

factures, \$850,000; on binder twine, \$102,000; on barbed wire, \$126,000; on galvanized fencing wire, \$43,000; on cream separators, \$45,000; on books and printed matter, \$69,000; on cotton goods from Great Britain under the preferential tariff, \$163,000. In woollens from England, under the preferential tariff there was a saving of \$451,000. Now, woollens are as much an absolute necessity in every household as coal oil or many other articles. In hats, caps and bonnets there was a saving of \$52,000; in fancy goods, \$32,000; flax, hemp and jute, \$35,000; earthenware and china, \$41,000; drugs, dyes and chemicals, \$21,000. These reductions I have mentioned on woollens, cottons, silks, hats, caps, and bonnets, flax, hemp and jute, earthenware and china, and drugs, dyes, and chemicals, are reductions on importations under the preferential tariff. Other reductions could be shown, Mr. Speaker, but these, perhaps, are the chief ones, and if you total them up you will find that they amount to \$2,885,000. And who says that is not a material reduction in the rate of duty that the people of this country have to pay?

This should convince any person who wishes to take an honest view of the question that there have been enormous reductions made in the rate of taxation to the Canadian people. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take great pride in the fact that a great many articles have advanced in price, but I am sure that they will not undertake to blame this government for raising the price of articles in all the markets of the world. We know that some years ago if a farmer had a horse to sell he would get \$50 or \$100 for it according to the class of animal it was, but if he had the same horse to sell to-day he would get double the price he could get some years ago. In the same way wheat, pork, butter, cheese, and other articles have advanced in price in the markets of the world, and no government either in this or any other country, can regulate prices throughout the world. I can only say that if hon. gentlemen opposite were ruling the country to-day, there is no doubt the markets of the world would be the same. What would they say then? Would they say that their policy was the means of increasing those articles in price? I maintain that a reduction in the tariff has a tendency to cheapen the goods imported into the country. If the duty had not been taken off binder twine, the farmers would have to pay 12½ per cent more for it at present than they do. The other day the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) delivered a masterly speech from his standpoint; but he found a great deal of fault with the tariff changes as made by this government. He took the farmers under his fatherly care, and told this House and the country that the government were the cause of raising the price of binder twine. He told us that the government were hold-

Mr. RATZ.

ing their twine at 14 cents per pound, and by so doing enabled other manufacturers to hold their twine at high figures also. Why, Sir, by placing binder twine on the free list, the government placed all the Canadian factories in competition with each other and with the world. So, if the government hold their twine too high, competing manufacturers are ready to undersell them. When this government came into power in 1896, they did not put their twine on the market. It was lying at Kingston, and it did not go into competition with the binder twine of other Canadian factories. I suppose they thought that if they entered into competition they would reduce the profits of the other manufacturers. This is a matter of business, and twine manufacturers are as anxious to do business as any other class of business men. The manufacturers all come into competition with each other, and the business regulates itself the same as any other business, and prices are cut to the lowest possible profit.

The hon. member had also something to say about post-hole diggers. He admitted that the reduction of duty on these had benefited the farmers; but it was only to a very meagre degree, as the importation was not large, and only some \$20 or \$30 was saved to the Canadian people on post-hole diggers. But the hon. gentleman must remember that nearly all the post-hole diggers that are used in Canada are manufactured in Canada, and on those the price was reduced to the extent of the reduction of the tariff, and has, therefore, been a saving of more than ten times as much to the farmers of Canada as the hon. gentleman has tried to have them believe. While the hon. gentleman had so much to say about the meagre sum saved to the farmers on post-hole diggers, he forgot, or, for some reason, omitted to tell this House that the government had saved to the farmers of Canada \$170,000 by the reduction of duty on fence wire, and by placing fence wire on the free list. I suppose it did not suit his case, yet he tells the people that the tariff changes are of no benefit to the Canadian farmers.

The hon. gentleman also told us a great deal about the cotton duties. We were told in 1897, at the time of the tariff changes, that wreck, ruin and destruction would be the lot of the business industries in Canada through the Liberal policy which was then introduced. But, Sir, for the past two years, hon. gentlemen opposite have all agreed with us that Canada had never before been in as prosperous a condition as it is to-day.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman the other day again placed himself on record as a prophet. He told this House that as soon as the orders that were booked with the English cotton companies were filled, then cottons would be dumped on the Canadian market at such a low price that Canadian