to the value of $4,445,480 and exported implements to the value of $6,152,559. That is to say, she exported one and a half times as much as she imported.

Successful Competition in World Markets.

As stated by the Minister of Finance, Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements, can go into the world's markets and successfully compete against the manufacturers of other countries. Considering for the moment only the United States, the one competitor of concern, reference to trade returns show that last year in the free trade market of **Great Britain** the United States sold implements to the value of $1,023,000. while Canada sold implements to the value of $250,000 or to an amount equalling about 25% of the American sales. Canada's population is about one-twelfth of the population of the United States, yet she was able to successfully compete in the free trade market of Britain and rival her American competitor there to a figure equal to one-quarter of the American sales. In **France,** where identical duties had to be paid by the United States and Canada, a like result was obtained. The United States sold implements to the value of $2,700,000 while Canada sold implements to the value of $686,000 or one-quarter of the amount sold by the United States.

In **Russia**, Canada did even better. The United States sales amounted to $5,800,000 while Canada's totalled $2,000,000 or more than one-third of her neighboring competitor.

Had Canada in all of these cases done 10 per cent of the trade of the United States she would have held her own. As a matter of fact, in England and France her trade was 25% that of the United States and in Russia 33⅓%. More significant still, however, is the trade in agricultural implements which the two countries have carried on in **Australia.** There both meet on an equal footing, though Canada is handicapped by being farther away, which necessitates a longer haul for her commodities. In Australia last year the total sales of agricultural implements from Canada exceeded the total sales of the United States by $160,000. The total sales of the United States amounted to $1,100,000, while the total sales of Canada amounted to $1,278,100. In other words, on the other side of the world, competing on equal terms, Canada, with her population one-twelfth that of the United States and handicapped by distance, has been able to outstrip her American rival in this industry to the extent of $160,000 in one year.

If Canada can more than hold her own when brought into competition with the United States in the free trade market of England, and in competition on equal terms in France and Russia, and if on the other side of the world she can out-rival her chief competitor is she not in a position to do the same within her own boundaries?

Sales in the United States.

But the case is even stronger than this. Even before the United States removed the tariff on agricultural implements, Canada sold in the **United States** itself agricultural implements to a value of between $80,000 and $90,000. Under the Wilson-Underwood tariff, which removed all the duties on agricultural implements, Canadian manufacturers are now in a position to compete in the free market of the United States on equal terms with the manufacturers of agricultural implements of that country.

If the manufacturers of agricultural implements of Canada can go even into the market of the United States itself, pay the United States tariff as formerly existing, pay the freight required, and sell their goods in competition with American manufacturers, what argument is there left to justify Canadian farmers being deprived of any advantage that may come through free competition of agricultural implement manufacturers in the Canadian markets? What, for example, can justify the retention of a protective tariff which helps to handicap Canadian agriculture in the face of figures such as the following which were cited and unquestioned in debate in the House of Commons.* The Cockshutt Plow Company of Brantford made an eight furrow plough, which sold in 1911–12 at Brantford for $600, at Winnipeg for $680 and at most points in Saskatchewan for $705. The same company sold a similar plough after payment of duty of from 13 to 15% in addition to freight charges, at Peoria, Illinois, for $525, and at Minneapolis, Minnesota, for $502. An eight gang plough of the same Company was quoted at Saskatoon at $705 cash and the figure given for that plough at Minneapolis was $541.20, both ploughs of the Cockshutt Plow Company. Similar statistics were given in Parliament, and unquestioned, showing cheaper prices in the United States on Canadian wagons, mowers, binders and hay forks than were to be had in Canada where these implements were manufactured.

Finally as respects competition in manufacture of agricultural implements it may be mentioned that Mr. Metcalfe, the head of the International Harvester Company which does business in both Canada and the United States, in giving evidence before the Ways and Means Committee of Congress in Washington in 1908-09 stated that in the city of Hamilton, Ontario, his Company was able to manufacture practically as cheaply as in the United States and that the goods manufactured were practically the same.

Effects of Continuing Protection.

The conditions being what they are, what, it may be asked, is the effect of retaining the duties on agricultural implements? The additional prices which the farmers have to pay are not necessary to give the manufacturers a fair profit, otherwise they could not sell abroad at the prices and in the quantities they do. The difference between what would be a fair profit and what is charged does not go to the State as revenue for these commodities are produced and sold within the country itself; it can, therefore, only help to swell the private fortunes of the men engaged in the business, and do this at the expense of the nation as a whole, and the farming community in particular. It is well known that through the facilities undue protection has afforded, the business of manufacturing agricultural implements has gradually become consolidated in the hands of a few firms, whose understandings and relations with each other are such as to constitute them an effective combine. The heads of some of these concerns have become millionaires, and are adding to their vast accumulations year by year. These enormous private fortunes are being acquired behind the screen of an alleged National Policy of protection, and are being used as a means of maintaining protection after its real purpose has long since been attained.

*See Speech by W. E. Knowles, M.P., H. of C. March 11, Hansard p. 1615–16.