

will say that he has erred. In 1897, in this House ("Hansard," p. 1244) Sir Richard Cartwright said :

Under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, England and the importation of England's goods was discriminated against to an extraordinary degree. In 1896 we exported to England, apparently, \$66,000,000 worth of our products ; to the United States, \$44,000,000 worth. We bought from England, \$32,000,000 ; and from the United States, \$58,000,000. There, if you will, is a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent against England and in favour of the United States, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now comes an afterthought ; it struck him and he gave it vent :

I have always said that the National Policy was a Yankee device imitated from the Yankees, and in fact a benefit to them chiefly, and there is the proof of it.

Well, Sir, if the tariff of his opponents, the National Policy tariff, discriminated, as he called it, and discriminated to that extent against England in favour of the United States, what is the result of last year's Liberal tariff ? It is astounding. It is that in 1896 we exported \$66,000,000 worth of products to Great Britain and \$44,000,000 to the United States ; and in 1897, we exported to Great Britain \$77,000,000 and to the United States \$49,000,000, being an increase in exports to Great Britain of \$11,000,000, and an increase of exports to the United States of \$5,000,000. But when we come to the discriminatory part, it stands in this way : That whereas in 1896, we took from Great Britain \$32,000,000—and so discriminated against Great Britain enormously according to the Minister of Trade and Commerce—yet in 1897 we took only \$29,000,000. And, whereas we took from the United States \$58,000,000 in 1896, under this preferential tariff which was to remedy this gross discrimination against Great Britain, we actually took \$61,000,000 of their imports.

Now, Sir, the logic in the case is irrefutable. If there were an enormous discrimination against Great Britain under the former tariff measure, to the extent of these imports relatively, it is still greater and still more enormous under the new tariff, because under it the imports are less from Great Britain and the imports are greater from the United States of America. But, Sir, it was stated that this new tariff would reduce the taxation ; that is, would reduce the rate of duty. Has it done so ? Taking the three months' report of my hon. friend, the report from July to September of 1896, I find that the total imports were \$17,690,000, the duty paid \$5,210,000, and the percentage of duty 29·56 per cent. That, be it remembered, was in 1896, under the old tariff. During the three months under the new tariff the imports were \$17,764,000, the duty was \$5,127,000, and the percentage rate of duty was 28·86 per cent. That is,

Mr. FOSTER.

under this new tariff—without protection, and when all its robbery and attendant piratical influences and effects were swept away, and the new and rejuvenated tariff of the hon. gentlemen was brought in—the total reduction in the percentage of duty in the three months compared with the three months in the preceding year (in which first three months the preferential tariff was in vogue) the total reduction of duty amounts to the enormous sum—and now the burdened taxpayers will surely breathe freely—the reduction in the rate of duty amounts to the enormous sum of 70-100ths of one per cent. If ever that old Latin quotation : "the mountain laboured and brought forth a ridiculous mouse," ought to be resuscitated for use, this is the proper time to call it to the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright). But, Sir, the hon. gentleman went still further. The First Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Finance, and every one of the Ministers, and all of those who echoed their words have declared, that the tariff has been revised from the old protectionist basis, and that now we have practically a revenue tariff.

The right hon. the leader of the House said on Friday last that he had fulfilled his pledge : that there should not be a duty for protective purposes, but simply for revenue purposes. I take the goods which were imported and which I referred to in the illustration when I was comparing the imports from Great Britain, and figuring out the percentage of duty under this tariff, what is the result ? Clothing is now 31 per cent. Does my hon. friend mean to tell me that 31 per cent is only a revenue duty, and that there is no protection in it ? Dress goods, 32½ per cent—is that a revenue duty, with no protection in it ? Knitted goods 32 per cent ; hats and caps, 30 per cent ; cottons, bleached, dyed and coloured, 31 per cent ; coal, 23 per cent—is that a revenue duty, may I ask the Minister of Finance ? Rice, 59 per cent—is that a revenue duty, I may ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce ? I remember his impassioned deliverances of many years ago against that rice duty ; and here we have—I am not sure that it is not concealed under the mechanism of a double duty—a duty of 59 per cent on the people's rice. Manufactured cotton goods, 27½ per cent—is that a revenue duty ? Cutlery and hardware, tools and implements, 27½ per cent. Pickles and sauces, 32 per cent ; provisions, lard, meats, &c., fresh, 32½ per cent ; and coal oil—I forbear to wound the susceptibilities of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) by stating just what the amount of that duty is ; but I beg leave to call his attention to these words :

It was a specific duty of seven and one-fifth cents per gallon at that time, and Mr. Davies