

the customs on spirits and wines \$2,140,000 specific duties, or, what the hon. gentlemen opposite say is worse still, specific and ad valorem combined. On tobacco imported we collected \$267,000; on sugar, \$1,250,000, all specific duties or specific and ad valorem combined. From excise I think we get \$7,950,000, making on these five items \$11,630,000 collected of these objectionable duties of which hon. gentlemen opposite complain. Not only that, but I have a long list here, which I shall not trouble the House with reading, of goods that are to-day, under the new tariff, subject to specific duties only or specific and ad valorem combined.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce a few days ago, in speaking of specific duties, said that under them the people could not tell what they were paying. Why, the only way in which you can tell what you pay is by charging specific duties. You charge 35 per cent on British goods, do you know the cost of these goods in England? Not at all, you have no means of knowing it. The only way, therefore, in which you can tell exactly what you are paying is by paying specific duties. If you abolish specific duties, then you will not know what you are paying. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce again said:

Let me say, speaking from experience, that it is a far harder thing to inflict a heavy protectionist tariff under ad valorem than under specific duties, and therefore it is a matter of some practical importance that we have succeeded in purging the present tariff to a large extent from specific duties, which had the pernicious effect to which I have alluded.

Nothing of the kind. In every case in which specific duties were abolished, as in the case of these woollen goods, they will have the effect of destroying a Canadian industry. What are the facts with reference to woollen goods? We imported last year \$2,674,000 worth of woollen goods under the old tariff which imposed a specific duty of 5 cents a pound and an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent, and the duty collected amounted to \$873,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that was too high a duty. It means 50, or 60 or 70 per cent on the goods. But what does it mean? It means exactly 32½ per cent, and the duty these hon. gentlemen have put on is 35 per cent. Then they say to us: Well, if we have increased the duty, why do you protectionists complain? I shall tell you why. Because all these goods worth over 60 cents a yard will pay an increased duty. On these, under the old tariff, the duty was 18 1-8, and under the new tariff it will be 21. That is, you are giving more protection to the finer classes of goods. To the coat of the rich man, you are giving nearly 3 per cent more protection than you did before.

Then you are giving protection to the finer class of goods, to the goods of the rich man nearly 3 cents more than was given before. On goods at 50 cents a yard, there will be

15½ cents protection, or nearly 2 cents more than under the old tariff, which gave a protection of 18 5-8 cents. But what about the class of goods bought by the poorer man, goods that are produced from Canadian wools? The result of this tariff is that our goods that are sold under 40 cents a yard, and weigh twelve ounces to the yard, the protection is less than before. On goods at 40 cents a yard the protection is about the same. Goods at 20 cents are given 25 per cent less protection than before. And what is the result? The result is that the manufacturer who imports all his raw material, the fine cape wools and merino wools, has a larger protection than before, while the manufacturer who uses wools produced by the Canadian farmers has a lower protection than before, and, as a result, we are told, will be wiped out of existence. We had already reduced the duty to such a point that we had gone a little too far. In my opinion, as regards these lower classes of Canadian cloths, tweeds, blankets and flannels. We touched the lowest point to which reduction could go, without wiping out the manufacturers. This reduction means the death of this industry. But hon. gentlemen opposite tell us: We will give the poor man cheaper goods. Not a bit of it. You may give him lower-priced shoddy goods from England in place of our own goods made from the pure Canadian wool. To prove what I say, I have a telegram here which says:

Cobourg woollen mills shut down early in the year and offered for sale yesterday.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They failed under the old tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that we had got the duty down to the lowest point at which the manufacturer could live. This proves that we did cut the duty down to such a point that it could not be further reduced without injury. The Government make a further reduction on these goods, and the result is that these mills were offered for sale yesterday and no bidders.

Now, with reference to the trade with Great Britain. I said that last year we imported of these woollen goods, \$2,674,000 worth, the duty upon which was \$873,000, or an average of 32 per cent. It is now made 35 per cent. But what I wish particularly to call the attention of the House to is, that of this \$2,674,000 worth imported, \$2,583,000 worth were imported from Great Britain—that is to say, 96 per cent of those woollens imported are produced in Britain. How much more can you expect to import from Great Britain under any preferential tariff? She may send in a larger proportion of our imports, but I do not believe she will. The effect of that tariff combined with the preferential arrangement will be to import a much larger proportion of our whole consumption. And what does that mean? It means that for every hundred