

part of his speech, that some time ago one of his colleagues, a gentleman who took a prominent position in discussing these trade questions, entertained the opinion that the tax on coal, and, I think, the tax on flour, as being sectional and oppressive in their nature, would lead to much trouble if imposed; but he says that that gentleman, like many others in his party, was not sufficiently advanced to know that the tax on coal, instead of being an injury to the poorer classes or to those who use coal for any purpose, would be a benefit and would enable us to take money out of the pockets of the Americans for our own service and purposes. But, Sir, he has himself undergone a very material change of opinion upon that point, and within a very short time. I heard him make that remarkable statement in regard to coal in the campaign in Pictou. He had not then reached that advanced state in which the wonderful fact dawned upon his mind that the Americans pay the tax on coal, for he used something like this language in addressing the people of Pictou, as one good reason why they should oppose the repeal of the tax on coal, and as a reason why they should not vote for Mr. Carmichael. He said: "See how this thing works. The people of Ontario pay \$400,000 a year into the Treasury of the Dominion, and you Nova Scotians get your full share of the benefit of the expenditure of that money for public purposes, without contributing a single dollar towards it." He went on to speak on the advantages which that county affords for manufacturers, and the benefit which was conferred on an establishment for the manufacture of railway wheels and axles; and in pointing to the success of that concern he attributed it not merely to the energy and skill and industry of the gentlemen connected with it—though he gave them credit for these business qualities—but he went on to say that the cheap coal which they had at their doors, which they got without any additional cost for production, would be an important factor in the success of their business. More than that, he said that the tax of 50 cents per ton on coal has this effect: that it handicaps—that was not the word he used, for I do not pretend to quote his words, but it was to that effect—the effect of the duty on coal is to handicap the manufacturers of Ontario to such an extent as to give an additional protection to the manufacturers of New Glasgow when they come in competition with the manufacturers of Ontario, when they come into competition with their products in the far West. It struck me, when he made his statement to-day, that he does not intend to face Pictou on the eve of next election, for if he did he would have to unsay what he said at the last election, and tell them that the duty on coal affords them no advantage, because the people of Ontario do not pay this duty, because they get coal as cheaply, and even more cheaply, than they did before, and instead of its being a benefit to the manufacturers of the town of New Glasgow, as giving them an advantage in the competition with the manufacturers of Ontario, it is in fact a loss and an injury. More than that—if what the hon. Minister has stated is true—what is to be done in the case of one of the Government's prominent supporters who, it is said, receives a return of duty paid on the coal which he brings from the United States for use in his tug boats and steamers? That hon. gentleman listened to his leader this afternoon, and of course could not question the accuracy of his statements or the potency of his reasoning or the soundness of his conclusions; therefore he must know that he has been wrongfully receiving that money from the Americans, and as an honest man he will, no doubt, make it a matter of conscience, and make retribution as soon as possible.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that such a rebate has been made, or is he speaking from rumor?

Mr. ANGLIN. I say that it is reported that he got coal from the United States for the use of his steamers without paying the duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Any person can do that if he likes.

Mr. ANGLIN. And bring it into Canadian waters, and use it in Canadian waters?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that nothing is liable to duty until it is landed.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is well to get an explanation on this point, and it is well for the tug owners in other parts of the country to know this fact, of which some of them have been woefully ignorant.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose they have been seeking information from you.

Mr. ANGLIN. They have been getting their information in a very telling way—through their own pockets—they have been paying the duty. Why, I notice that the tug owners of Quebec have been in the strange belief that the duties paid have been coming out of their pockets and not out of those of the Americans, and have sent a memorial to this House stating that this tax is a burden and interferes with their business, and that altogether it has been an injury and a serious detriment and loss to them.

Mr. BOWELL. Do these gentlemen go to the United States for their coal?

Mr. ANGLIN. They can get it without landing it, I suppose.

Mr. BOWELL. If they do, it would not be dutiable until landed or sold in the country.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then I suppose these gentlemen will be very much obliged to me for obtaining this information for them. The hon. Minister of Customs has come to the relief of the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), who wants to get his coal in free for the use of his tugs; and after the explanation of the hon. Minister, that hon. gentleman, I suppose, will not find it necessary to pay that money over to the Treasury, to which, according to the teachings of the hon. Minister of Railways, it most unquestionably belongs. The hon. Minister of Railways says that in a few months he has learned a great deal on this subject—new light has dawned on that wonderful understanding of his. I remember how, five or six years ago, when he was talking on this question of coal duty, it seemed impossible for him to know any more of it than he knew then. But he has received new light since, and this afternoon he read to us some most elaborate calculations and statements, which he says prove most conclusively—though I could not see the proof—that the Americans pay this duty on coal. I understood the hon. Minister to make this statement—that some years before the imposition of this duty on coal, the price in Toronto was very much higher than the price in Philadelphia, but that immediately after the imposition of the duty the price in Toronto not only fell to the price in Philadelphia, but the price in Toronto actually fell to \$1.64 a ton lower than the price in Philadelphia; and he asks the people of this country to believe that the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal has led to that extraordinary change. Well, Sir, if the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal has that extraordinary effect, why does not the hon. gentleman prove himself logically consistent for once, and ask this House to vote the imposition of another 50 cents on coal? If the Americans pay the duty, why should we spare them? Why should we be satisfied with taking a paltry 50 cents out of them if we can get a dollar or two? Besides, according to the hon. gentleman's reasoning, it will reduce the price to a lower point than it has ever touched before. In reply to what he knew would be the answer to that, he used most extraordinary arguments in the hope of bringing the people of this country to believe that they do not suffer anything from the National Policy, because many staple articles can be purchased to-day at lower prices than they brought four or five years ago.