

gentleman propose to legislate on a bad principle because they did so in another country, and it is legislating against nature? We shall see. The hon. gentleman made a still later utterance; it was delivered in Montreal. He declared:

We are told that we must not destroy the manufacturers of Montreal. I say that we are not going to destroy the industries of Montreal. I contend, on the contrary, that the application of the ideas that we defend will inaugurate an era of prosperity such as Montreal has not known since the inauguration of the National Policy. The present system raises a maximum of taxation, not only on the consumer, but also on the producer. They have a tax on iron, which is also 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.

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 materials of every manufacturer, 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.

Can there be a more explicit statement than that made to the business of the city of Montreal, and consequently to the country, that the hon. gentleman's tariff would include the removal of duties upon raw materials, he specially mentioning two leading articles, coal and iron. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was present with the hon. gentleman. He stands exactly on the same footing, for he declared in this House as follows:—

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 necessary of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its operations. It will fall on the poorest classes of the community in the depth 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.

That is the opinion of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce—it was his opinion, at least. Now, what said the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies)?

Protection is false and delusive, and if the coal industry cannot live without being propped up by protection, then we say it is as well for this country that the coal industry should go.

That hon. gentleman is an important member of the Cabinet. The leader of the Gov-

Mr. FOSTER.

ernment was present in the constituency of Brant at the by-election which took place not long ago. He was a little guarded in his utterances. He spoke all around the subject, he did not give a definite idea of what he would do; but he had a colleague with him on the same platform who was perfectly definite, and the leader of this House sat and listened to the speech delivered by the leader of the Ontario Government, my hon. friend being in the constituency at that time with the intention of carrying it for his party and defeating the Liberal-Conservative candidate. Mr. Hardy said:

Was it going to hurt the manufacturers of Brantford to get free coal? Every year from \$30,000 to \$50,000 were ground out of them that a few New Yorkers who controlled the mines of Nova Scotia should get the benefit. The Grand Trunk Railway was said to pay almost a half a million a year in duties on coal. Suppose they were added in part to the wages of the men—(applause)—or in part in dividends. That would bring about a new era in the history of the Grand Trunk. So, with free iron, free raw material for all the factories, that policy of free raw materials would give a far more live protection than was now given.

Could anything be more explicit? and yet Sir, the latest development is that the Finance Minister in this House and Sir Oliver Mowat in the other House, vouch for the fact that the Minister of Finance spoke by the book. The Minister of Finance went down to the city of Montreal, and to one particular interest he made this statement:

If it turns out that the United States coal duty is raised to a high figure, then we shall claim to exercise the right to revise our views respecting the Canadian duty, and we shall feel bound to impose a duty, not only on bituminous coal,—

Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) hear that—

—but also on anthracite coal, which at present comes into our markets from the States free of duty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is that the tariff or the Franchise Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. The country is vainly hoping and wishing it may be on the tariff, but the Ministers are outside of it yet, I know, and it will probably take more than the Easter holidays for them to consult their leading men and get together on it. Well, Sir, that is my last point in the argument.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He describes it as argument.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has not been attending to his legislative duties. He comes into the House now, after the main part of my argument is over, and he wants me to repeat it. Surely he won't ask me to do that. The argument summed up is this: That for