

enjoying to-day the privilege of free entry of our cattle into England.

My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) stated that Mr. Laurier had promised free trade as it is in England. Well, Rome was not built in a day, and at the first session of a Parliament it is an utter impossibility for any political party to carry out all the pledges they made with regard to reform. We have an enormous national debt, and of necessity we will have to raise a large revenue each year. For many years Canada will have to levy considerable amount of taxation in order to provide for the demands on the Dominion treasury. The present is the only course we can adopt now, but I do hope that from year to year the debt of the country, and the annual expenditure will be kept from increasing at least, so that the gross amount of taxation on the people will be considerably less than at present. Thus, the way will be open for further tariff reform. I believe that the present Government have made an honest effort to cut down expenditure. I believe that the Postmaster General, who has been subjected to unfair criticism with regard to his course, has made an honest effort to curb the growing expenditure in his department, and I believe he will persist in that direction. The hon. member (Mr. Davin) also told us that this new tariff had more marked evidences of protection than had the old tariff. Sir, it is rather amusing to notice that since the announcement of the tariff, we have any number of deputations waiting on the Government, and the corridors of the House are filled with men urging that if the tariff goes into force in its present shape it will be a serious thing for their institutions. That to me is a positive evidence that there is a reduction in taxation, and that the tariff is not protective as it has been in the past.

It is quite evident that the Government are travelling in the right direction; it is quite evident that some of those institutions have been struck. If they were not, they would not be here appealing to the Finance Minister for some concessions, and the fact that they are here urging the Government to grant them relief, is positive evidence that the changes in the tariff are in the direction of giving to the people of this country the commodities they use at considerably lower prices.

Mr. DAVIN. Did not similar deputations come to Mr. Foster?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, similar deputations did come to Mr. Foster; but the difference is that those that waited on Mr. Foster, as a rule, got everything they wanted, and were protected up to the hilt, while those that have waited on Mr. Fielding and presented arguments in that direction, have not. I am inclined to think, gone away as well satisfied as they were before. When hon. gentlemen opposite conducted a protective tariff, we know that they opened

their ears to the manufacturers, and were willing to carry out their suggestions. We on this side of the House have no ill-feeling towards, and no disposition to interfere seriously with, any manufacturing institution that can hope to live. We want them to live; but the unfortunate fact is that in the past they have not only lived, but have heaped up enormous fortunes under the advantages which were given to them by the previous Government.

The hon. member for Western Assinibolia said that when a government came into power they should carry out the promises they made in Opposition; that after appealing to the people, they should carry out the promises they made to them. Well, an honest effort is being made by the Government to do that. But a man who supported the late Government, as the hon. member for Western Assinibolia did, can hardly claim that they made an honest attempt to carry out their promises. We know that in 1891 they went to the country promising to seek for reciprocity with the United States; that was their cry; and after the election was over, they sent a sham deputation to Washington; but we know that they made no honest effort to carry out that pledge. We know that the people were virtually humbugged. Therefore, such an insinuation comes with very bad grace from any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House.

The ex-Minister of Finance stated that this tariff was exactly the tariff of the past—that there was no difference. Well, when we come to look over the different changes, we find that there is a very considerable difference. The farmers are to have free corn for feeding purposes; after a year they are to have free binder twine; after a year they are to have free barbed-wire fencing; they have certain reduction in coal oil and improved facilities for handling that commodity. All these show that there are considerable reductions in the tariff.

The hon. member for Western Assinibolia eulogizes the bounty system. So far as I am concerned, I have expressed the opinion in this House on previous occasions that if there is any industry in this country which it is thought desirable, from a Dominion standpoint, to encourage, it should be done by the bounty system. In that way you make all the inhabitants of the Dominion pay their proportionate share towards the development of the industry. Thus, the hon. member for Assinibolia, if he wears a silk hat and pays a duty upon it, will contribute a part of that duty towards helping to develop iron. But where you impose a tax on the users of iron, in order to shut out competition, and to develop the industry in that way, it is the users of iron alone who pay for the development, and those who do not use iron do not pay anything. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the bounty system is the proper system if we are going to contribute towards the development of any industry.

Mr. McMULLEN.