

statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Finance as unquestionable—and I remember that only a short time ago it was said to be something quite improper for any member on this side of the House to question statements made by these hon. gentlemen or their subordinates—if we were to allow them to state our case as they pleased, and as they have chosen to do in more than one instance; if we were to accept as unquestionable, promises that we regard as absolutely false, we would then be compelled to accept also the deductions at which they have chosen to arrive. But we, on our side of the House, question almost every statement they have made, either as utterly inaccurate, or as a very skilful perversion of what we regard as true. The hon. Minister of Railways chose to commence his speech this afternoon by declaring that neither he nor the Minister of Finance was ever truly regarded as Free Traders, that nothing could be found to prove that they had ever taken, in the Governments of the Provinces to which they both belong, a course as Free Traders, or advocated a policy that could be fairly called a Free Trade policy. Yet, a few minutes afterwards, with an inaccuracy, an inconsistency, a reckless disregard of self-contradiction, which distinguished that hon. gentleman this afternoon more than in any speech I ever heard him deliver, he told us distinctly that he had always advocated Free Trade in Nova Scotia as far as it could be carried out there, because in the peculiar circumstances of that Province Free Trade was a necessity. He told us, furthermore, that for many years before Confederation he was an advocate of a Union of the Provinces, and in that he told us what is correct; but when he proceeded to tell us that, in adopting a 15 per cent. Tariff after Confederation the hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House did not mean to adopt a policy of Free Trade, but rather a protectionist policy, and that in framing that Tariff they had acted strictly upon the principle of Protection, he asked this House to believe what is impossible for us to accept. A 15 per cent. policy was adopted, I believe by the Parliament of old Canada, and that 15 per cent. became the Tariff after Confederation, avowedly for the reason that the people of the Maritime Provinces were known to be Free Traders; that it would not do to offend their Free Trade principle by asking them to accept even the old Tariff, but that the old Tariff must be modified in the direction of Free Trade in order to reconcile the people to Confederation, to which it was known a great majority was strongly opposed. That was the true reason why the rate of taxation on the great part of our imports was reduced to 15 per cent. But they placed upon the free list a large number of articles, and he claims that as a measure of protection. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if it was a measure of Protection, in 1868-69, to place a large number of articles upon the free list, how has it come to pass to-day that it is a measure of Protection to take off that free list so large a number of articles and reduce it to such insignificant proportions? How is it that the hon. the Minister of Finance has found it necessary, even this Session, to come down and add some of the articles to the free list, which, a short time ago, according to his principle of Protection, he took off that list? No, Sir, it was not acting upon any principle of Protection; it was acting upon a principle which has always guided the advocates of a revenue Tariff policy, that that large free list was adopted in 1868-69, and was maintained from that time till the unhappy year of 1879. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman, after having contradicted himself in that extraordinary way, after having made those extraordinary statements, and placed himself in that strange position, proceeded to speak on the question of the coal duties. He told us truly that for many years he has been an advocate of a duty upon coal, and he told us, as we have heard from him often before, that for his part he could see no good reason why, for

Mr. ANGLIN.

revenue purposes alone, a duty should not be imposed on coal. He added that one of the strongest objections against the duty on coal was the fact that it was a partial and a sectional impost and this he seemed to admit. But, he strove to contend that, although in some senses the duty is a sectional impost, nevertheless, it does not bear largely on the poorer classes in any part of the country, because, forsooth, the poorer people used wood for domestic purposes rather than coal; and, when asked by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) what he thought of the duty as it affected Toronto, he scouted the very idea of having any regard for the working classes of even so large a city as Toronto, and overlooked the fact, that if the working classes of Toronto alone were affected by this duty on coal, there would be a sufficiently strong reason why it should not be imposed. But, we all know that coal has been taking the place of wood in all our large cities and towns for many years past; that every day it is becoming more and more the fuel of the working classes—I will not particularly say of the poorer classes, because the hon. gentleman repudiates the idea that we have now any poor class in Canada. He speaks of those who were in want, several years ago, as shivering wretches. That is the language employed by these patrons of the poor—not the brothers or the protectors—but the patrons of the working classes, and he speaks of those who, owing to circumstances over which they had no control, owing to the will of Providence, who so directed the affairs of this country and of the whole world, that a few years ago we had generally wide-spread distress, so that many shivered for want of fuel—speaks of them not as men having the same feelings as himself—men as respectable as he would be if every charge made against him were proved as calumny; he speaks of them as an inferior order, as shivering wretches.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will, probably, allow me to correct him. I suppose he does not intend, personally or unintentionally, to do me an injustice, but when he says that I used the expression "shivering wretches," he is mistaken, for I used that expression as a quotation from a speech of the ex-Finance Minister. I did not use the expression myself, so that the reproof falls upon his friend and not upon me.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then it is only to be regretted that the hon. gentleman, to whom I listened with great attention, did not use this expression so that we could understand it. Well, Sir, the coal duty is a sectional duty. It is true that a very large portion of the coal imported into the country, as well as produced in our own mines, is used for manufacturing and railway purposes; but it is also true that a very large portion of it is used for domestic purposes, and that a large number of the people of this country feel very severely and sensibly the burden which is imposed upon them by the tax on coal, unless, indeed, they can be persuaded, and they never have been persuaded yet, that the Americans pay the duty instead of their having to pay it themselves. I believe that the statement made to that effect by the hon. gentleman is one which will startle the country as much as any he ever made. He has never shown himself deficient in that quality which Danton has said is so necessary to those who would carry their purposes by means of strong assertions; but I do not think he has ever ventured to go much further in the way of assertion than he did when he said that the Americans pay the whole duty on coal. The Finance Minister went so far as to say that the Americans pay at least one half the duty on coal; and I think we were a little startled in this House, and I think the business people throughout Canada were startled by that statement of the hon. gentleman, but the hon. gentleman is not advanced enough with regard to this coal duty to suit the views of his hon. colleague. The hon. gentleman told us, in the early