

who entertains such a very low estimate of human nature as his speech the other night led us to believe he holds, ought to be careful how he places words in the mouth of any man that the man never uttered, because it is open to the imputation that the hon. gentleman's knowledge was not at fault. Now, Sir, I tell him, if he did not know it, he ought to have known it; and I tell you why. This subject had been a matter of public discussion. The *Globe* newspaper had falsified the report of Sir Henry Tyler's speech. Either the *Globe's* correspondent in London, or the persons at the *Globe* office in Toronto, falsified Sir Henry Tyler's language and made him say that which he never had said. That became a subject of discussion, and the *Globe* was challenged with the production of Sir Henry Tyler's speech, which proved the statement I have made, namely, that either the correspondent in London or the parties in the office at Toronto were so driven to the wall to sustain their untenable position on this question, that they had to do what the hon. ex-Finance Minister, after this has been a matter of public discussion, ought not to have done,—put words in the mouth of Sir Henry Tyler which he never uttered.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Produce the speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have got it here, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that not only does it not say what he has stated that it said, but the very reverse. Sir Henry Tyler, of course, like all gentlemen in his position, was anxious to show why he had not a larger net balance in favor of the railway, and he would have been only too glad if he could have shown that the imposition of the duty of 50 cents per ton on coal had compelled him to take that 50 cents out of the earnings of the railway in order to adjust his balance, but he did not venture to say so; he could not say so, because I happen to know that the Grand Trunk had purchased coal cheaper than the company had purchased it before, and therefore Sir Henry Tyler was not in a position to make such a statement. He said:

"He gives us all the reasons for the excess in the expenditure of the present half year, which you will see on page 12—increased consumption of fuel caused by much severer weather during the past winter. 2nd. Advance in prices of fuel, wages, and materials. 3rd. Outlay in working the extra traffic, which, of course, requires extra fuel; and so on. As regards fuel, I should like to tell you what we are doing in that respect. We are gradually economizing, and using more coal and less wood."

Sir Henry Tyler was made to say that his company was suffering, that the Grand Trunk and all the railways were suffering to the extent of the duty on coal. He tells the people that, although he had not got as large a balance as he desired, he was increasing it, because the company was using more coal and less wood. He said:

"In the half-year ending June, 1880, we used 60,000 cords of wood and in the half-year ending June, 1881, only 48,000 cords. *Per contra*, we used in the half-year ending June, 1880, 109,000 tons of coal; so that we had a decrease of 12,000 cords of wood and an increase of 34,000 tons of coal. As wood becomes more scarce, and there are extra facilities for getting coal, we shall hope, in working our traffic, to effect further economy in this respect."

The hon. the ex-Finance Minister put language in Sir Henry Tyler's mouth which he never uttered.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is that all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that not enough to show that Sir Henry Tyler did not say what has been reported? Is it not quite enough to show that there is no foundation for that which *Hansard* shows the ex-Finance Minister stated, and the words he put in Sir Henry Tyler's mouth? Is it not enough that Sir Henry Tyler, instead of saying they are suffering from the increased cost of coal, owing to the duty, and that it was increased by the amount of the duty, which the ex-Finance Minister made him say, the company are economizing by using more coal and abandoning the use of wood? If the hon. member for Lambton does not think

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that enough, I am afraid it will be very hard for any one to satisfy him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows it is not enough as well as I do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it will not be necessary to occupy the attention of the House much longer in respect to the question of coal. I think I have disposed once and for ever of any foundation whatever for the imputation that the duty upon coal has increased the cost to the consumer in any part of the whole Dominion. I have shown that whereas poverty and suffering existed before, now all is comfort and prosperity. I have shown hon. gentlemen that the great coal-mining industry, which was languishing and dying, and would have been crushed out, has revived; we would, under the late policy, have been in the position that Ontario would have had no protection, for there would have been no Canadian coal-mines that would have been brought into requisition. But all that had been changed, and now we found not only industries springing up in every direction, but, at the same time, it can be clearly established that this has been accomplished without either manufacturers or railways or any persons being called upon to pay a single additional farthing. But suppose it had cost the railways something? What have we done for the railways under our policy? Does the hon. gentleman know how those railways have progressed under the National Policy that he and the leader of the Opposition are so exceedingly anxious about—those great corporations which cannot be said to be so very poor? The hon. gentleman has only to look at the returns, and he will find they are of a very striking and interesting character, like all other statistics relating to the National Policy. Those prove beyond controversy the interesting growth, prosperity, advancement and progress of this country. There is no barometer you can apply that will give you a clearer test as to the public weal than the railway receipts of the country. The railways stretch through the country in every direction, and just in proportion as the country flourishes the receipts advance, and as the country suffers they decline. Let me invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to what the railway returns show, and then they will see whether there was any cause for expressing sympathy for the railway companies, even if they paid a coal duty. The following is a comparative statement of the tons of freight carried and of receipts:—

—	1876-77.	1877-78.	1878-79.	1879-80.	1880-81.
Number of tons of freight carried.....	6,859,796	7,863,472	8,348,810	9,938,858	12,102,245
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Receipts from passengers.....	6,458,493	6,386,325	6,459,598	7,076,340	8,198,274
Receipts from freight	11,321,264	13,129,191	12,509,094	15,506,935	18,616,517
Receipts from mails and express.....	744,741	795,797	789,926	851,288	942,671
Receipts from other sources.....	217,554	208,764	166,448	102,076	150,257
	18,742,052	20,520,077	19,925,066	23,536,639	27,907,719

Thus we have a total of \$18,742,052 in 1876-77, against \$19,925,066 in 1878-79; and when the hon. gentleman's policy was changed, we have \$27,907,719 received from railways in this country, or an increase in 1880-81, from the year the hon. gentleman received permission to retire from the management of public affairs, of no less than \$8,082,453. So that, if the railways had to pay a few cents duty a ton on