

They cannot manufacture these goods in competition with the Americans. When you take off from 15 to 20 per cent, and then take off another one-eighth from the foreign goods, where will our manufacturers be? They will not be able to resist because they have no protection on their raw material. They cannot buy their raw material any cheaper now than they did before, as iron cannot be manufactured any cheaper than it is at present. Now, we want to protect these manufacturers. If we do not, if we are not loyal to them, this country cannot prosper. And the farmer is just as much a manufacturer as are the others. He ploughs up the soil in order to manufacture wheat just as the baker manufactures bread out of the flour. Let me say further that I am a Canadian, that I am out for Canada first before any other country, and that I am next a British subject; but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am here to protect our country strongly, so that our farmers and mechanics may be able to earn a living. If we do not protect the manufacturers, if their establishments are not kept in the country our young men will have to go where manufacturing industries do flourish. The hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Richardson) wants everything admitted free into the North-west, and does not want to give any concessions to the manufacturers here who employ so many hands. The hon. gentleman wants to feed these hands; but if he does not protect the manufacturers, all these hands will have to go to the other side of the line. If these goods are not manufactured in Canada, they will be manufactured in the United States, and our people will emigrate to the United States to seek employment in these factories. It will then be the American farmers who will feed them, and our North-west friends will not have any people here to feed.

Our hon. friends opposite were continually urging that the United States were friendly to them and hostile to the Conservative party, and that if we would only return them to power they would secure better trade relations with the United States than possibly could the late Government. But what have we found since they came into office? Two Ministers went over to Washington to talk trade relations, and they came back and told us that they had favourable reports. But hardly were their backs turned when the Dingley Bill came down and the American tariff went up higher. I do not believe in running after people. That exhibits weakness, and you can never make a success by conduct of that description. Let a business man run after a thing too much and coax too much, and he will never succeed. One requires to be more independent, and by dint of being independent he will get more than he could otherwise.

In my opinion, it would have been much

Mr. KLOEPFER.

better if the present Government, instead of travelling through the country hearing what the people had to say, had stayed at home and written to the manufacturers and got their views. If they had done that, we would have a much better tariff than we have to-day, and you would not see so many deputations running to Ottawa as we now see. I am sure that none of these factories can stand if the duties are not changed. The least little change in a tariff will help goods in from other countries. I believe that the old tariff was all right, except that it was rather too low, and instead of reducing it where the duty was 32½ per cent, we should have made it 35, and where it was 35 per cent we should have made it 40 per cent, and kept the home market for our own farmers. If we cannot keep our people here, our farmers will not have a home market. There is no use expecting that we can ship any manufactured goods to the other side because if any did enter England, the English merchants would soon drive them out. The United States are protectionists from the infant in the cradle to the great-grandfather, while in our case our duties are actually too low and the consumers do not benefit. In the time of Mr. Mackenzie, when the duty was 17½ per cent, goods sold for twice the price in Canada that they do now. Therefore, 35 per cent duty is not too much on all goods, and it will be found that fifteen or twenty years ago the prices were much higher. I have known goods which sold at \$4.50 in Mr. Mackenzie's time sell at \$1.85 to \$1.90 now. Why should a country like this have a tariff only averaging 30 per cent when our neighbours have a tariff of 40 per cent, which tariff they are about to run up to 50 per cent. That is a policy which is suicidal on our part. Instead of reducing the tariff, we ought to raise it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have only reduced the tariff here and there, but where they did reduce it, they hit the best industries we have in Canada. Now, I shall go on to sewing machines.

Mr. GIBSON. Your own factory?

Mr. KLOEPFER. Well, I have an interest in it, and I have not had it very long either. Before 1894 sewing machines were charged \$3 specific duty and 20 per cent, but in 1894 the late Government made a mistake by reducing that tariff down to 30 per cent. What happened? From 1894 out, American machines came in, and the poor manufacturer in Guelph struggled along as best he could until at last his business went down and he stopped.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). He was dead long before that.

Mr. KLOEPFER. You do not know anything about it. That man made money before. He had a plant there which must have cost him \$350,000, and which, after