

six months with respect to the imports from these two countries shows this: that the falling off in the value of imports from Great Britain in free and dutiable goods amounts to 7 per cent., while the decrease from the United States was 33 per cent. Then it was asserted that the Tariff would act unfairly on the English manufacturers, and subject them to a large proportion of the increased percentage. By referring to the tables it will be found that the increased rate of duty upon free and dutiable goods, imported from Great Britain during the six months of the present year, was 19.43 per cent., against 19.9 under the old Tariff of 1878; and that the percentage from the United States, omitting as is proper, from the consideration of this question, the foreign goods that were imported but were also exported, but were entered last year for consumption, because there were no duties imposed on them, the percentage of increase has risen from 12 per cent. in 1878 to 15.3 per cent. this year. In the one case there is but an increase of  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., while in the other there is an increase of 3 per cent. on the average duty collected on those goods. I know hon. gentlemen will very naturally ask how it can be possible that with the increased duties imposed upon British goods the rate of duty has only been increased  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., but we must take into account the fact that the sugar that was imported last year was double that imported this year, and paid forty-two per cent. What I say with respect to English imports has double effect when applied to the United States, because we imported from them under the same rate of duty double the amount of sugar we imported from Great Britain, and if we had imported the same quantity in this year it would have given the increase in the same ratio, and have made the difference 4 per cent. instead of 3. These facts go to show that, while the object, design, and intention of the Government was not to legislate directly against any particular country, but in favour of Canadian interests, the effect of the Tariff has been to diminish less the importations from Great Britain than from the United States. The next objection to the Tariff was that it would increase the cost of goods and give us no revenue. The hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), speaking on this point,

said that, if the policy of the Government succeeded, if an additional impetus were given to the industries of the country, the Tariff would not produce the revenue that was proposed, and he was good enough to venture the statement on that occasion that the effect of the Tariff would be to increase the cost of goods to the consumers by six or seven or eight million dollars. You see, Mr. Speaker, that he left something of a margin, but what the effect has been is quite clear. The returns show that the increase of the Tariff upon imports has been  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. more than it was before. We had a revenue of twelve millions from imports, and if you add one quarter additional to that you do not get six, seven or eight millions, scarcely the half of it. But the statement was made that the Tariff would enrich the manufacturers and impoverish the masses. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman opposite said, in order that he might be safe in his predictions, whatever might be the circumstances, that by-and-bye the manufacturers themselves would be impoverished, and that the whole country would be in a worse position than ever before. An hon. gentleman opposite, anticipating the discussion of this question, said the other day, and I think it was the leader of the Opposition, that half the manufacturers of Canada are dissatisfied with the Tariff.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Well, I have not seen half the manufacturers of Canada, but I have seen a great many of them. Knowing what would be said on the floor of the House, judging from what has been said in the past, I felt it my duty to ascertain from personal observations, as far as our manufacturing industries were concerned, what the effect of the Tariff had really been; and in my intercourse with the manufacturers, I will not say that there were no objections made to the operations of the Tariff. Were I to say so, I would be stating what is not true; but what I do assert is that, on the whole, the manufacturers express themselves satisfied with the Tariff, and if I had not found some objections to some of its provisions, I would have concluded that it had been framed too much in their interests, so that the very fact