

Would discourage proposed extended mining operations, hinder expansion of industries and repulse investors.

Would lower rates, and from that cause coupled with irregular employment, would greatly lower wages.

Would overstock the labor market.

Would increase the cost of coal to lower province consumers.

Would, as in former slack years, drive out a most desirable class of population.

Would greatly lessen inter-provincial trade, one of the great arguments put forward in favor of confederation.

Would be unjust to Nova Scotia, already unfairly treated in the matter of free anthracite, and free coal—and coal for coke.

Would impair the revenue of the railways owing to decreased traffic; and

Would not, while adding to the price of coal in the lower provinces, lessen the price in Ontario, which is the chief clamor for free coal. This assertion is based on past experience. Ontario shouted for free anthracite, and got it. Well, in 1886, the price of duty paid anthracite was, at points in Canada, \$5.05. For six months after the abolition of the duty the price fell 20 cents only, a ton, and not fifty cents as, naturally, expected. At the end of six months the dealers, or the operators, or both in combination, "caught on," perceived that Canada must have the coal and so sent the price up beyond the former duty paid price. In 1887 the price went up to \$5.40, in 1888 it was \$5.30 and seven years later they were still to the good at \$5.30 per ton and there they still are. Instead of giving Ontario cheaper anthracite, I calculate the