

other Provinces on the Atlantic seaboard. A remarkable statement had been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, to the effect that by placing a duty of 75c. a ton on coal and 50c. a barrel on flour coming into the Maritime Provinces from the United States, it would cause the Americans to give us reciprocity. He wondered how any intelligent man could believe that four millions of people would be able to change the fiscal policy of a nation containing forty millions, by putting a duty on coal and flour, and a small duty on malt. A short time ago the Canadian Government put a duty on malt coming into this country; but did the Americans take all duty off malt and allow the Canadian article to go into the United States markets free? No; they doubled the duty on malt going into the United States. The hon. member for West Toronto seemed to say that the imposition of this duty would not increase the price of coal. Now, if the report of the examination before the Coal Committee last Session, in connection with the depression of trade, was consulted, it would be found no attempt was made to deny that the imposition of a duty on coal would increase the price in the west.

MR. TUPPER: Is the hon. gentleman not aware that a meeting of manufacturers held at Toronto agreed to the proposal to put a tax on coal?

MR. OLIVER said that he was informed that a person named Fraser, in the employment of hon. gentlemen opposite, went through the country and convened a meeting at Toronto, composed of individuals who supported the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite. He might state that the Board of Trade, which was an independent body representing the commercial men of this country, also had a meeting, but did they adopt a resolution to put a duty on coal?

MR. TUPPER: It was lost by a majority of three.

MR. OLIVER: And how many persons attended the meeting at Toronto? Not over 40.

MR. TUPPER: I understood from the statement of the Chairman, Mr.

Howland, that 50 of the leading manufacturers of Ontario were present.

MR. OLIVER said that not one of these individuals represented a majority of the manufacturers in their various localities. There could be no doubt that the consumer of an article paid the duty upon it, and yet this was the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite. It would be just as wise to put a duty on salt coming into this country, and force the salt of Goderich down to the Maritime Provinces. If hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded at any time in putting a duty of 75c. per ton on coal, the people would rise against them, and put other men in their places. He would not deny the speech which he had been taunted with having made. On that occasion he tried to do what he believed was for the benefit of the people; but, after considering the matter fully, he must admit that he was mistaken in what he previously said.

MR. McCALLUM said it was just as likely that the hon. member for North Oxford had taken a mistaken view of the case now, as at the time to which he referred. The Government deemed it desirable to raise revenue by means of a revenue on tea, but he would point out that, by adopting this proposed duty on coal, a still greater amount of revenue would be derived, while the coal owners of Nova Scotia would be encouraged. The most selfish people of all were the mover and seconder of this resolution, because they had been supporting a Free-trade Government for five years, and at the eleventh hour they brought down a resolution of this kind, which they knew would not carry. If they thought it would carry would those gentlemen vote for it? He (Mr. McCallum) intended to vote for it, because it was part of the policy he advocated. He hoped it would carry; and if so, being a vote of non-confidence in the Government, it would remove hon. gentlemen opposite from their places, and put other men on the Government benches who would so arrange the policy of the country as to protect its industries and give men a good day's wages for a fair day's work.