

The total result of the Tariff as it affects raw materials used by the foundrymen of the Dominion, as compared with 1878, is an increase from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to  $14\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., including coal. Then on boiler plate there is an increase of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. I do not intend to take up the time of the House more than to show first of all the effect of this duty on the raw material which enters so largely into the farming, lumbering and other industries of the country. A large number of our population have to pay the additional duty on the iron and the additional profit on the duty paid on the iron, for the merchants, I presume, in all cases charge not only the duty on the iron, but the profits on the outlay as well. Thus we find that the carpenters and the blacksmiths pay \$12.50 on every \$100 worth of materials used for building purposes, tools, &c. So with the cooper and all other laboring classes, while, on the other hand, we find that the manufacturers who are largely consumers of iron are no better off than they were before. I maintain that this amendment contains elements of large taxation to the several industries I have alluded to. I desire to place these things specifically before the House, in this amendment, because it is part of our policy to place on record the worst features of the hon. Finance Minister's policy.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am sorry this question has been sprung upon the House without notice, as we all know that the iron industry is a very large one. Iron enters into almost everything that is used in the avocations of life, from the spade with which we till the soil up to the highest form of machinery for the purpose of saving manual labor. Had my hon. friend taken up the question of putting more duty on iron, I would have supported him willingly. Pledged as I am to support the Government—and I gave no uncertain sound on that question in my constituency—pledged to support any Tariff which would benefit the producers of iron and tend to the employment of labor, I would have joined with the hon. gentleman in asking for this increase. We all know that for every ton of iron that is produced four tons of coal are required in the various stages of its manufacture. If we produced the iron which we now import we would burn the coal down in the Lower Provinces instead of shipping it to the Upper Provinces, so that not only would we have a greater amount of coal mined, but we would have to employ a vast number of people in the various ramifications of its manufacture. But the hon. gentleman argues that the duty should be taken off, and I will try to show him presently that some of his grievances are ill-founded. He does not try to find a remedy for the state of things in this country. While other industries have been largely protected iron has not been sufficiently protected, and the reason is simple. If the Government were to tax iron what would hon. gentlemen opposite say? They would say: "We cannot build ships, because you tax iron so heavily that it makes ships dearer, and we cannot compete with the rest of the world." Now, I do not agree with that. I believe that if a duty were placed on the iron coming into this country, which we manufacturers call a raw material, viz., pig iron, then, instead of the price of iron being increased the competition amongst ourselves would be so great that pig iron would be as cheap, or cheaper than the cheapest we now import. If all the pig iron we now import—the hon. gentleman said it was 45,000 tons last year—were made in this country, what would be the result? In Pictou, where exist the finest iron beds in the world, side by side with abundance of coal, pig iron would be produced in large quantities, whereas now it cannot be because iron dribbles into Canada from all parts of the world. That is the complaint of the iron manufacturers, and not that the duty is too high. I had the honor of being Chairman of the Ironmen's Association, at their meeting here last year, and they proved that the duty had not only not increased the price of iron but

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury).

diminished it; and that if the Government would put a higher duty on iron, the selling price would be far less than it is now, because the competition would keep down the price. Now, my hon. friend has referred to the increase of the duty on iron from 17 per cent. to 35 per cent.

Mr. BURPEE. I said from 5 to  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I took down from 17 to 35.

Mr. BURPEE. That was on screws and bolts and nuts.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, that is a small matter, because I might remind my hon. friend that screws and bolts and nuts are cheaper to-day than they were in previous years. My hon. friend found fault with the price of nail, plate and bar iron. Notwithstanding the increase in the duty, bar iron, nails and nail plate, are cheaper.

Mr. BURPEE. The price of bar iron in Montreal, in 1878, was \$1.80 per cwt.; in 1879, \$1.80; in 1880, \$2.15; and in 1881, \$1.85. It was about 10 cents per cwt. higher in St. John.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend shows that it was 5 cents per cwt. or \$1 a ton dearer in 1881, than in 1878.

Mr. BURPEE. Besides the difference in the price in the English market, where it was 16s. 3d. less in 1881, than in 1878.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Never mind the English market. My hon. friend has shown that bar iron is only 5 cents per cwt. more than it was before. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman if he can refute the fact that nails were cheaper in 1881 than they were in 1878, notwithstanding the increase of 5 cents per cwt. in the price of bar iron.

Mr. BURPEE. The price of nails in Montreal, in 1878, was \$2.60 a keg; in 1879, \$2.65; in 1880, \$3.15; and in 1881, \$2.70; and the price in St. John in 1878 was \$2.45; in 1879, \$2.25; in 1880, \$3.10, and in 1881, \$2.70.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I entirely disagree with my hon. friend, because I know as a fact that nails were selling in St. John last year at \$2.40 and \$2.45 a keg. We can easily find out the prices of these grades of iron by telegraphing to the manufacturers. My hon. friend speaks of \$2.70 and \$2.75 being the price of those nails, but they were small. But if he takes the average between the ten and twelve penny nails, he will find the price is very much cheaper in 1881 than in 1878. The hon. gentleman did not take the average.

Mr. BURPEE. I took the large size.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Exactly; but I can produce figures from the merchants in St. John to show. What have the managers found fault with? That the Londonderry people were in a position to supply them with nail plate for nails, without competition, and could make the difference between the two markets, and were enabled to get in this country the full price of iron as against English iron—they could not import English iron to very much better advantage than they could purchase the Londonderry iron. The hon. gentleman says it was 5 cents per cwt. higher than the English iron; but everyone knows the Londonderry makes a superior nail plate, that the English makers roll out any scrap left and make an article of uncertain quality. But the quality of the Londonderry article is quite superior, for they only roll one description of iron; and any manufacturer would rather pay 5 cents more for that quality.

Mr. BURPEE. I said 10 cents higher was the average.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I took 5 cents down—he said \$1.80 to \$1.85.

Mr. BURPEE. I said 10 cents, but admitted the Londonderry was worth 10 cents more, being cleaner and free from rust, and that it was better to use it than the cheaper article from England.