

lacious protection is supposed to give. If we produce \$20,000,000 of wealth and add that in one year to the wealth of Canada, every dollar of that \$20,000,000 is taxed exactly in the same way to those who are producing and carrying that produce to market. The man who produces the wheat the railway which carries it and everybody who deals with it is, to a certain extent, mulct of the percentage on the \$20,000,000. I should like to present another view to you, and that is the taxation that we put for protective purposes upon our iron. We put a duty of \$4 a ton upon iron for the purpose of developing the iron mines of the province of Nova Scotia. In that province the output has been decreasing. It was at one time 60,000 tons; it has now fallen to 49,000 tons. The value of that iron under free trade conditions is \$500,000—about ten or eleven dollars a ton. We are paying—everybody that uses iron in the country—and I may say that the farmers of Manitoba and the farmers of the country generally use more iron and have to pay more for iron than for anything else in their industrial occupation—to the blacksmith's shop, to the hardware store, to the agricultural machine men, and to various sources the farmers of Canada spend more money for iron in their industrial enterprise than for anything else. We produce \$20,000,000 of wealth in the province of Manitoba; that \$20,000,000 is taxed enormously through the iron that enters into the requirements of the production of that wealth and for what—to induce the production of half a million dollars worth of iron in the province of Nova Scotia. Is that justice—is it common sense? That is the effect that it produces—and it is for hon. gentlemen who disagree with my views to argue the contrary and not to generalize and go off on a tangent in some other direction—that is the effect of giving a spurious development, you may say, to our iron mines in Nova Scotia at the extreme end of the Dominion—the wealth that is produced by the province of Manitoba, 2,500 miles away from it, is taxed to that enormous extent to maintain this iron industry in Nova Scotia and the energies of the province of Nova Scotia are cramped by the same protection. Their iron mines and coal mines under the stimulus of free trade will be developed to an extent undreamed of, while they are now struggling under a false commercial system at

the expense of their fellow countrymen. Now, hon. gentlemen, the point has been raised with regard to the attitude of the present leader of the Senate towards protection in reference to the assistance he gave to the smelting industry. The leader of the government in this House, while head of the Ontario government gave assistance to this work in the shape of a bonus. That is quite a different thing. I do not complain for one moment of the \$2 a ton bonus that is given in Nova Scotia. Make it 3 or 4 if necessary to build up. I do not complain of the \$1 a ton given in Ontario, because the whole country pays it. It does not tax a special industry. It does not injure anybody, it is taken out of the general revenues of the country. But here is a condition entirely different, half a million dollars' worth of iron is produced in Nova Scotia, but because there is a tax of \$4 a ton put upon all iron that enters into consumption in the country, no matter where it comes from,—and all the industries in the country that depend upon iron for their prosecution are taxed to an enormous extent. As I said before, it was 32 per cent that we paid upon the duties that came from Great Britain. We pay about the same for things that may come in from the United States. A large proportion of that is iron, and consequently the tax upon all iron that is used in our machinery and our blacksmith shops and our hardware stores and every walk of industrial life is taxed to that extent and simply and solely for that purpose in which the revenue shares to a very slight extent. I do not think that that statement can be controverted. Now that has been the position during the past four or five years. Abolition of protection has been the watchword of the present government and I desire, while the present government are reformulating their policy with regard to the carrying out of the promises and pledges they made to the country, that I should present the protective view in these prominent forms. It becomes my duty as a consistent free trader to assist the government in carrying out its policy of obliterating protection from the statutes of Canada and replacing it with the enlightened policy of free trade. There is no question as to the advantage that there is to a country that prosecutes its industries under the principles of free trade. Free trade means the expansion of trade; protection means the restric-