

ing 100 bolts three-sixteenths of an inch diameter by  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inch long. The labour costs 21 cents, and the material  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents, making a total of  $28\frac{1}{2}$  cents, and the wholesale price is  $29\frac{1}{2}$  cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the weight of the bolts?

Mr. TAYLOR. These bolts are 100 to the pound.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman is asking for a protection to the extent of \$36.70 a ton, while he is now receiving, according to his own showing, \$31.80 a ton, which I think is not a bad protection at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. And he pays nothing on his raw material.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like very much to go as far as I could to meet the views of the hon. gentleman who has spoken with respect to this item. There was some regard had to the difference in the sizes of the bolts, and the protection on the smaller size is larger than that on the other. There have been, of course, reductions in the raw material, and if the hon. gentleman will make the calculation of the cost of his raw material, the value of the output, and the ad valorem duty on that, he will see that after all he has a pretty large protection—one which, I think, is as much as could reasonably be given to the industry. We all see that difficulties are now felt owing to the present abnormal state of the trade. Markets are congested on the other side, people there want money, and under these circumstances they are apt to sell at prices down to cost, and sometimes below cost, and we in Canada have at this moment to compete with that abnormal state of things. But it is not to be supposed that that will last, and I feel pretty certain that when things are again in their normal condition the protection given here will keep this industry in this country. I hope it will. If I thought it would not I would be inclined to give a little more, but it seems to me that this is a pretty stiff protection.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister of Finance has made an extraordinary statement. He says that markets are congested and prices abnormally low, and that is the reason why the taxes should be high here.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say any such thing. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, and does not wish to misrepresent me, I will say what I did say. I said that owing to trade in the United States being in an abnormal state, the markets were congested and people had to realize, so that there was a disposition to sell at cost, or below cost, and our industries had at this time to compete with that state of things, and I hoped that when the markets would resume their normal condition this would be found a reasonable protection.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When prices went up. He said personally he would like to give the hon. gentleman more protection if prices remained as they are. What is the object? Why, to make the consumers of this country pay a little more. They have the misfortune sometimes of buying articles, the hon. gentleman thinks, for less than they are worth. Well, that might ruin the man who undertakes to sell to them from abroad, but I do not understand, if a man pays 50 cents for one dollar's worth, how that does him any harm. The hon. gentleman has led the House to suppose that if he had his way—and he will, if things remain as they are—he would give these parties a little more protection, or otherwise the people of this country may be ruined with cheap goods.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I wish to say a word upon this question, because it affects, not only the industry to which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has referred, but some other industries in the country as well. I do not agree with the Minister of Finance that we ought not to be protected against an abnormal market. I think, on the contrary, if there is protection needed, it is to protect our manufacturers against bankrupt markets. Suppose you would have bankrupt markets for two or three years in the United States, and no protection, what would be the consequence? Our manufacturers would have to shut down, and our workingmen would not be able to earn enough to pay for the necessities of life. Give our workingmen something to do and something to earn, so as to pay for the necessities of life, and then they will buy. But if they have no money, they cannot buy. I believe that after our manufacturers have had a protective system which has enabled them to commence operations and to prosper to a certain extent, that protective system should not be discontinued so soon—in some cases, a few years after the industries have been created. I think that the manufacturers have some rights in this country. The farmers have certainly a great deal of right, and their protection has not been reduced by the present tariff, but continued and even extended. But by what right manufacturing industries are to be destroyed, I do not know. It is all very well for speakers opposite to say that it is not in the policy of foreign manufacturers to kill competing industries in this country. I have here a little book which has been issued by the 'Press,' a leading newspaper of New York. Under the head of "Method of crushing rivals," the method is thus described:

The manner in which English capital is used to maintain her manufacturing supremacy is well understood abroad. In any quarter of the globe where a competition shows itself as likely to interfere with her monopoly, immediately the capital of her manufacturers is massed in that particular