

strongly in favour of repealing the preferential tariff altogether, or of making it as he says, more equitable, and I include with him in this position on this question the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). These hon. gentlemen say that because of a preferential tariff, as it at present exists, and because of the reduction of 33½ per cent on textile fabrics and woollen goods the woollen mills of the country are to be closed up. The hon. member for East York said that for a preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain he was willing to increase the preference to 50 per cent. If the woollen mills cannot stand the present competition, what would become of them if it were increased to 50 per cent? And I dare say the hon. gentleman would even be willing to add, say 10 or 15 per cent more, in order to strike a bargain? If the woollen mills are going to be closed up because of the present preference, I suppose they would flourish if it were to be increased to 50 or 60 per cent? This is the kind of argument that hon. gentlemen opposite address to the House. I was nearly forgetting the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He appeared to have made a discovery in the remarks that he addressed to the House. He said that the government were taking credit to themselves, because, as a result of giving the preferential tariff to Great Britain, exporters of goods to this country, similar to those manufactured in Great Britain, were obliged to bring the price down to the amount of the preference and he entirely controverted that position. He said that it would never operate in that way at all. Am I right in making that statement?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman asks if he is right in making the statement that I entirely controverted it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). Then, I am stating the case correctly as far as he is concerned. A little later on he said that if we had a preference with England and England would put a duty on corn, meat and other products coming from Canada it would not increase the price of these articles because all other countries exporting similar articles to Britain would have to come down in the price equal to the preference to Canada. It would appear, therefore, that the laws of trade and commerce would work one way in Canada, and in directly an opposite way in Great Britain.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. It has been pointed out that we send a mere fraction, and must always send a mere fraction of the bread-stuffs to England, and therefore the greater must bear the burden instead of the smaller. That is the distinction.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is very strong in fractions.

He has figured it out to his own satisfaction that the preference to Great Britain only amounts to thirty-five one hundredths of one per cent, but he and his friends say in the same breath that the Prime Minister went to England and gave away valuable concessions and got absolutely nothing in return. I leave it to gentlemen opposite to settle these inconsistencies and contradictions among themselves. I again come back to the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that the preference the present government gives Great Britain does not reduce the price of similar articles coming into this country from other countries, while on the other hand he tells us that if Great Britain put a duty upon corn and wool and meat and other products going into her markets and gave Canada a preference, then every other country sending similar articles into Great Britain would have to come down to the extent of the preference.

Mr. CLANCY. That was not it.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). Oh, yes, that was it.

Mr. CLANCY. I endeavoured to point out that the class of goods imported from other countries to this country were of a different kind, although they may be classified the same, and therefore could not come into competition; and that other countries had separate fields from Great Britain. There are two distinct fields, as the hon. gentleman knows, and therefore they cannot come into competition.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). The remarks of the hon. gentleman are on record and any person can read them. He may wish to make an explanation now, but we all know what he said the other evening. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have asked what the present administration have done.

Mr. CLANCY. I never asked that.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that this government since it came into power have made very great improvements and developments in the Post Office Department; they have re-organized and rejuvenated the militia of this country; they have extended the Inter-colonial Railway into Montreal, and, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said the other day, they have turned a dead railway into a live one; they have provided cold storage and transportation facilities so that the immense exports of products from this country have become possible; they have provided such facilities that the fruit and other perishable products of Canada at the Paris exposition were able to carry off the lion's share of the prizes in competition with the whole world. This government have done a great many other things since they have been in power, and I believe they have fully satisfied the