

# Industrial Canada

VOLUME I.

TORONTO, CANADA, DECEMBER, 1896

NUMBER 12

.....

## TARIFF INQUIRY.

SOME OF THE INTERESTS HEARD FROM.

THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION. CONSIDERABLE TIME SPENT IN TORONTO, MONTREAL, HAMILTON, LONDON, AND OTHER LEADING COMMERCIAL CENTERS. MANUFACTURERS LARGELY IN FAVOR OF A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.—INTERESTS THAT FAVOR A LOWERING OF THE DUTIES.—CONFLICT OF VIEW BETWEEN MONTREAL AND TORONTO.—SOME CRITICS CRITICISED.

THE work of the tariff commission commenced in Toronto on the 18th of November. The commissioners are Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce; Hon. W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance; Hon. William Paterson, Minister of Customs, and Sir Oliver Mowat, Minister of Justice. Ontario's late Premier can hardly be considered one of the commission, but his thorough knowledge of conditions in Ontario no doubt influenced his associates in having him accompany them in their travels throughout the province.

Manufacturers in Toronto and elsewhere made a strong claim, on the whole, for the continuance of a protective tariff. It has been said that the arguments presented by these gentlemen were of a selfish character. But it must be remembered that they were asked to present the case from a manufacturers' standpoint. They represent a large interest in the Dominion, and what directly affects the welfare of the manufacturers of the country directly touches a very large portion of the population in the person of the employees of these concerns. Indirectly others are affected.

For any reason let the manufacturing interests of a community be injured and not only are hundreds of workmen thrown out of employment, but the commercial interests of the entire community are seriously jeopardized. And any one who has studied the history of the towns and cities of the Dominion can point to communities that are simply a shadow of their former self because of the removal of large industries, either to other places, or obliterated through fire, or other unfortunate circumstances.

Where INDUSTRIAL CANADA believes there are changes that ought to be made in the tariff, and that there are manufactures protected to-day, in return for which the general public are receiving comparatively little benefit; at the same time it has no sympathy with that political sentiment that would decry every movement and utterance of Canadian manufacturers as inspired by solely selfish motives.

The manufacturer who has his goods to sell is perhaps no more influenced from personal motives than the man who wants to buy and is going to buy where he can obtain them the cheapest, without particular regard, too often, as to who is affected by his purchase. We find an illustration of this spirit in the large cities where departmental stores exist. Public meetings are held and large newspaper discussions indulged in and these stores condemned as injurious to the general welfare. At the same time the people who are patronizing these stores are largely those who are doing the growling. When it comes to spending their money they go where they can buy cheapest. The selfish spirit, unfortunately, perhaps, reaches all classes of people. We are not saying that this is the proper spirit to animate men in their dealings one with the other, but we are taking circumstances as they exist, and which are not exceptional, and not discussing the ethical view of the question.

At the first meeting in Toronto Mr. A. E. Kemp, of the Kemp Manufacturing Co., presented the claims of the manufacturers of enamelware, stamped tinware, and copperware. Just here it is worthy of note that one advantage of the tariff inquiry is the gleanings of information as to the character and standing of many Canadian manufactures. We are told that there are three manufacturers in Canada in the same line as Mr. Kemp; one in London, one in Montreal and one in Toronto. The goods manufactured are largely household utensils. The duties on their finished products vary from 25 to 35 per cent. Some of their raw materials were free, while the duties on others varied from 5 per cent. to 30 per cent. In certain parts of the Company's business there are innumerable competitors, but in the enamelware line there are only two. Competition in this line was now chiefly with Germany. Mr. Kemp claimed that the Canadian producers sold their goods cheaper in Canada to-day than they were sold to the consumers of the United States, Great Britain or Germany. The German manufacturers had made a hard fight to hold their trade. They had the advantage of the Canadian in the case of their labor, which was less than one-half of the wages paid in this country. Under the tariff of 1878 the duty on enamelware was 17½ per cent. To-day it was

35 per cent. An article that sold for \$1 eight years ago would sell to-day for 30 cents. Mr. Kemp was opposed to any reduction of existing duties.

An interesting interview took place with the bicycle manufacturers represented largely by H. A. Lozier & Co., Toronto Junction, and Mr. S. F. Evans, of Evans & Dodge, Windsor. Mr. Thomas stated that for some years England had a monopoly in the manufacture of wheels. In 1884 there were only six bicycle factories in the United States, and their output was about 11,000 completed wheels. In 1895 there were over 500 bicycle manufacturers in the United States, each one on an average making not less than a thousand bicycles. It was stated that the export of American bicycles into Canada would not be affected by the tariff either one way or the other. The consumption here would regulate the disposition of the output. Mr. Evans and Mr. Thomas explained the process of importing wheels in parts and the method of conducting assembly shops. H. A. Lozier & Co. made every thing except the rims, which were purchased in Canada; the tires, which were brought from the United States in the face of a duty of 30 per cent. and the steel tubing on which a duty of 15 per cent. was paid. The duty on the steel balls and other accessories was 30 per cent.

The manufacture of shirts, collars and cuffs was represented by Mr. J. W. Gale, A. A. Allan, and H. J. Cullfeldt. The inability of the Canadian manufacturers to compete with European and American producers was pointed out and the reason alleged therefore. It was said that raw material and labor cost less in Europe, and that raw material was cheaper in the United States than in Canada. Cottons were from 25 per cent. to 30 per cent. cheaper in the United States than in Canada, and thus the American manufacturer was enabled to make a slaughter-market of this country. Another consideration which was mentioned was that the season in Canada began nearly two months later than it did in the United States. In Europe both capital and machinery cost less than they did in Canada. In Europe raw material costs 20½ per cent. more than in Canada and skilled labor less



HON. SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, K.C.M.G.  
MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.