

which he had been chairman, to enquire respecting this industry, which was an important factor in a county, prosperity, power and progress; and from the data therein furnished by a number of witnesses, he was induced to bring the matter before the House this Session. It appeared that some \$12,000,000 had been invested in working the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and in addition to this large amount of capital invested, a number of other industries were almost entirely dependent on the coal trade. It was well known that the shipping interest was closely allied to it. The tonnage employed in 1873 in carrying coal from Nova Scotia exceeded half a million, and the number of hands employed, directly or indirectly, amounted to about 23,000. The output of coal during that year amounted to 1,051,467 tons, and the number of vessels employed, directly or indirectly, in the trade amounted to 3,604, including 428 steamers. The output had fallen off from over a million of tons in 1873 to 757,496 tons in 1877. The main cause of this decrease was the imposition by the United States of an impost duty of 75c. per ton, which made it impossible for the Nova Scotia coal to compete with the Pennsylvania and other coals in their markets. The imposition of a tax of 10c. per ton on all coals exported, abolished a large percentage of the profits of the mines, and also materially interfered with their profitable working. The Dominion imported from the United States 933,980 tons last year, the whole of which was admitted free of duty. Of this quantity 420,000 tons was anthracite. It was true there was no anthracite in Nova Scotia, but the bituminous coal there produced was of such good quality that if it could be sent to Ontario it would be largely used in the place of the anthracite. Ontario was entirely dependent on the United States for her coal, and if any disturbances occurred, or any combination took place among the proprietors of mines in that country, the price could be raised to almost any extent. Ontario was, in this respect, owing to the want of reciprocal trade relations with Nova Scotia, entirely at the mercy of the United States. Consider-

ing the quantity of coal used, and that it is a necessity, it was of the utmost importance that it should be obtained as much as possible from amongst ourselves, and not imported from a foreign country. A duty should be imposed on foreign coal, which, it seemed to him, would be as wise and legitimate a duty as that on other articles, and it would be an easy method of strengthening our financial position; and, besides, we had precedents for it as, in addition to the United States, Cuba, Barbadoes, Trinidad, the Bahamas, and even Newfoundland, levied a duty upon coal, and yet none of the latter had any mines in operation. It might be said that coal was a raw material, but he maintained the contrary. It required to be cut, to be hewn, to be picked out, to be shovelled, blasted and riddled, and was, in fact, as much a manufactured article as lumber. The coal mine owners paid a duty on almost every article they used, and were entitled to some consideration in return. There was no industry which paid so much to the revenue as the coal trade. The system pursued in the United States was one which was liable to utterly destroy this interest. Besides their protective duty of 75c., a rebate was allowed on every ton shipped from their coal fields *via* Baltimore to the North-Eastern ports. Mr. Belloin, a gentleman well acquainted with the coal trade of Nova Scotia and the United States, in his evidence before the Committee, said: "I would suggest the building up of the coal trade of Nova Scotia by a duty equal to that of the United States, thus placing the Nova Scotia trade in the same position as coal shipped from Baltimore and other ports and places." He further says that, "if the imposition of a similar duty was made, the effect would be that the United States would remove their duty." Another witness said: "That a duty would help us, at all events, in exports to Quebec and Ontario to compete with the American coal there," and "to that extent it would enable us to meet the 75c. imposed there." Other testimony is to the effect that the witness "was prepared to adopt a retaliatory tariff with the United States." Yet another said:

**MR. MACKAY.**