

consumers, and yet he is telling them: Gentlemen put your heads together, and tell us what you want; put on your prices; we will be glad to see you get a good return for the money you have invested, and for the cotton you have produced. The result will be that these cotton mills will combine, and on every dollar in their stock they will pay an annual dividend; money will be forthcoming to pay the interest on their investments, for the cotton the mills will produce will be offered to the public at a price that will pay a dividend on the entire investments in mills as well as the cost of material and working expenses. That will be the result when that arrangement is perfected, as I have no doubt it will. We know that protection leads to combination, combination leads to trade union, and trade union leads to monopolies; one thing follows another just as day follows night. There is one point in this connection to which I wish to call the attention of the House. We think to-day that we are manufacturing cotton in Canada very cheaply. We think we have accomplished a great deal in producing the articles we now produce. Now, I have noticed in the report for 1882 of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, the centre of the cotton district of England, that the price realised for the entire out-put of cotton of all kinds and grades, was threepence a yard; that is, from the best and most expensive goods manufactured out of cotton down to the lowest, from the most expensive produced down to the cheapest produced. What was the price realised in 1870, twelve years before? The price realised then was sevenpence a yard. I should like to know how the Canadian manufacturer, with a limited population of four and a half millions, with no other country to look to to provide an outlet for the surplus products, is going to compete with the outside manufacturer, and put on all the new and expensive improvements in machinery necessary to keep pace with the times—how he is going to produce an article at a sufficiently low price, if in the cotton district of England there has been an actual reduction in twelve years of 133½ per cent. in the cost of the article he is turning out. I wish to know how our manufacturers are going to compete under these circumstances. I was sorry to hear the hon. gentleman announce his intention to put a duty on winceys, and I am glad that he has decided to take part of that duty off. I am sorry, for the great struggling masses of this country, that it became necessary to put a duty on that article that so largely enters into the clothing of the poorer classes, though I congratulate him on the reduction he proposes to make. He says he put on the duty to encourage the manufacture of that article in this country. It seems curious that he is not aware that winceys have been made in this country for several years. I can give the names of several places where factories have been established.

Mr. BOWELL. Where?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will endeavor to give the hon. gentleman the information. I am sorry that it is necessary for him to ask the question, because he ought to be posted. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to fix the duty on winceys at 22½ per cent. I would like to know under what calculation, or under what amount of information, he has come to the conclusion that it is necessary to give the manufacturers of this country a protection of 22½ per cent. on winceys in order to induce them to manufacture. Why, Sir, in order for the Finance Minister of this country to be able to judge intelligently between the consumers and the manufacturers, he would need to be a mechanic, thoroughly posted with regard to the cost of these articles, the cost of raw material, and the cost of manufacturing; and we have the evidence that simply because he is not posted he has made very serious blunders. We know that at the commencement he gave the cotton manufacturers too much protec-

Mr. McMULLEN.

tion. The result was that we have a large number of mills; we have now more than we need. We have good reason to know that had the cotton mills been left alone and the additional number not built they would have been able to pay 40 per cent. dividend; but now there is over competition, there is financial disaster, and they are producing more cotton than is wanted. Under a protective tariff it is utterly impossible for any Finance Minister to so balance matters between the producer and the consumers as to do justice to the producer and at the same time to place an article in the hands of the consumer at a price at which he is fairly entitled to have it. He cannot be possessed of that information, and in order to conduct a National Policy such as the Government have inaugurated and are now trying to run—and they are trying their best not to run it into the ditch—but I am afraid they will, in order to run it intelligently, require to have the assistance of a number of men thoroughly posted as to the different manufactures, so that they would place their products in the hands of consumers at the lowest possible price. The Finance Minister is not in a position to do that. What does he know with regard to the manufacture of cotton, or of winceys, or of a sulkey rake, or of a gang plough? He is entirely at the mercy of those men who come to press for an increased duty. They come and put on a poor mouth, and say: Mr. Finance Minister, we want you to give us a little further protection; if you do, we will establish certain things in this country. And he gives them what they want, and as the result of all that, the people of this country are suffering, and are paying more than it is absolutely necessary for them to pay, simply because he does not know how to fix the duty in order to do justice to the consumer as well as the producer. Now, Sir, I was amused with the comparisons the Finance Minister made between agricultural implements in our North-West and those on the other side of the line; and I was glad to find the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) let out the secret when he said a very large amount of manufactured implements had been sent to the North-West which were now lying scattered about the country, and were selling as cheap as possibly could be expected. That is true. When the Minister of Finance quoted the different prices at Winnipeg, Brandon and other places along the line with the prices on the American side of the line, he omitted to mention the fact that our North-West is over-stocked with Canadian implements. I know of a manufacturing concern in Ontario that has thousands of dollars worth of implements in Manitoba which they cannot sell, and for which they would take 50 cents on the dollar if they could get it to-morrow. Other institutions tell a similar story; it appears there are as many agricultural implements in that country as can be used for two years to come, and thus the manufacturers are at a severe loss. A leading partner in a large manufactory told me that in this Dominion his firm had \$125,000 worth of agricultural implements scattered up and down, between the east and west, and their entire capital stock is \$100,000. They cannot sell their goods. That is the case in a great many instances. I say that the wealthy manufacturing institutions are wiping out the smaller ones; the manufacture of these things is being centralised; institutions throughout this country, which rendered very admirable service to the people are, one by one, being wiped out of existence, those who work in them are suffering, and the manufacturers themselves are losing the little means they possessed. It is only a question of financial strength as to how long the smaller institutions can stand against their wealthy rivals. I was also amused with a remark that fell from the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Tupper). He said that the volume of farm produce, that the volume of our exports of farm produce, had largely increased, and that this was one of the cases in which the National Policy was doing a great