

this country are asked to put their hands into their pockets for \$416,000 per annum. If we are going to buy those goods from Great Britain, let it be because British manufacturers can produce them as cheaply as others. If we are going to pay any amount to Great Britain, let us pay it to Great Britain herself. She protects our commerce on every sea, and, if we wish to assist her, let us contribute a ship to the navy or make a contribution in some such way; but to contribute money to men whom we are to assume to be lame and impotent, who are not able to hold their own in fair competition with the rest of the world, is absurd. Where are all the arguments of the Minister of Trade and Commerce which he formerly advanced against protection and against bloated protectionists? Where is his loud complaint about the hundreds of millions of dollars that he, when in Opposition, said went into the already too-full pockets of the manufacturers? There is no sympathy for our manufacturers now, so we are going to put the money into the pockets of the manufacturers of England.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Our taxpayers will get the benefit from getting goods at reduced rates.

Mr. POWELL. No, not at lower prices; but we will enable the British manufacturers to get their goods in here. We will not get the goods cheaper or get any benefit, but the British producers will get the benefit and have that portion of our trade, and by the amount of the reduction through the preference our revenue will be short. I would be untrue to my constituents, did I in any way undertake or desire to deny our right to help Great Britain along; but if we are going to help Great Britain, let us help, not the producers in Manchester or Sheffield but the British nation as a nation, and let it be a fair business equivalent for the need of protection she affords our commerce on every sea.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As Great Britain takes two-thirds of our exports, and is likely to take a great deal more, and as there is no better axiom in trade than that, if you want some one to buy from you, you must buy from them, we will be encouraging trade with them and assisting our own producers, too. It is clear as daylight, that, if you reduce the tax on a given article, the Canadian consumer will get the benefit of it. I know, of course, that hon. gentlemen opposite do not care anything for the interest of the consumers.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman says, that, in order to have trade, we must buy from those whom we wish to buy from us. Hon. gentlemen opposite in this show the fallacy of their whole argument. Our exports to Great Britain have been rolling up by leaps and bounds, and last year increased \$17,000,000, while imports from Great Britain have, year to year, decreased; at the

Mr. POWELL.

same time, our exports to the United States have declined, while our imports have increased year after year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. By the National Policy.

Mr. POWELL. I do not care what did it. The hon. gentleman is too keen a logician not to know that his remarks are not pertinent to the issue. The hon. gentleman made the point, that reciprocity was needed to secure export trade. My contention is that under modern conditions that is not true, and my contention is supported by the results of trade in every part of the civilized world.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to inquire, what amount of money was refunded to countries outside of Great Britain for goods that were imported subject to duty without giving the preferential tariff of last year, up to the time it was decided to apply the preferential tariff to those articles?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry I cannot make a definite reply to the hon. gentleman, in the absence of the Minister of Customs. I think the amount was about \$100,000; I make that statement subject to correction.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then, about \$100,000 was the necessary reduction under the 12½ per cent. It is understood that it cost the country \$100,000 for the Government to adopt the plan adopted last year, by going blindly into giving a preferential tariff only to Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only difference between my hon. friend and myself is, that I do not agree that we proceeded blindly in this matter, but that we proceeded with very intelligent sight, and accomplished what we desired.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understood the hon. gentleman said the preferential tariff would not apply to those other countries, and he went into it blindly. If he had taken the advice of the ex-Minister of Finance, who told him that it was impossible to carry out the plan as laid before the House and the country, we would not have been obliged to pay \$100,000. It would have been better to have induced the mother country to remove the restrictions which were subsequently removed, and have thus saved \$100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the Minister of Finance will bring down a correct statement of the refunds paid, because it will show the amount we were obliged to pay, and for which the people have got no benefit, and which they had to pay for the blunder of the Minister. Those goods were brought in, they paid an increased duty, they were sold to the consumers on the basis of the increased duty, and, after the consumer had paid the full price, plus the increased duty, it was found that the Government had to put their hands into the Treasury to the amount of \$100,000 and make a present to