

transport that cotton from New Orleans to the United Kingdom at double rates of freight, and we will not touch the duties from the United Kingdom either on raw material or on manufactured articles. My hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) told us the British preference was not decreased, and that the British manufacturer has now a greater preference in our markets against the foreign manufacturer. I do not deny that. But would it not have been a magnanimous thing for Canada to have "let well enough alone," to use an expression at one time very popular with hon. gentlemen opposite, especially when we help ourselves by helping the trade relations between the Motherland and this great daughter Dominion? So I think it was unwise—I do not say it was unpatriotic, because I do not believe there is an unpatriotic man in the House—to touch these duties under present circumstances.

I have shown that this duty on raw materials would represent only  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on the manufactured article. And what protection—if I may use the word which hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to make their own, but which they have urged very strongly upon us—what protection has the Canadian manufacturer of cotton or woollen textiles as against this  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent represented by the duty on raw material? I have a little table here which I will not take time to read, but the general result of which I will give. On woollen goods that come into this country from the United Kingdom there is an average duty of 25 per cent. And do you mean to tell me that the Canadian manufacturer cannot afford to pay  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent when he has a protection on the manufactured article of 25 per cent? It seems to me the minister might very well have gone that far. I think that is a good reason why I can support the amendment presented by my right hon. leader. That amendment states that the Government's fiscal measure is particularly objectionable because it places extra barriers against British trade. Another reason—and I have dealt with that also—is that while this means increased taxation especially on goods from the United Kingdom, it will yield little or no revenue. Certain commodities do yield a very little revenue, but as to others, I think the amendment sets out the facts as they are.

The Minister of Finance asked us three questions yesterday, or he put the matter before us in three phases. He practically asked us to answer these questions: first, shall we cease to send troops? Well, so far

as I am concerned, I say send more troops if needed. Second: he puts it up to us to suggest an alternative method. Can I suggest an alternative method? Yes, my suggestion is that the British preferential tariff be not disturbed.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell the House where the preference would be if we had free trade?

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not know what the hon. gentleman means; I think he should be a little more explicit. Free trade—does my hon. friend mean with the whole world?

Mr. BURNHAM: Just as you like.

Mr. LOGGIE: Very well; I will take it just as I like. My suggestion is that the present rate of duties on goods from the United Kingdom be not disturbed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer the question.

Mr. LOGGIE: The question arises: can we get the money in any other way, and how much do we require? In 1914 we imported from the United Kingdom non-dutiable goods to the value of \$28,000,000, in round figures. As there are several commodities to which the increased rate does not apply, I put it down at \$25,000,000, which, at 5 per cent, would yield us \$1,250,000. In the same year we imported from the United Kingdom dutiable goods to the value of \$100,000,000, in round figures, which, at 5 per cent, would yield us \$5,000,000. So if my suggestion is of any value, we would require \$6,250,000 to take the place of the revenue to be derived from the proposed increase in the British preference. I have on previous occasions pointed out to the House that pork, which is the chief food of the lumbermen and fishermen, is already over-burdened with taxes. It was my privilege and my duty to tell the Government led by my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition, that the duty on pork under the late Administration was burdensome. What is the result of increasing the duty upon pork by  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent? When hon. gentlemen do this, they add \$1.50 to the price of each barrel of pork. In other words, the duty on a barrel of pork is now \$5.50, and the fishermen pay three cents per pound into the treasury of the Dominion of Canada for every pound of pork they eat. Instead of doing that I would make the fishermen pay more on his tobacco. If he is