

cabinet that it was a preferential arrangement to specially benefit the mother country, but as its operations became known to the mercantile community of England, they began to change their mind and asked themselves this question: If this be the case, how is it, that our exportations to Canada are falling off while those from the United States to Canada are increasing? If you look at the tariff you can understand why that has been the result. While the hon. gentlemen opposite have professed free trade principles—that is before the election—and while they re-echoed them in England, their tariff is not a free trade tariff, nor is it what is known as a revenue tariff; and I am quite satisfied that my hon. friend who sits opposite me (Mr. Mills) will not attempt to prove or even to state that it is one or the other. All you have to do is to look at the rates of duty to convince you that it is not a free trade tariff. Let me give you a few figures in order to sustain this portion of my argument. If you refer to the tariff you will find that the old rate of duty on pig iron was \$4, under the present tariff it is \$2.50, but bear in mind, that they adopted a principle which they had, when in opposition, in the strongest possible language condemned as vicious, that of increasing the bounties, so that a greater protection was given to the manufacturer of iron than they had enjoyed under the old regime, while the reduction of the duty was a loss to the revenue. No doubt my hon. friends opposite will argue that that was for the benefit of the consumer. The following are the old rates compared with those in the new list:—

	Former Duty.	Present Duty.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Pig iron per ton	4 00	2 50
Coal, per ton	0 60	0 53
Corn, per bush	0 7½	Free.
Bar iron, per ton	10 00	7 00
Wheat, per bush	0 15	0 12½
Flour, per bbl.	0 75	0 60
Corn meal.	0 40	0 25

I have selected those items to show that wherever the duties affected the trade from the United States, they have been lowered, and the consequence is that larger importations have taken place from the United States during the last nine months than at

any previous period. So far, therefore, as preference in the new tariff is concerned, it was in favour of the United States rather than of Great Britain. Now, let us look at the importations from the mother country and see how far the hon. gentlemen opposite have carried out the principle of free trade. Here are the duties imposed upon a number of articles which are principally imported from Great Britain with the 12½ per cent deducted:—

	Former Duty.	Present Duty.
	p. c.	p. c.
Carpets	30	30½
Shawls	25	26½
Linen	30	30½
Doilies	30	30½
Dress goods	22½	21½
Sewing thread	12½	13½
Cotton fabrics	30	30½
Laces	30	30½
Braids	30	30½
Musical instruments	25	26½
Cutlery	25	26½

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Is the hon. gentleman giving our rate of duty on English goods or on goods generally?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am speaking of the tariff as it exists, with the 12½ off, and that applies to the world, but what I want to point is that the duties have been decreased on importations from the United States while on those from Great Britain the duties have been actually increased. Is it any wonder that the manufacturers of this country say that the present tariff is as good for them as the old one in many respects? Is it any wonder that the late election in Centre Toronto was carried more on a personal issue than on party lines by the election of one of the strongest protectionists in that city—by the election of a gentleman who boasted that he had supervised every single item in the tariff, and more particularly the iron duties, and the manufactures of machinery in which he is himself engaged.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—There is the 12½ per cent reduction.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am aware of that. There will be a 12½ per cent reduction on goods until the first of July.