

men opposite to decide that sugar shall be free, in order that people may get it at a cheaper rate? I do not know that it requires three months for that. I can understand him, if he refers to the duty on pig iron, asking himself how will this affect the bar iron industry, the rolling mills, the manufacture of car wheels, and other iron industries; but if he begins on the basis of pig iron and makes that free, then let him make all the rest free and he will have a simple tariff. The hon. gentleman from Halifax wants the tariff simplified. I may quote a precedent for simplifying the tariff. When Sir Richard Cartwright was Finance Minister in Mr. Mackenzie's administration, he took no particular pains to readjust the tariff; he just took the tariff of Sir Francis Hincks as it was, and added 2½ per cent to everything on the list, and had it passed by the Parliament of Canada.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The previous one was a simple and reasonable one. That cannot be said of the present tariff.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It was not an exclusively revenue tariff at that time, because if the hon. gentleman will study the history of the question he will find that Sir Alexander Galt had imposed a duty on woollens, and particularly blankets, upon the protective principle. Under that protective tariff the blankets and woollen manufactures of this country were established and are in existence to-day. The result of it was that a very few years afterwards the coarser qualities of blankets and woollens used by the lumbermen and the people of this country were as cheap, or cheaper than they could be bought in England.

Hon. Mr. MacINNIS (Burlington)—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—My hon. friend from Burlington has had experience, and he knows that my statement is correct. When I am told that the tariff of Sir Francis Hincks was a simple one, I say it was, but I am speaking of the genius which the Finance Minister in Mr. Mackenzie's administration displayed, and the happy manner in which he solved the tariff problem at that time. The country will be interested in seeing the proposition

that is to come before the House. Is it necessary that the present government should have three months to consider whether the iniquitous three cents a pound on the products of the hog should be removed? We are told that it is in the interest of the consumer that that tax should be removed, but what would be the result on agricultural industries? How will it affect the coarser grains? Will it not be an injury to that class for whom the opposition has expressed so much solicitude during the last twenty years. For twenty years they have been denouncing this protective tariff as iniquitous and a robbery. Do they want six months more to ascertain how to remove it? I say, adopt the English system at once if you are honest; put the duty on articles that we do not produce in this country, and make the unfortunate farmers, for whom you have been weeping and almost going into mourning, pay more for their sugars and teas, and keep out the raw material altogether, because you cannot adopt a revenue tariff and raise the necessary funds for carrying on the affairs of the country unless you tax every article which is now free under the present tariff. Give us a stamp duty and give us duties upon articles that are now free, and you will accomplish the objects you have in view, but whether that will be acceptable to the country, or whether it will be a relief from taxation for the very class for whom you have been so solicitous for years past, is a question I leave hon. gentlemen opposite to solve. My hon. friend from Halifax called attention to the announcement made by the late Finance Minister in the House in 1893 that the tariff would be considered with a view to reduction before the next meeting of parliament. That is true, and that is one of the errors which we, as a government, made. It did interfere with the trade of the country; but with the present opinion prevailing in this country as to what the hon. gentleman who now controls its destinies will do, there will be a stagnation in business which will prevent the investment of money in many industries. Everything will be cut down, you may depend upon it. I am speaking from experience, and I acknowledge frankly the error which we made in 1893; but when that announcement was made by the Conservative Finance Minister, it was on this basis, that whatever reduction should take place, the