

They ask him to allow the tariff to stand for further consideration, believing that the hon. Minister may receive so much light that he will be enabled to allow the tariff to remain as it was before. Well, Sir, when the Minister proposed the changes in the tariff, these hon. gentlemen approved those changes. They sought to assure the House, and they sought to assure the country through the press, that these changes were very considerable, almost revolutionary, and they seemed surprised to find the Minister going so far in the direction of tariff reform. Now the hon. gentlemen say they do not want any tariff reform. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) says the tariff was better as it was before—

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a sentiment which the hon. gentleman sanctions. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. McKay) has given expression to the same view. That hon. gentleman asks us if we want the labouring men of Canada thrown out of employment as they are thrown out of employment in the United States. Why, Sir, bad as our tariff is, the tariff of the United States is far worse. That tariff which was to have made a very paradise of that country, the hon. gentleman now admits has produced—at all events it has not prevented—such a state of things that the majority of those engaged in industrial pursuits are at this hour out of employment. Does the hon. gentleman think that that system is going to produce any better effects in this country? What is there in the position of Canada that is to make the condition of the industrial labourer here any better than that of the industrial labourer of the United States? There is nothing whatever, Sir. But this is perfectly clear—that if the people of Canada want to retain the industrial classes in this country they must give them cheaper means of subsistence and better opportunities in the race of life. That the Minister of Finance was half disposed to give them. He took a few steps in that direction in proposing his new tariff, but he has been resiling from that position ever since and recalling everything he has ever done to relieve the masses of the people from taxation.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh! how exaggerated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says this is exaggerated. Why, Sir, I was shown on Saturday a bill of woollen goods the tax on which under the old tariff would have been 25 per cent, while under this tariff it is 42½ per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Produce the goods.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Woollen shawls are goods of the class I have mentioned. And I think, before this discussion is over I will be able to convince the hon. gentleman that he has increased the taxation on

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

a great number of articles beyond what it was under the old tariff. Of course those gentlemen who think that this country exists for the benefit of men who choose to invest their capital in speculative enterprises will approve of this. But the vast majority of the people of this country who have an idea that the masses have some rights that ought to be respected will come to a very different conclusion.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat makes the statement that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House cheered the Finance Minister when he made his Budget speech and brought down his tariff. We did so, and we will do so again. We cheered because of the fact that he made the statement that in the revision of the tariff the Government would not wipe out any industry in Canada that could be maintained by a reasonable duty. And if, by the changes made, an industry was to be seriously affected, it was no doubt his intention, after the tariff was laid on the Table, to have such points thoroughly investigated.

Mr. MULOCK. You did not think he was sincere.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, we did; and we think he is sincere to-day. I do not think it is the intention of the Finance Minister or the Government, or of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to cause any Canadian industry to suffer by the changes in the tariff. Such a thing would be contrary to the policy of the Government and to the policy of gentlemen on this side of the House supporting that Government. Now, I just make this statement: The gentleman in whose interest I am speaking is not a political supporter of mine, but he has some \$70,000 invested in a manufacturing industry in my town. He writes me to the following effect:—

Unless the duty is increased on the smaller size of bolts, there is nothing left for us to do but to quit making them, as we are now selling at a loss.

Now, I am confident the National Policy has brought about competition in this country in these articles. When it came into effect you could not buy one hundred bolts of this size made in Great Britain and the United States for 29½ cents. You can to-day buy them at that figure in half a dozen places. bolts made in Canada, the production of which employed Canadian labour. I consider the statement of the Finance Minister that if by this tariff we were going to wipe out a Canadian industry he would call a halt, is one which applies here. I think it must be plain to anybody on looking at the tariff that if 1½ cents and 30 per cent on the small size and 1 cent and 25 per cent on the larger was right before, then 1 cent and 20 per cent on the larger size and 1 cent and 25 per cent on the smaller size is not a due maintenance of the proportion