

perfecting their products. The First Minister must see that the Government are throwing their influence in favor of one particular firm in each line, by the form of tender that is adopted. He can readily understand that the manufacturers are anxious that their goods should stand well in the market, but the Department is throwing a considerable weight in favor of the one article that is specified, to the injury and detriment of other manufacturers of the same article. It does seem to me, also, that it is limiting competition. With reference to ploughs in the North-West, there were none a few years ago, but I can assure the First Minister that in that article, as in others of Canadian manufacture, when they recognised the fact that the Americans, through long experience, had secured a better prairie plough than we had, I know, of my own knowledge, that the manufacturing firms of this country went to vast expense in order to get the American patents and to import workmen, in order to compete with the American products. I believe that what is stated there now is correct, in reference to ploughs, and that in the North-West our Canadian manufacturers have attained the point when they supply as good an article as can be imported. I would like to see that provision struck out, where it is made imperative that they shall have an American plough, so as to give our Canadian manufacturers a chance in that line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place whether the statement that has just been read, about the merits of the Chatham waggon, is going to be an advertisement for that company, one thing is quite clear, and that is that the hon. gentleman's speech is going to be a most substantial advertisement of that particular waggon. I am glad to learn from the hon. gentleman that the Canadian manufacturers now can make as good, or better, goods in every kind of agricultural implements as they do in the United States. I remember, not very long ago, when, perhaps, the hon. gentleman himself proclaimed on the stump in Parliament the extraordinary injustice that was being inflicted upon the poor settlers in the North-West, because they could not get American implements; that it was an injustice that our tariff should keep out an article because we could not make it as good or so cheap, just for the sake of bolstering up the National Policy; that we were robbing the settlers in the North-West. I am glad, however, to learn from such clear evidence as is given by the hon. gentleman that that state of things has changed. Now, my hon. friend speaks of the form of advertisement. Well, that form of advertisement that he wishes to have would never do—such as a plough called the John Deer plough. Every manufacturer, as the hon. gentleman says, has his own plough, his own implement, which he thinks is not only equal, but superior. There must be a specification. If you are going to have tenders at all, you must call upon them to compete in the same article. Now, I take it that the John Deer plough means that Mr. John Deer has a certain kind of plough, in shape, in form and weight, and it is well understood what the John Deer plough is. I take it that any manufacturer in Canada, whether he has bought a patent from John Deer, or whether he steals the patent and makes the plough, if he makes a John Deer plough that man can compete—that is the name of the plough.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; that is an American plough.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear you can have no competition unless the article is the same. I take it that there are a great many implement makers, each having their own form of plough, each having several excellencies. There can be no competition; they cannot fight; they cannot tender; there can be no means of judging who puts in the lowest tender, unless we know that it is for the same article. It would never do for any Department wanting a large supply of ploughs, or

waggons, or any other implement, to allow a general scramble among all the manufacturers, by way of tender, and then afterwards the Department would have to select from all these different kinds of implements. I take it, the Department has learned from their officers, from those who are experts, what article best suits the North-West, best suits the Indians. If the Indians have been accustomed to one kind of agricultural implement, it is inadvisable to change that capriciously, because they will have to commence to learn the use of the implement over again. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is the desire of the Department to get the best article, the article fittest to be handled by the Indians. They must require a special specification, and they offer everything to tender. The Government makes it a principle—I think Parliament insists upon that principle being carried out—to get everything by tender, except in remote portions of the country. There was a time, formerly, when an article could only be got in one place, and from one party, or, from want of transport, could not be got in Canada at all, but that kind of thing has passed away; and now the Departments call for a particular article, giving it the name by which it is known in the trade.

Mr. MILLS. As the Chatham waggon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Chatham waggon, I take it, is known. It is made in a particular way. The hon. gentleman comes from that vicinity, and I dare say he knows whether it is a good waggon or not. At all events, in advertising, it is necessary to specify the article, whether it is the Chatham waggon or the John Deer plough, or the Peter Wilkins plough, or the Peter Jones harrow; all these implements have a particular name, well understood in the market. That is the object of the Department; and if there is any mistake about it, I shall certainly see that there cannot be a doubt raised, as has been raised by the writer of the letter in question, as to whether he could compete or not. If he makes the article, whether it is known as the Chatham waggon or the John Deer plough, and it is equal to sample, he has a chance to get the contract.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The form of tender does not allow that. He cannot make a waggon and call it the Chatham waggon. The tender says it must be the Chatham waggon. The contractor is to supply the Chatham waggon, and is not at liberty to supply any waggon. The letter of the Department to that person was explicit. The party wished to tender, for some agricultural implements equal to any in the market, and wanted to know whether the tender would be received. The Department replied that they exceedingly regretted that they could not depart from the form of tender and accept other than the articles as described. If Massey mowers were called for, they must be made by the Massey Co. If the tender stated that the mowers were to be equal to the Massey mower, half a dozen firms would have competed. So with regard to sugar. The tender for the supply to destitute Indians provides that the sugar shall be Paris lump. Gentlemen in the grocery trade know that this is a kind manufactured by Redpaths alone, and that it costs 1 cent per pound more than the best granulated sugar. We need to give destitute Indians Paris lump, when every Canadian family uses granulated and pay for this lump 1 cent per lb. additional. This limits the tender to the article supplied by Redpaths. There is no chance for the Halifax, Moncton or St. John refineries, because they do not make Paris lump, only granulated sugars. But granulated is good enough for the First Minister's house and for the rest of us, but Paris lump, at 1 cent per pound additional, is needed for the destitute Indians. And so I might run down the list, and show that the form of tender is so framed that a monopoly is given to a particular manufacturer, to the exclusion of other manufacturers. The First Minister is wrong in his suggestion