

by the legislation now before us we are giving preferential trade to Belgium and Germany without receiving any corresponding advantage whatever in return.

But, Sir, when you examine more closely what these proposed preferential arrangements with Great Britain are, I think you will find that they are not so great as has been supposed. I imagine that the British Government and the British people are being imposed upon these few days, because, while they have been told that we are going to decrease the duty on British goods one-eighth this year and another eighth next year, they have not been told that before we reduce those duties, we did what they say is done in those "fake" stores. These stores, in advertising bargains, first raise the price, say from 16 cents to 25 cents, and then advertise them as bargains at 20 cents. That is pretty much what this Government has done? In the case of linen goods, what have they done? On the greater portion of the linen imports they have put on an additional duty of 25 per cent, and they then announce that they are going to reduce the duties on these goods from Great Britain 12½ per cent. Last year, of linens, brown or bleached, we imported \$71,000 worth; of linen duck, canvas, huckaback or other manufactures of flax, \$492,000 worth; of linen thread, \$119,000 worth; and of other manufactures of flax, hemp or jute, or these combined, \$180,000 worth; making a total importation of these goods of \$863,000 worth. But on all these goods the Government, before decreasing the duty 12½ per cent to Great Britain, added 25 per cent to the old duty. Of another large class of linen goods, damask of linen, including napkins, tray cloths, stair linen and diaper, we imported \$270,000 worth; of linen handkerchiefs, \$110,000 worth; and of towels, \$122,000 worth; making a total importation of these articles of \$1,366,000 worth. On all these goods the Government have increased the duty from 16⅔ to 25 per cent, mostly 25, before reducing it 12½ per cent to Great Britain. They may say: If we have increased the duty on these articles, why do you protectionists complain? I complain because of all these goods there is not a dollar's worth made in Canada to-day, and there will not be for the next seven years. Great Britain has the complete control of that trade, so far as Canada is concerned. The duty on these goods was placed at 20 per cent by the late Government, because, as they are not made in Canada, the duty affords no protection to Canadian manufacturers, and therefore the articles should be brought in at the lowest possible rate.

They talk about giving this preference to Great Britain. Why, Great Britain has the preference in these articles to-day. Our importations of linen goods amount to about \$1,366,000. How much do you think of these goods come from Great Britain? \$1-

Mr. WALLACE.

292,000, or a little over 95 per cent, showing that the preferential trade given to Great Britain can not help her at all, since she has the whole trade practically to-day. Now, with reference to cottons, the same remark applies. Of cottons, printed, divers colours, we imported last year to the extent of about \$2,560,000. Of this amount we imported, in round numbers, to the extent of two million dollars from Great Britain, so that all other countries supply less than 20 per cent of our importations of these goods. We cannot therefore expect, by giving preferential trade to Great Britain, to increase her trade in that commodity, because there will be always special lines of which the American manufacturers and others have the control and which we will continue to import from them. What more has been done in this matter of preferential trade? Before these hon. gentlemen took off the 12½ per cent, they took the precaution to add 16⅔ per cent to the duty on these articles. I venture to say that had they said to Great Britain: We have given you a preference over all other countries, but before we took off the 12½ per cent we added 17, the case would have presented a different aspect. With regard to other cotton goods, we imported \$4,230,000. Of this, \$3,130,000 worth came from Great Britain, or more than 75 per cent, and, as I have said, there will be special lines in the manufacture of which some countries are sure to excel and of which Great Britain, even with preferential trade cannot expect to send us a larger proportion in the future than she has done in the past. Then we come to the question of woollen goods, on which these hon. gentlemen have changed the duties from specific to ad valorem. And, Mr. Speaker, one after another, these gentlemen on the other side who got up to sing the praises of the new tariff made it one of their strongest points that they had abolished these specific duties very largely, and, as the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said yesterday, they will not rest until the last vestige of these specific duties is abolished. You would think that specific duties were something indefensible, something very improper, and yet I may say that in every case where they abolished it, these hon. gentlemen have destroyed a Canadian industry. Such, no doubt, was their object in abolishing specific duties. But to-day, what have they on their tariff? Why, the most of the duties they collect in Canada to-day, under their new tariff, are specific duties. I have here a long list of the articles on which specific duties are charged. Most of the products of the Canadian farmer are protected by a specific duty. If these duties were wrong, why did not hon. gentlemen opposite change them? They dared not do it. I have a list of five articles on which were paid \$11,750,000 duty, and the duties on which in every case are specific or specific and ad valorem combined. We get from