

they would find a resolution moved by the right hon. gentleman recorded, in which several industries of Canada, but not the coal industry, were referred to as requiring protection.

AN HON. MEMBER: The mining interest was mentioned in it.

MR. MACDONNELL said that mining might mean anything, as might also the motion which the right hon. gentleman had proposed this Session in connection with the readjustment of the Tariff. The protection of various industries was demanded, but what did this mean—75 or 50c., or one cent a ton on coal; or did it mean anything?

MR. YOUNG said he desired to point out the very dangerous character of the motion to the manufacturing interests of the Dominion, and especially to those of Western Canada. Before doing so he might notice briefly the remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland. That hon. gentleman stated he desired to have a readjustment of the tariff which would give encouragement to our manufactures. He (Mr. Young) had ventured at the time to say that such was the present policy. Such, indeed, had been the policy pursued in Canada for twenty years, with this difference, that under the existing Government there was $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more protection than there had been under the late Administration, with the additional fact that in consequence of the change in the price of gold in the United States, the amount of encouragement given was, so far as American manufacturers were concerned, more than 10 per cent. greater than under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power. The hon. gentleman said he wished to see a system adopted which would keep the people of this country in Canada. Well, it appeared from a return drawn up by hon. gentlemen opposite, that under their rule some 500,000 or 600,000 Canadians had gone from this country to the United States; whereas, he ventured to say, that not one in ten emigrated at the present time who formerly did. The hon. gentleman who brought forward the fallacy which had been so often heard

this Session—a fallacy, the absurdity of which made him surprised that it should be repeated so often—that the Opposition should at once decrease the taxes of the people and give a large amount of Protection. He would not insult the intelligence of the House by attempting to expiude such a transparent fallacy, but only say that hon. gentlemen opposite would be quite as able to lift themselves over the House by their boot-straps as to carry out both ends of that proposition. Our manufactures were becoming more and more dependent on coal, particularly in the older sections of the country, where wood was becoming scarce and expensive. He found, on looking over the returns, that last year we imported \$1,792,000 worth of bituminous coal into the Dominion, all of which was imported into the Province of Ontario, with the exception of about \$16,000 worth. Now, he ventured to affirm that, though a duty of 75c. was placed on coal, as proposed, it would not lead to 100 tons of Nova Scotia coal being used in the Province of Ontario; it would take, at least, \$1.50 to \$2 a ton to force it into use in that Province. Evidence which was brought before the House two years ago conclusively proved, to his mind, that at least one and a-half dollars would be required to force Ontario manufacturers to use Nova Scotia coal; this duty of 75c. per ton, then, would be a direct duty upon our manufacturers. This motion did not refer only to bituminous coal, it proposed that a duty should be put on anthracite coal as well; the idea probably being that, unless this was done, the effect of a duty on bituminous would only lead to a larger quantity of anthracite being used. This proposition made the motion still more dangerous. He found that, last year, we imported \$1,706,000 worth of anthracite coal of which \$1,304,000 worth was imported into Ontario. The proposed duty of 75c., therefore, would be a direct tax on the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec. While certain temporary advantages might be gained by this class by putting duties on certain imported articles, the placing of a tax on coal and other raw material would do them more harm than a slight advance on

MR. MACDONNELL.