

I am arguing for. In a speech that he made in Toronto during the public meeting of the Conservative Association he used the words protection to the people as the result of the remission of taxes—that is to say, he claimed that he had remitted certain taxes and by that explained he had protected the people or industry that were receiving the benefit of that remission.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—No.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—No, I will read your words, sir, uttered in Toronto. “Next we come to the article of tin which is used in the manufacture of almost every article used in the household and by the repeal of that duty gave an additional protection to the fish and fruit canning industry.” Now, that is what I call free trade. He remitted the taxes on tin in order to benefit those interested in the fish and fruit canning industry.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—The hon. gentleman has it quite correct in the quotation which he has made, but he must be reminded that in Canada we could afford to take the duty off raw material thereby giving additional protection to the canners.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—That I thoroughly understand. That is the protective argument, but if the remission of the duty on tin is going to be a protection to the people who carry on the business of canning, why is not the remission of the duty on binding twine going to be a protection to farmers, or the remission of the duty on anything at all going to be a protection to the people of Canada at large?

Hon. Mr. GLASIER—Why do you take binding twine in particular?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Binding twine is a very serious impost on the people of Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. GLASIER—Why does the hon. gentleman select the province of New Brunswick as an illustration for his argument? How are you going to raise the revenue?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I will reply to the question of revenue in its proper place. I did not mean to give any offence by select-

ing the province of New Brunswick. I was correcting the figures that were brought forward by the hon. gentleman in the House of Commons from New Brunswick to whom I have already alluded, and I wish to point out to this House the necessity to the people of New Brunswick, the necessity for a change in the commercial policy of the country—that if they adopt a different commercial policy, in conjunction with the rest of the country, there will be a very different showing in ten years from now in the statistics referring to their province. It is in the interests of New Brunswick and in the interests of Canada generally that I am speaking, and not in the interests of any one province or any one section of the country. I wish to point out that the hon. the leader of this House himself has taken the broad ground that by the remission of the duty on tin he was thereby protecting the fishing and canning industry. And how have we protected the fishing industry? By taking off the duty on rope and the duty on twine used for nets, that is how we are protecting the fishing industry. If it is wise in the interests of the fishermen to take the duty off rope and off twine, then why is it not in the interest of every industry of the country engaged in the preparation of raw material for export abroad, that all the duties should be remitted, and reimpose the taxation on the country in a manner which would not press upon the labour and industry of the country. That is the broad position I take.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOW—Direct taxation.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Not one single penny of direct taxation is necessary, and if hon. gentlemen are anxious to hear a little more about the revenue, I am quite prepared to introduce that branch of the subject at this particular moment, I would refer to the duty on coal oil. Well, sir, we consume in Canada 15,000,000 gallons of coal oil yearly, and we pay a duty on the imported coal oil which amounts to about 5,000,000, or about eight or nine cents a gallon, but in consequence of the imposition of that duty, it costs the people so much more to purchase the coal oil produced in the country, and I say, hon. gentlemen, that it can be shown fairly that the cost to the people of Canada upon the purchase of 15,000,000 gallons of coal oil is about \$1,400,000 more than if the markets were