

this country puts the whole duty on. Therefore, taking \$3 instead of \$4 as the increased price on the Canadian iron, it amounts to \$667,056 which the manufacturers in Canada were able to place upon iron by reason of the \$4 charged as duty against imported iron. Then, Mr. Speaker, you know that the duty on iron or any other material becomes a part of the original cost to the importer, and he places the profit, whatever that profit may be, upon the duty as well as upon the original cost of the article. Therefore, the consumer not only pays the duty, but he pays the percentage placed upon that duty by the importer or the dealer, and that has been \$248,351 during the last five years. Therefore, we have paid in the form of bounty duty, and increased price by reason of the duty, and the profits on duty by importers, no less than \$2,322,676; and that was for the protection of the manufacturer of 222,352 tons. The cost to the country was \$10.16 for every ton of pig iron manufactured in this country. Now, I ask if that was not an extraordinary duty. I say the Government deserve credit, great credit, right in the very teeth of powerful organizations, for putting iron freer in the hands of the manufacturers and others who use it to so large an extent in many ways and thus benefit the consumers. Now there is another thing that I want to bring before you. What saving do we make on that calculation under the Liberal tariff? Taking the same number of tons as we imported in 1896, and making exactly the same calculation, we find that we have saved to the people of this country no less than \$54,000 a year, even paying the increased bounty which the Government has promised to pay. It has been a saving to the country of no less than \$54,000 on the basis of that calculation.

The Liberal party promised to reduce the duty on coal oil. It is said that some people ran their campaign on the coal oil can. I never did that, although in this House I took an active part during two sessions in urging on the Government to a reduction of the duty, and I repeatedly told my constituents that it was an imposition to ask them to pay 100 per cent on any products that could be manufactured here at reasonable cost; and I also stated it was a heavy burden, and that we demanded from the Conservative party a reduction of duty, and that if we came into power we would reduce the duty. I never advocated the placing of coal oil on the free list. I was accused the other day of having stated during my speech, I think in 1892, that I advocated free oil. I suppose few hon. members in this House remember the speech, and in order to refresh their memories I will read some quotations. The speech was delivered on 30th May, 1892. I said:

I am not opposed to the National Policy in respect to coal oil, but I am opposed to the excess—
Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

sive duty of over 100 per cent in favour of the coal-oil interest, because this enables them to control the whole industry of refining oil.

Further on I said:

Although I am favourable to extending to this industry a reasonable protection, it is wrong, I think, in the interest of the consuming population of this country, to extend to the refiners a protection of 100 or 125 per cent.

This was the case at that time. I further said:

If the Government should reduce the duty from 71-5th cents to, say, 5 cents a gallon, it would relieve the people of at least one-third of the burdens which they are now obliged to bear in this matter. I hope the Government will reconsider this question—not upon the basis of free trade, because I do not contend that coal oil should be put on the free list, for, so long as we have the National Policy in this country, it is only right, and just, and equitable that protection should be given to the oil producers, as well as to every other industry along the line of justice. I trust that the Government will try to see their way clear to reduce the duty upon coal oil to 5 cents a gallon.

I was accused here the other day of having preached free trade as regards that article. The Government and the Liberal party have fulfilled their promises to reduce the duty on coal oil to 5 cents, and I must say that I would not be sorry to see the reduction carried a little lower, and in my opinion it would be better in the interest of the consumer to have greater freedom in regard to the distribution of coal oil in tank cars. Oil in tank cars can only be distributed at 78 points in the Dominion, 39 in Ontario, 13 in Quebec, 10 in New Brunswick, 7 in Nova Scotia, 5 in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and 4 in British Columbia. I think the points at which coal oil should be distributed in tank cars should be increased, so as to give the people an opportunity to bring the oil in as cheaply as possible and thus save at least one cent per gallon.

The Liberal party also promised to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we have not fulfilled that promise. There were a few agricultural implements on which hon. gentlemen opposite made a deep cut in 1894, and it was made for a purpose—either 35 per cent was an extortionate rate, or the rate was reduced to meet the demands of the people on the eve of an election. They made such a deep cut on eight articles that now, under a revenue tariff, we find there is a reasonable duty to produce revenue from that particular source. But we constantly urged the Government at that time to reduce the duties on numerous other articles used by farmers throughout the country. Let me say that under this new Liberal tariff we have reduced the duties on twenty-four articles largely used by farmers. These articles are as follows: Axes, scythes, reaping hooks, hay or straw