

duty on wire rods placed by my hon. friend last spring. That is a practical illustration to my hon. friend of what these tariff proposals are going to mean to consumers in this country, in the matter of higher prices for the materials they have to use. These are small items, but they show the effect of the tariff legislation of last year.

We talk about patriotism and production; we ask our farmers to grow larger crops, of better quality; and yet, Sir, under these tariff proposals, the farmers of this country are going to have an added burden of another  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on the prices of the agricultural implements which they will have to buy. For the moment I exclude from that statement reapers and binders and mowers, which are not touched by the  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent increase; but on all other classes of agricultural machinery we have a horizontal increase in duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. I have every reason to believe, and I think the authority of my information cannot be questioned, that already the agricultural implement men of this country are arranging and have arranged to increase the prices of their goods to the farmers, as a result of this  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent increase. I must accept the word of the hon. member for Brantford, and I do accept his word, that the Cockshutt Plow Company cannot and must not be included in that category. Perhaps a little inside history would not be objected to by my hon. friend from Brantford in this connection. It is a very well known fact that for some months back, for a year or so, the Cockshutt Plow Company of the city of Brantford, Ont., has not enjoyed, under good Conservative rule, that measure of prosperity which it enjoyed under the Administration of my right hon. friend and leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I believe that from the 1st of July last that company has passed up its dividends to its stock-holders, or so I am informed, and on top of that financial situation that company, I am informed, had already a large inventory of goods in its warehouses, not only in the East, but particularly throughout western Canada. I can quite see how this legislation will particularly suit the requirements of that particular company. It does not propose until it can dispose of this large surplus of products to increase prices. But, Sir, it will have the benefit of the  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent increase to protect it from the importation of the foreign-made product. I can very well foresee that when this company has disposed of the very large surplus

now in its warehouses it will not be very long in joining the other manufacturers of agricultural implements, the Massey-Harris Company, the International and others in putting the price just as high as the new tariff will permit. I am sorry my hon. friend from Brantford is not here to hear my statement, because I do not wish to do him or his business any harm; but I say that if his company or the company with which he is associated has not already raised its prices as a result of this increase of the tariff on agricultural implements, it is because the situation existing in that company itself does not make it feasible for it to do so at the present moment.

What about leather and leather goods under this  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent increase? I am told, on what I consider good authority, although I am open to correction if my information is not correct, that from the day on which my hon. friend made his first Budget statement this session the wholesale leather people of this country immediately notified their customers, the boot and shoe manufacturers, that leather had increased  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in price; and I am also informed that the manufacturers of boots and shoes have come to the conclusion that as they are paying  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent more for their raw material, they must tax their customers, the jobber and retail man, at least another 5 per cent, and ultimately, of course, this must be paid by the consumer, the man who wears the boots and shoes, because of this benevolent Finance Minister who has increased the protection to the wholesale leather manufacturer to the extent of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. These are some of the facts in connection with the practical working out, so far as the consumer of Canada is concerned, of these tariff proposals of my hon. friend.

There is this to be said: We are helping out the Canadian manufacturers. I do not suppose this country has ever in its history seen a more carefully or splendidly staged performance than the performance of the Canadian manufacturers since this war has broken out. Our attention is everywhere directed to the theory that we should use goods only that are made in Canada. My hon. friend who moved the address in reply (Mr. Weichel) made that the burden of his speech and the Minister of Finance tells us that it is the proper method for people, like individuals, to make what they need instead of buying it abroad. I do not think the people of Canada need that sort of propaganda. The patriotism of the Can-