

climate of Canada, about which we had so much discussion this afternoon. They have to be protected still longer, at the risk of losing them altogether, and, Sir, though I am a free trader on principle, and if we cannot get free trade, a revenue man on principle, I still have to admit the force of the contention that these poor little industries, which have been protected nearly to death by hon. gentlemen opposite, are not fit to go out in their nakedness and stand the Canadian climate without some shreds of protection being left on them.

Yet when I come to criticise the tariff on my own account, as I propose to do, though in a very friendly spirit, I shall have to contend that the Government of the day perhaps had a little too much consideration for these tender pets when they were framing their tariff. Looking at the maximum tariff, or general schedule, we find that a great many taxes are retained which are strictly protective and highly protective in their nature. I confess that I had hoped that the Government would have found it possible to make reductions in many directions in which they have not made them. If they have erred in this respect, however, I am satisfied that it has been from tenderness of heart towards the weanlings which have not yet been weaned, and from the fear that, if these were subjected to such treatment as the members of the Government individually would think wholesome and good for them, the poor children might possibly be lost in the experiment. So, although I think the Government might fairly have made a further reduction all round in that maximum tariff, I am inclined to give them credit for the best intentions and am by no means inclined to withdraw my confidence from them, even if we were to consider the maximum tariff by itself.

But the maximum schedule is not the whole of this tariff proposal, it is not, to my mind, the main portion of it. Even with the imperfect reductions which the Government have seen their way to make, it must be admitted that the new tariff gives us very considerable relief in many directions. The reduction of the duty on iron, will, undoubtedly, give most considerable relief to those who use iron, and that means, practically, the whole community. The reduction of the duty on coal oil, with regard to which a good deal has been said already, certainly gives a measure of relief—17½ per cent seems to be a very considerable measure of relief. Our friends of the coal oil industry tell us also that the regulations that have been removed effect a further reduction of 2 cents in the duty. So that, looking at it from a coal oil refiner's standpoint—and they ought to know the facts of the case—we have had, virtually, a reduction of one-half of the tax on coal oil. That, it must be admitted, is a very considerable and material relief to the users of this article.

Mr. DAVIN. How does my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) make that out? I would like to have him explain.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend must excuse me, because I do not undertake to make it out at all. I have told the House that there is a reduction of 1 cent on the duty, and the manufacturers of coal oil say that the relaxation of the regulations about importation in tanks will compel a reduction as great as would have been effected by further reduction of 2 cents on the duty. This makes a total of 3 cents, or one half the duty, if the contention of the coal oil refiners is correct.

Referring to the iron schedule, I cannot pass over the question of bounty without a word. I am very glad to see that the Government have adopted the bounty system rather than a high protective duty as a means of encouraging our iron industries. That these should be encouraged in some way, I think even the strongest free trader must admit. We have vast deposits of iron ore, but it is a peculiarity of iron mining that these deposits can be developed in a paying manner only on a very large scale, and iron can only be produced cheaply on a very large scale. It is evident, therefore, that the people who have the necessary capital to go into the exploiting of mines and smelting of ore cannot be induced to undertake the work on that scale without assistance, and it is necessary that the public should do something for them. If the development of natural resources is to be promoted at all, I think it is much safer and much fairer and better in every way to do it by a bounty than a high protective tax. I am therefore pleased to find that the Government have found the way to encourage the production without taxing all the consumers of iron to the extent that was done under the former tariff. It is not fair that the consumers of any particular article should bear the whole cost of encouraging its production. The development of our iron mines is for the good of the country at large, and the people at large should contribute for it, and not only those who use specially large quantities of iron.

But, coming to the reciprocal tariff, or differential schedule, or whatever it may be called, I confess that I find in this the gist of the fiscal policy of the Government. I think that the introduction of this policy is nothing less than a stroke of genius on the part of those who framed this tariff, or on the part of those who originally evolved the idea that these gentlemen have had the courage to put into practice. For the policy is not a new one in principle, though it is new in the method of application. The policy of providing that goods coming from Great Britain should be especially favoured was adopted as the Liberal policy as long as five years ago. It was voted for by every Liberal in the House, in support of a motion moved by my hon. friend who is now the