

helped to some extent the interests of the Dominion, we propose to give you relief in regard to the duties on the so-called raw material; we propose to break down the interests of the provinces by the sea, and we will take care of you, we will give you what you call raw material at lower rates. Accordingly, the Minister of Finance on 22nd of April—whether he made an earnest fight on the question or not I am unable to say—came down to the House and showed that among many promises made by Reformers this was one of the promises which was not to be kept. So the "Globe" was not very happy. But on the 25th of May these amended resolutions were presented. On 27th of May the "Globe" thus refers to the comparative position of affairs:

The best feature of the changes announced on Tuesday is the disposition to give encouragement to manufactures by lowering the taxes on raw material rather than by increasing the duties on the product. For instance, spring steel, spiral spring steel, spiral springs for railways, steel billets and steel axle bars for the manufacture of carriage springs and axles, are placed on the free list. Steel for toolmakers is reduced from 15 per cent to 5 per cent. Scrap iron under the old tariff was \$4 per ton; under the first resolution, \$1.50 per ton; it is now \$1 per ton. Steel ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, puddled bars, &c., under the old tariff were \$5 per ton; under the first resolution, \$4 per ton; now reduced to \$2 per ton. Structural iron is reduced from 15 per cent to 10 per cent. Bridge plates for steel-plate manufactures are reduced from 15 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem. Rolled iron or steel plates, used by boilermakers, are reduced from 15 to 10 per cent ad valorem. Iron and steel are the basis of so many industries, we may say virtually of all, that we regard it as of the utmost importance that progress in this respect is steadily in the direction of reduction.

I have to express to the committee my debt of obligation for the very great courtesy they have shown to me while speaking as I have done, and it was largely out of respect to the committee and to some extent due to possessing only a superficial knowledge of the intricacies of this industry, that I referred so much to authorities, and authorities of high standing all the world over, and at considerable length. But I desire to point out to the Government, although I think it will be useless so far as averting this disastrous blow is concerned, that when they found on April 22nd difficulties in touching the iron and steel duties, they should have allowed them to remain in the tariff as they were, instead of tinkering with the tariff in that respect. They had the whole recess before them in which they could consider the subject and endeavour to deal with it, instead of coming down to the House with the proposition which they said would involve large reductions. It must be remembered that all men are more or less selfish in regard to tariff changes, and hon. gentlemen opposite frankly say that they have made radical reductions based upon no other desire than that of

pleasing the largest number of people. Is it a proper principle on which legislation should be enacted that if the Government finds more people interested in industries that use certain products than are employed in the production of the raw material in its first stage, they should seek to meet their views and let the rest of the community go. I submit that there is no true principle underlying these proposed tariff changes. The Government do not profess that free trade is to be found in them; certainly no protection is found in connection with the industries involved, and my great complaint is that the changes in the tariff have been partial instead of universal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would suppose it would be deemed discourteous if I did not say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman, although I have not the slightest intention of following him through his very lengthy and elaborate speech. I listened to him with very great attention, for which I hope he will be grateful. I find that the scrap-book of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is well known in the House, and when he gets it out it becomes a terror of the majority of members. I do not think that his speech of to-day is any departure from his reputation in that respect. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) began by stating, that there was too little protection for the iron industry in this tariff, and he had not proceeded very far before he began to complain that the Government had granted a bounty, and he appealed to the country to notice that this Government was increasing the bounty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) say, that I complained of the bounty?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman did, in the earlier part of his speech.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) did not do me that courtesy he said he did, of listening to my speech. I would like to see the bounty larger, and I said that once or twice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The purpose of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was evidently to excite opposition against the Government, and opposition against the tariff, on the ground that it was giving an increased bounty to the iron industry. That was his purpose, unless I mistake the purport of a portion of his speech. He also professed to quote from some Liberal speaker who described a bounty as the most vicious form of protection. I think my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will have difficulty in obtaining any competent authority to endorse that statement. So far as my opinion is worth anything, I do not hesitate to say, that I do not regard a bounty as the