

concerns, of course, would not have located in Canada except for the incidental protection which the tariff affords. Considering the extreme industrial activity at present in a place like Hamilton, calling for large numbers of women workers, it is probable that only about two and one-half times the actual number of hands employed would be directly dependent upon industry, making a total of, say, 75,000. If we add to this even twenty-five per cent. more, as being indirectly dependent upon industry, we have a total population of over 90,000 dependents (direct and indirect) for their living upon the manufacturing industries. Any interference in any large way with the tariff which now enables these manufacturers to do business would practically wipe out the city of Hamilton. What is true of Hamilton would be measurably true of many other towns and cities.

### Agricultural Implements

We might also ask what would be involved in the question of removing the duty on agricultural implements? There are approximately 160 firms in Canada making one or more lines of agricultural implements, so that the figures given below do not include many agricultural implement manufacturers who make other lines as well, nor do they include companies subsidiary to or dependent on the agricultural implement industry. The number of agricultural implement plants proper is sixty, total capital employed \$60,000,000, total wages and salaries \$7,000,000, estimated number of people directly and indirectly dependent upon the implement business 40,000 to 50,000. Now, it is quite possible that if the duty were removed on agricultural implements (and it must be remembered that the rate of duty is considerably less than manufacturers have to pay on any machines imported for use in their factories), and the duties were also removed from the raw materials entering into the manufacture of such implements, a few of the larger concerns might still live on account of their large foreign export business; yet as they purchase millions of dollars worth of supplies of all sorts from other manufacturers in Canada, all such secondary concerns would be adversely affected immediately, and there would be a general weakening and tearing down of a large portion of the industrial fabric of the country throughout. Figuring the total duty paid on agricultural implements in 1916, and taking the total value of the property of the farmers throughout Canada, it means about 3½c. for every \$100, or in other words, a farm valued at \$10,000 would pay on the average annually \$3.50. This does not seem like a staggering obligation by way of contribution to the national funds. The removal of the duty on tractors, without any consultation with the tractor manufacturers, to see what they could do to help out the situation