

Referring to the coal trade, he said the Liberal party would not preach one doctrine in Capre Breton and another in the rest of the Dominion. If the coal business could not be carried on without protection, then it is better not to carry it on at all. Protection was not a necessity for its welfare; the coal business is not a pauper business.

But what does he do here to-day? He puts 60 cents a ton on coal. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce also said:

Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which could be imposed is a tax on a necessity of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its operation. It will fall on the poorest classes of the community in the depths of the Canadian winter. It is absolutely sectional, pressing heavily on the people of Ontario, and not at all on the great mass of the people through the other provinces. It will form a standing grievance. It is a most doubtful benefit to Nova Scotia.

It is not merely Ontario that the tax on coal affects; it affects Manitoba and the North-west as well. It affects the price of coal along the whole line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the section of country to which I belong many of the farmers burn coal, and the price of coal from the Lethbridge mines and from the anthracite mines is regulated strictly by the price of coal that comes from below the line. The Prime Minister, speaking in Montreal before the election, said:

They have a tax on iron, which is a raw material of every industry. The tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry, is 60 cents a ton. Although I have not the latest quotations of coal, I am sure that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. Now, I am asked, What are you going to do? I have just told you what we are going to do. We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely the duties on raw material.

Here is the positive language of the Prime Minister. Then, speaking at Sohmer Park in the same city a few days later, he remarked:

I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw materials would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank heaven, they have not thought of taxing it. Cotton is free also. But is iron free? Cotton is a raw material, and wool is a raw material for certain manufactures. But there are two articles which are raw material of every manufacture, and these articles are coal and iron, and are they free? If you have a revenue tariff, the object would be to develop the country, and all raw materials should be free under such a tariff.

The Winnipeg "Tribune," whose editor and proprietor is a member of this House, began to suspect in December last that the Liberal Government, of which he is a supporter, was not going to carry out its promises, and this is what that paper said:

It was with considerable pain that the "Tribune" observed the remarks of members of the

Dominion Government who have recently passed through the city, with reference to the tariff. Both Mr. Davies and Mr. Blair observed that they had not heard the tariff mentioned while in the west. If they are disposed to interpret silence on this great—nay, paramount question—to mean that the people of the west are not desperately in earnest in their desire to secure a revolution of the tariff, then we must tell them plainly that they entirely misapprehend the spirit and sentiment of the people. We would like to inquire how it could be possible that they should hear anything about the tariff while passing hurriedly over our plains in private cars, without a stop of more than an hour or two here and there, on their way east? Citizens of the west are noted for their innate courtesy and kindness to visitors and visiting Ministers, more especially if they are here for the first time.

And having spoken pretty strongly, it says:

This may be deemed very plain talk. It is intended to be plain. Like Mr. Greenway, the "Tribune" is a thorough believer having the same policy in power which it advocates when in opposition.

How will the hon. gentleman act now? Is he going to support these men who turned their backs on their promises, who have done the very thing he feared? It will be very curious to see what he will do. I do not know whether there is a shred of a promise or a profession made by the hon. Prime Minister that he intends to keep. Why, when he was at Renfrew he as good as made a promise that he would not do what it seems is now going to be done. The Rev. Mr. Huxtable, a gentleman representing the prohibition movement, said to him:

A majority of some 80,000 of the voters in Ontario have decided in favour of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. We understand that Sir Wilfrid Laurier—

But, Sir, the moment these words fell on the sensitive ear of the hon. gentleman, he stopped and said: "I must tell my friend that I am not Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but only plain Mr. Laurier. I am a Democrat to the hilt." And yet, Mr. Speaker, if all accounts are true, this quasi promise will not be kept and the hon. gentleman will have a title which will sit very gracefully on him. It looks as if we were going to have men made knights, who have so completely belied their promises; we shall have stars glittering on truthless bosoms and honours showered on dishonoured heads. However, I hope for the sake of consistency, that that little shred of a promise will remain unbroken, and that the hon. gentleman will come back from the Jubilee, the same plain Mr. Laurier. I express that wish, though I am really afraid that when he gets to the other side and finds himself in an aristocratic atmosphere, his virtue will ooze out from his finger tips, and he will come back decorated with a title. Instead of being the grand Mr. Laurier, he will have a title, and there will at the same time be such a batch of titles,