

fishermen, no less a sum than \$4,500,000 was awarded to be paid to Canada; and, to-day, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, true to the policy of protecting that great and important Canadian industry, is in a position to come down and ask justly from this House that no less than \$150,000 per annum shall be contributed by this Parliament from the public funds as a bounty to the fishermen, whose fishing grounds have been, to a certain extent surrendered, under the Washington Treaty, to the fishermen of another country. I mention this in order to show that the policy which animates gentlemen on this side of the House is a policy that was adopted in 1867, on the first formation of the Canadian Government, and has continued until the present time. Well, Sir, it will also be remembered by gentlemen opposite that we made a very strong endeavor to secure protection for the great coal mining interests of this country and for the great agricultural industry. It will be remembered that the Government of that day—the first of this Confederation—brought down a policy imposing a duty upon coal coming from the United States into this country, and accompanied it by a proposition to impose a duty upon grain and breadstuffs brought from the adjoining Republic into Canada. It will be remembered that, notwithstanding that that policy was maintained for a year, we were obliged ultimately to succumb to the united hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of our own friends who were less advanced on this important question at that time than I am happy to say, they are to-day. Now, Sir, it is very well known to the House that I have always been—from the first hour I entered this House—an advocate for a duty on coal. I never could see, and I cannot now, why coal should be exempt from duty, even as a pure question of revenue, any more than any other article found in the Tariff. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House join issue with us in that respect, and the ex-Minister of Finance calls a duty on coal an odious tax, while the hon. leader of the Opposition maintains here, as elsewhere, that it is a sectional tax. Well Sir, I can only say that I fail to see any foundation for the statement that it is an odious tax, or for the view that it is a sectional tax. What makes it an odious tax? Why, these hon. gentlemen say coal is a necessary of life! Yet the Tariff they propounded and maintained, provided for the imposition of duties upon other articles which are just as much necessities of life as coal. In this cold country, hats, boots and shoes, and clothing of all kinds, are necessities of life. It is not a matter of choice as to whether any individual in this country will wear these articles or not; they are articles of prime necessity, and