

but entirely with the United States. I will refer very briefly to one or two matters on which the hon. gentleman dwelt in his speech to the House to-day. He started out with the assertion, which has been frequently made in this House, and frequently made throughout the country, that the duty increases the price of the article by exactly the amount of that duty. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if that is the case, how did it happen that in the United States for many years, while there was a duty of \$28 per ton on steel rails, they were sold there for from \$28 to \$30 per ton. If what the hon. gentleman says is correct, the manufacturers of steel rails in the United States produced and sold them for nothing. I think that that one case is sufficient to dispose of the argument of the hon. gentleman that the duty imposed by the Government increases the price by exactly the amount of the duty. The hon. gentleman went on to say that he buys Canadian tweeds on which there is a duty of 45 per cent. I think one does not need any particular intellect to know that Canadian tweeds do not pay any duty at all. They are made here. The hon. gentleman also referred to Canadian blankets, on which he said there was a duty of from 80 to 120 per cent. Why, Sir, you can buy a Canadian white blanket to-day at 40 cents per pound; it takes one and one-fifth pounds to make a blanket, which would cost about 26½ cents; the cost of manufacturing added would bring it to about 36 cents; add the manufacturer's profit and the wholesale dealer's profit, and yet the blanket is sold for 40 cents. Now, I ask any man in this House where does the duty of from 80 to 100 per cent. on that article come in? I contend, Sir, that there is not a farthing of duty upon it. The competition among the woollen manufacturers of this country is so keen to-day that there is not a farthing added to the price on account of the duty. But, Sir, there is this advantage in the duty, that it gives the Canadian manufacturers the whole of the home market. There is no combination among these men; and the competition has kept down the price to the lowest point at which these articles can be sold, I do not care where they are made. The hon. gentleman says that plain shirting pays a duty of 65 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you of my own knowledge that better shirting is sold in Canada to-day at 12½ cents a yard than was sold for 22 cents a yard several years ago, during the time of the 17½ per cent. duty on these goods. At the same time, these articles are made in this country and give employment to our own people. Another important consideration is that the price of the raw material is not materially advanced in consequence of the duty; and what is known to every woman in this country who handles these articles is that the Canadian manufactured article is much superior in quality to the imported goods which we used to have before the National Policy was inaugurated. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to some other articles. He said that solid steel spades are sold at Gananoque at \$10.60 a dozen, while those of the Pittsburg make are sold there at \$7.80. Now, we all know that there are a dozen different qualities of spades made, so that to compare these prices without knowing anything about the respective qualities of the two articles is absurd. But under the impetus given to the manufacture of these articles by the National Policy, we find that all articles of that kind are sold in

Canada from 25 to 35 per cent. cheaper than they were before the introduction of the National Policy, besides which they are of a superior quality to what our people used before. The hon. gentleman refers to coal oil, and says that No. 1 white is sold in Canada at 13½ cents a gallon, while United States oil is sold at 7½ cents per gallon. There are two or three points that deserve consideration in this connection. The wine gallon by which American coal oil is sold, being one-fifth less than the Imperial gallon, 7½ cents per wine gallon would be equal to about 9 cents per Imperial gallon. Then in the United States the barrel is paid for extra, while in Canada coal oil is universally sold at so much a gallon, and the barrel is thrown in.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member who says "no" does not know anything about it. No man can show an invoice for Canadian oil in which the barrel is charged extra. I have dealt in it for 24 years, and I have never heard of such a case. The barrel costs about 3 cents a gallon, and if you add that to the 9 cents, that brings the cost of American oil up to 12 cents a gallon; then add the freight, which will be a cent or two, and you will find that the price of American oil is really higher than the price of Canadian oil, which costs from 12½ to 13½ cents per gallon. Then, Canadian oil had to pass two tests which American oil is not subjected to. To salt I have already made some reference. It is most preposterous to think that an article of consumption in every house in the country, particularly on every farm should be increased in price from 55 cents to \$1.10 per barrel. It is an indefensible impost on the farmers of Canada, resulting from an illegal combination; and yet we find the hon. member for East Huron justifying that combination and the exorbitant prices which it has exacted. But the Government have come to the rescue of the people, and have reduced the duty one-half; so that instead of being 15 cents per 100 lbs., it is now 7½ cents per 100 lbs. And what is the result? On the 2nd of July a circular was sent out by this illegal combination saying that the price of \$1.10 a barrel has been reduced to 85 cents a barrel. I think the Government would have been justified in going still further and abolishing the duty altogether; in that way to teach these men that they cannot defy the laws of Canada with impunity. The hon. gentleman refers also to the question of sugar, saying that the duty was imposed on account of the National Policy. Now, everyone knows that the duty on raw sugar was imposed for revenue purposes, and brought in several million dollars a year to the treasury. But the Government felt this session that their surplus was large enough to enable them to abolish the duty on raw sugar, which was no protection to the manufacturers whatever, because while the duty on raw sugar is abolished the protection to the Canadian manufacturer remains. What is that protection? The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) represented most unfairly that the cost of the raw sugar, with the duty added, amounted to \$4.40 per 100 lbs., and then he made the assertion that the average selling price in Canada during the year ending 30th June, 1890, was \$6.64 per 100 lbs., and he asked: Who gets the balance of \$2.24? He did not say that the refiners pocketed that money, but he left that in-