

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member for St. John should not be placed in a false position, because he stated at the time that the quality and class of the Londonderry iron was superior to that of any other iron.

M. PATERSON. I should be very sorry to do any injustice to the hon. member for St. John, and it would only be with more regret that I would do any injustice to the hon. member for King's. But if I understand the question I do not understand that the \$2 per ton duty makes the Londonderry pig iron any better. That Company, no doubt, would produce as good iron without the \$2 per ton duty as with it. We now come to consider the effects of this duty on manufacturing industries. It has injured them by imposing a duty on raw material. It is perfectly useless for the hon. member for King's, who is an intelligent business man, to venture on the line of argument in Parliament, that because they had to impose a high rate of duty on certain articles and it was found the price, notwithstanding the imposition of the duty was even lower than before, the imposition of the duty did not compel the people to pay extra taxation. The hon. gentleman should know the fact that markets rise and fall. It has been already pointed out by the hon. member for St. John that the price in Canada has increased relatively with the price in Great Britain and other countries, and if iron ruled lower at one time in the foreign markets it would sell at a correspondingly low price in this market. The argument is fallacious. What we have to consider is this: Would the iron have been sold at \$2 per ton less if there had been no duty to pay. The hon. Minister of Finance, who is a candid and discerning man in business affairs, must answer in the affirmative, that if \$2 per ton duty were removed the price would fall by an equal amount. We had the prediction of the Finance Minister, that in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, there would be a sufficient number of iron furnaces, and that, as in the United States when their blast furnaces more than supply the home demand, the prices would fall, but with a large importation of foreign iron every business man must know that the imposition of the duty must be paid not partially but wholly by those who purchased the articles. I know from conversation with one of the manufacturers in my own town, that he made a bargain for a quantity of iron with a British merchant, the terms varying with or without duty. The difference in price was the amount of the duty levied by the Government. Take some of the manufacturing industries of the country and see what has been the effect of the duty.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Will the hon. gentleman state the price of pig iron previous to the imposition of the duty and the price at the present day.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not state that; I have not the figures with me and it is not necessary for me to do so.

Mr. DOMVILLE. How then can you say it is dearer?

Mr. PATERSON. My line of argument is before the House and it is sufficient to convince any man. Let me take the quantity of iron imported and what do we find? In 1878 there was \$2,152,644 worth imported, in 1881 it was \$3,299,188. That certainly proves that we had to be supplied from abroad, and as our home consumption is not sufficiently strong we must be paying the full amount in enhanced duty. I do not believe it is possible that the American producer of coal who knows that not one ounce of anthracite is mined in this Dominion, except possibly British Columbia, supposes that the manufacturer would pay the duty on the article, and so with reference to this article of pig iron. I will grant the position of my hon. friend if, as I said before, you had furnaces in sufficient number here to compete with the foreign market. It might be the position in a certain

state of the market; there might be some slaughtering going on. I will admit that for argument's sake, though I do not believe it to be correct; but forced as we are to buy iron in foreign countries, is it not the height of absurdity to suppose dealers in iron, who know that we must find our way to their market, who know our necessities to buy are greater than their necessities to sell, would share in paying in the duty. It cannot be. Take some of the large industries of this country. Take the articles of wag-gons and carriages—and I may say here that my figures are taken from the Census of 1871. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) and the Finance Minister were hardly fair in attempting to pooh-pooh the statements of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) because he took the figures from that census. Will the hon. the Finance Minister or anyone else tell me if, in speaking upon this matter in the House, where we may get figures upon which we may argue other than these? The hon. the Finance Minister himself endeavours to get some approximate figures by special Commissioners with regard to certain industries in this country, but he himself had to admit that they were not correct. There is only one place where we can get anything approaching correct information as to the home production of certain articles, and that is the Census of 1871; and I may say that we are a little at a disadvantage, especially those on this side of the House, in discussing the question, because, while we produced largely the goods manufactured in this country in 1871, the Census return of the quantity of those goods in that year will represent nothing in comparison with the products of those goods in 1881. I trust that when hon. gentlemen opposite find it necessary for them to send us to the country when this Parliament shall have reached its full time late in the fall of 1883, that they will be able to present us with the results of the Census of 1881, before that time, so that we may be able to address the electors, and base our statements on returns ten years later than those which are now at our command; and I know that these later figures will be much more favorable to the Opposition than those of 1871. In 1871 the carriage and waggon makers of this country produced \$3,580,920. That production has gone on increasing. These manufacturers have shared in the general prosperity, and have benefitted by the increased population of the country during the last ten years, and the extra demand for their goods caused by that increased population. Practically there is no more importation of foreign goods of that kind now than there was then, and at that date, I believe, something like 97 per cent. of these goods was home production. They had the practical control of the Canadian market and the imposition of a higher rate of duty was of no benefit to them. But how have they been affected by the duty on the raw material? The duty on their

Iron.....	increased from	5	per cent.	to	17½
Bolts and Nuts.....	do	17½	do	35	
Screws.....	do	17½	do	35	
Malleable Castings.....	do	17½	do	25	
Tools, a large item.....	do	17½	do	30	
Electro-plate Ironings.....	do	17½	do	30	
Hardware.....	do	17½	do	30	
Axles and Springs.....	do	17½	do	30	
Anvils.....	do	17½	do	30	

Take next, our foundries and machine shops; and I believe there is no industry in this country that gives employment to more mechanics than do these establishments, many of them being the longest in operation in this country. They were flourishing before the National Policy was introduced; and what has been its effect upon the large class which they are present? It is but a repetition of the others I have mentioned. There is an increase on their bar iron, their Russian sheet, their screws, their bolts, their nuts, their solder, their wire, their rivets and all the other articles they use, amounting to over 10 or 12½ per cent. Take next, agricultural implements, and what does the Census show?