they are obliged to save, owing to the small margin they have; and now the hon. member for Macdonald has discovered that their farms are likely to be mortgaged because they have to buy an ounce of shoe tacks in the year. These hon. gentlemen are essentially gentlemen of small grievances. I submit that the farmers of this country are quite as intelligent as these hon. gentlemen who presume to teach them. They are not looking for impossibilities. They cannot stand alone, but must look for consumers among those who are engaged in other pursuits, and it is a most unsound doctrine to say that our farmers are not interested in finding con-