

the National Policy could not possibly render any service to a trade that already had a monopoly of the whole business of Canada. With regard to agricultural implements, of which he has spoken, he has added burdens to the manufacturers in some cases by heavy additional taxation on their raw material. But then the Finance Minister asks, what have we done for them in return? We have given them the whole market of old Canada, and in addition new Canada. But they had the market of old Canada before the National Policy. The whole of the agricultural implements imported into old and new Canada in 1878 amounted to \$126,326. If that had been utterly wiped out, by reason of the National Policy, would that additional business have produced such a wonderful revolution in the trade of Canada, as the hon. gentleman boasts he has produced? What else is the fact? That after the imposition of the National Policy, the importation of those articles actually increased. In 1879 it rose to \$245,523, I think. The year after it fell again to \$169,714, but even that was \$43,000 more than in 1878; and this last year, 1881, they rose further to \$177,888, or \$51,500 more than before the National Policy went into operation. Where, then, is the wonderful revolution effected in our markets? As to his giving this industry the trade of new Canada, and asserting that without the present duties the United States would have furnished Manitoba and the North-West with their farm implements, how can it be argued that if those manufacturers were not able, under the old Tariff, to sell their implements at a profit, they could have competed in the North-West with our own manufacturers?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Because some of them are nearer our North-West.

Mr. ANGLIN. They have some factories nearer, it is true, but what advantage could that have given them with the old duty of 17½ per cent. against them. Have they not to pay a higher price for iron than our manufacturers? Had the Americans not to carry to the North-West the material of many of the articles they produced, and is that not as expensive as the carrying of the manufactured article? There was, therefore, no increase in the duty necessary in order to give our manufacturers a monopoly of the markets of the North-West. Take the difference between the cost in Toronto or any other city in Ontario and the cost landed in Winnipeg, and it will be seen there was no increase of duty necessary to give our own implement makers the absolute control of the North-West market also. I believe there were some causes in operation that prevented the agricultural implements of our own manufacture from being used in the North-West for some time. One was that our manufacturers did not for a time learn to produce the article specially required in the North-West, that the ploughs sent from Ontario were found not to be as useful breaking up the soil of the prairies as those manufactured in the prairie countries of the United States, that other agricultural implements were found also not to be so well adapted as the American article; but as our manufacturers found what was necessary they began to provide what suited the wants of the country, and even driving out the American article. It is an insult to the skill and enterprise of the agricultural implement makers of this Dominion to say that they could not, with a protection of 17½ per cent., compete successfully with the United States manufacturers in the great North-West. As they succeeded in excluding the American implements from the Provinces of old Canada, they would succeed in excluding them from the great North-West. If that be true, and it cannot be controverted, what becomes of the statement of the hon. gentleman, that his National Policy has conferred such wonderful benefits on the agricultural implement makers to revolutionize that trade, and though it has reduced

their profits has enabled them by selling a much larger number to realize larger profits on the whole every year. The implement makers are not at all satisfied with this Tariff. We have had statements from time to time during this Session to show that some of the very largest agricultural implement makers in Ontario are very much dissatisfied with the Tariff. With regard to carriages, the hon. Minister told us they are cheaper now than ever before, and would have us believe that his magnificent policy has given carriage makers an extended trade by giving them a monopoly of our own markets. He alleges that although he has taxed so heavily nearly every article that goes into the composition of a carriage, notwithstanding carriages are now at a much lower price than they were before, and higher wages paid, the carriage makers are making better profits. There is no system of arithmetic that would enable the hon. gentleman to figure out such a result. Higher taxes on the raw material, higher wages for the workman, lower prices for the article sold and better profit for the carriage maker. The hon. Minister alleges he has enlarged the market, that there is such an increase of wealth that people can afford to buy more carriages now than formerly. I would willingly believe this to be true, but I know it is not true. In St. John we do not see as many carriages as we did ten or fifteen years ago. In 1878 we imported altogether in all Canada but \$154,853 worth of carriages. Did the Tariff reduce very materially the number imported or the price? In 1879, during the depression, the quantity imported was smaller and the value lower, but the next year we imported to the value of \$137,378. In 1881, when we may suppose the National Policy was in full operation, we imported \$151,433 worth, or just \$3,400 less than in the year before the National Policy went into operation. Where did the National Policy, in this particular trade, confer any benefit on the manufacturers? With regard to sewing machines, the hon. Minister made another extraordinary statement. For once he forgot to credit the National Policy with all this increased trade, and said it is partly the effect of lower prices. Far more are sold but at cheaper rates. The people, he says, can afford better to buy them. It is a most gratuitous assertion to say that people buy sewing machines only when they are well off; nine-tenths of them are bought by persons to be used as a means of gaining a livelihood, though no doubt the general increase in their use is very large. When we look at the number imported we find that the Tariff could not have enlarged the market for the Canadian manufacturer. In 1878, the whole value imported was \$101,404. In 1881, was the quantity imported smaller? Had the National Policy the effect credited it? Not at all. The amount imported was nearly twice as large, \$193,337. There were double the number of machines, so that instead of having once and a half as many machines we had three times as many machines imported as in 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We manufactured and sold four times as many.

Mr. ANGLIN. I admit that to be unquestionable. Surely it does not prove that the National Policy was the cause of the increased production and sale of these articles, because if it had any effect it would be to increase the sales at home by the exclusion of the foreign article; but instead of excluding the foreign article, we find that under the operation of the National Policy the value of the sewing machines imported is nearly twice as large.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The reason is that they import the heads now and put them up here, and make and finish the frames here.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then the case of the manufacturer is worse.