

men employed in England to make these goods, a hundred Canadians will be walking the streets without employment. That will be the effect in my opinion, of the change from a combined specific and ad valorem duty to an ad valorem duty with a reduction of 12½ per cent on that class of goods. The manufacturer of the finer class of goods who imports the raw materials, will be benefited by this tariff, but the manufacturer of the Canadian wools or Canadian shoddy, if you like, will be wiped out of existence and the Canadian farmer and the Canadian artisan will both be injured. I think it just to call the attention of the House to another error, as I think it, made by the Government with respect to the duty on cheap yarns. They have reduced the duty to 15 per cent, while the manufacturer who uses this raw material is given 35 per cent. Now, there is a great fallacy in this regard. It is said: Here is a manufacturer who pays 20 per cent on his raw material, while there is a duty of 20 per cent on his manufactured article, and so he has no protection. But that does not follow: he may get a very substantial protection, because the material upon which he pays the duty may be only one-quarter of the value of his finished product. If his raw material costs \$100, and he pays a duty of 20 per cent, the amount he is charged for duty is \$20: but if he sells the manufactured product for \$400 and has a protection of 20 per cent, he has a gross protection of \$80, or a net protection of \$60, after paying the duty on his raw material. The carpet manufacturers of this country, as I am informed—in fact, I know—do not make the yarn themselves, but buy it from men whose only business it is to make it. We have a large number of yarn manufacturers in this country who supply not only the carpet manufacturers but the woollen manufacturers and the manufacturers of other products, who all now get protection to the amount of 35 per cent. With a reduction of duty on these yarns to 15 per cent these yarn manufacturers will be wiped out of existence. I do not see any reason why yarns of this cheap quality should not get as much protection—and we gave, and I think properly, a little more—as is given to the manufacturers of the finer yarns. If it is said that the finer yarns require more labour, I answer that the price is higher in proportion, and to be consistent you will have to give at least as large a percentage of protection on the low-priced goods as on the high-priced.

Now, there are other things, the duties upon which have been raised. For instance, the Government has increased duty on linen goods 25 per cent. Linen goods are not made in this country to the amount of a single dollar. The duty on guns, muskets, rifles, pistols, revolvers and firearms in general are increased 50 per cent—from 20 per cent to 30 per cent. I think I am right in saying—I speak subject to correction—that

Mr. WALLACE.

there is not a single factory of these articles in this country. What is the reason for this increase of duty? None that I know of. I would like the Ministers to state why they have increased the articles 50 per cent, when none are made in Canada, and probably will not be made in Canada. Then there are musical instruments not elsewhere specified which are imported to the amount of nearly \$100,000. The duty has been increased 20 per cent. I do not know why. We had a little higher duty on those instruments that were produced in this country, on organs and pianos, and by that means we had built up an enormous industry and gave employment to hundreds, yes, to thousands of skilled artisans; but we kept those instruments that were not made in this country, down to the lower rate of duty, 25 per cent. Now, without reason, not for the purpose of promoting any industry, the rate has been raised to 30 per cent. I do not believe that it will be for the benefit of the people of Canada, nor a benefit to Great Britain, because of the \$96,000 worth imported, less than \$5,000 are imported from Great Britain, \$34,000 from the United States, and \$50,000 from Germany. I believe Germany will have the advantage of this manufacture, because they have devoted themselves more to that kind of industry than they have done in Great Britain. So I say that the Government has made a mistake with reference to those articles. I am reminded at this moment, Mr. Speaker, of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), how he raised his voice last year, and every year in fact, about the diamond duty. Why, he said, the unset diamonds of the rich man are brought in free of duty, while the necessities of the poor man are taxed from 25 to 35 per cent. Now, he says he approves cordially of the present tariff, but diamonds are free just as they were before, and I suppose that the hon. member for North Wellington is quite satisfied, because he is going to invest in diamonds.

Mr. MILLS. Is there any duty on ice?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Put some on your head.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, Sir, the Government have thought fit to increase the duties upon liquors and cigars, and they say, perhaps many people say, that these are proper articles upon which to raise a revenue; there is not much sympathy for the consumers of these articles. A portion of the people, at any rate, are very glad to impose a tariff upon these articles. Well, Sir, while these gentlemen were revising the tariff, I think I could have pointed out a way in which they would have very much improved their finances. It may be said, and can be said, that when I was upon the other side of the House I did not advocate this; but even so, a general revision is taking place now, and those gen-