

Sewing Machine Company to manufacture their goods in this country. If the duties were reduced, it would be in the company's interest to manufacture their machines in the United States and pay the duties. There had been no increase to the consumer, generally speaking, as a result of the protection to the manufacture of furniture.

Reverting again to the subject of furniture, witness said the productive capacity of the United States was far in excess of the demands of the country.

Now, hon. gentlemen talk about reciprocity with the United States; but I would like to know what we are going to send to them. On every hand they seem to be producing very much more than they want for their own use, and they are anxious for what we are anxious for, to get an outlet for their surplus. That is one of the reasons why I think this preferential clause should not apply to the United States. While I have great sympathy with the policy of preference to Great Britain, and would be willing to give every reasonable preference to the mother country, I certainly have no sympathy with the view that it should apply to the United States. For, so far as I remember, the United States has at no time in our history shown us any favours or any disposition to deal with us on fair terms. Another gentleman who gave his evidence at that meeting was a Mr. McMullen—I do not suppose it was the hon. member for North Wellington—a member of the firm of McMullen & Harris. This is his evidence:

Since July he had been making bedsteads, and was importing his raw material from the United States. If the tariff of 20 per cent were continued, he hoped to have forty or fifty men making bedsteads alone. They were the first in Canada to start making bedsteads of brass entirely.

There was a meeting of the commission in the city of Montreal, and at that meeting a gentleman by the name of Mr. Brown appeared. I have no doubt that the Finance Minister will remember the little incident that occurred on that occasion. Mr. Brown was evidently a very strong free trader, and had been reading the speeches and the literature of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the statement he said:

The first thing that should be placed on the free list is agricultural implements, which are protected by duties ranging from 20 to 35 per cent. Under present conditions, the most improved implements are almost as necessary to the farmer as the soil itself.

Implements might be placed on the free list without injuring anybody. The United States tariff has placed them on the free list from countries levying no import duty on similar articles from the United States.

This statement seemed to be news to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he turned to the gentleman sitting next to him and asked where Mr. Brown had got his information. Then, I believe, he plucked up his courage a little, and asked Mr. Brown himself where he had got the information, and that gentleman

Mr. WILSON.

elicited roars of laughter by replying: "I got it from the campaign literature of the Liberal party, and I have it here." That gentleman was a free trader, a man who believed that the best interests of this country would be served by free trade pure and simple; and he had got this opinion from the speeches of his leaders, and supposed that those speeches were to be depended upon. Whether that is the case or not those hon. gentlemen who know them best will be able to judge. Then the workman appeared before this same commission. A Mr. James M. Ramsay, representing more than five thousand workmen employed in iron industries at Lachine, asked that, in the interests of the mechanics and workmen, no change should be made in the present tariff. Further on, the report says:

Sir Richard endeavoured to catch the witness in some explanations, but the witness replied: "If you had a little money invested in it, you would catch on sooner."

Now, I will refer to only one other witness. Mr. Dobie, manager of the business of E. W. Gillet, manufacturer of crystal yeast cakes and baking powder. He said:

The firm's headquarters was in Chicago. If there was a material reduction in the duties, they would manufacture in Chicago instead of in Toronto. They employed fifty hands in Toronto, one half men, one half women. Men were paid from \$8 to \$15 a week, and women \$5. The firm paid out \$100,000 a year, and their output from \$140,000 to \$150,000 a year. Duty on baking powder was 6 cents per pound. Same on yeast. This was equal to 100 per cent ad valorem. If the duty was reduced to 20 per cent, it would pay the firm to do its manufacturing in the United States and pay the duty, and simply sell in Canada. The price of the firm's goods manufactured in the States and here are the same. The price to the wholesale and retail grocers and the other consumers was the same as if there was no duty.

To Sir Richard.—We have the principal business in the United States, and there is no trust.

To Mr. Fielding.—They are all the same. Package sells for 10 cents.

This is one of the ways which these hon. gentlemen took, I believe, to get out of the difficulty in which they were placed. They had promised the people free trade pure and simple, and they hit upon the scheme to go round and inquire of the different industries to ascertain exactly what they wanted. I remember distinctly the ridicule that was heaped upon the late Government because they pursued a similar course, a course that was very much more appropriate to them than to hon. gentlemen opposite, because they were protectionists, and they wanted to know what was in the best interest of the country from the gentlemen who were manufacturing the goods and from the farmers who were tilling the soil. At that time hon. gentlemen opposite did not want any such information. What they wanted was free trade pure and simple. This brings me to the statement of the Finance Minister. He lamented very much the departure from