

Mr. ANGLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. All right, he is a very respectable Grit.

Mr. ANGLIN. All Grits are respectable. When they cease to be respectable they cease to be Grits. But the hon. gentleman said that after the imposition of the 50 cent duty, Toronto, Montreal and Quebec became competing points; and the dealers on the other side determined to sell to parties at those points so low as to enable them to pay the duty and compete with the home produced article. He did not tell us much about the prices of bituminous coal, but dealt with the anthracite rather than the bituminous, part of which comes from Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. At all events, Quebec and Montreal and places between were points at which our coal competed with coal brought from the United States long before the National Policy was imposed. On former occasions when this question was discussed in this House, it was stated that coal could be brought up the Gulf of St. Lawrence at a considerable profit to Quebec and at a fair profit to Montreal, where it could fairly compete with the bituminous coal from the United States. I remember well that Mr. Mitchell, who then, I think, was interested in a line of steamers running to and from the Gulf, made that statement, which was also made by many other business men, so that Quebec and Montreal and intermediate places were as much competing points as they are to-day. In the Lower Provinces, it is said, we are still further from the coal-fields of the United States, than Quebec or Montreal. I do not know whether it costs much or anything more to bring coal to St. John or Halifax than to Montreal or Quebec, but judging from prices I think coal can be imported as cheaply to the former as to the latter points. According to the theory advanced by the hon. Minister of Railways there must be an understanding among the coal dealers of the United States to sell for export to Canada, for the sake of the small quantity they do sell here, at lower prices than they accept for coal to be used in the United States. Business people will not credit that. For my part, I have to burn a considerable quantity of anthracite coal every year, and I find that the duty adds 50 cents to the price of the coal besides the 5 or 10 cents more additional profit charged by the dealer. The hon. gentleman compared the output of coal from 1873-4 to 1878 with the output from 1878 to 1881, and showed that the output is much larger at present than it was during the late Administration, attributing the increase, of course, entirely to the National Policy. Now, it is always well, when we are discussing matters of this kind, to ascertain what causes are in operation to bring about the results we are all agreed on. We know that of late years there has been a wonderful change in the carrying trade in the various countries of the world. We know that a very large number of steamers now go to harbors in Nova Scotia to procure an additional supply of coal, finding it profitable to go a little out of the way to get this new supply of coal rather than set out with a full supply, since, by taking the former course, they are enabled to start with a larger quantity of cargo. During the last year we had in the harbor of St. John, for the first time in my recollection, as many as fifteen or sixteen English steamers coming to take cargoes of deals, which had to procure additional coal. This is a portion of the additional output which is attributed to the National Policy. We might as well attribute to the National Policy the fact that they came to St. John to take deals and thereby did serious injury to the trade of wooden ships. We do not resort to any means of that kind in order to establish our case. We do not choose to be inconsistent, to be inaccurate, or to deal in incongruities, false deductions or false premises. What we seek to establish is the truth. We leave the public themselves, in most cases, to infer from what is known to be true what the natural and proper deduction ought to be. Other causes brought those steamers

to our ports, not the National Policy. But there were in our ports sixteen large steamers to be supplied with coal for the transatlantic voyage. And the output again was increased in another way. The hon. the Minister of Railways himself, talking of the Grand Trunk management, showed us that they are abandoning the use of wood to a large extent and substituting for it coal. He read what he thought was a contradiction of the statement of the hon. member for Huron but, of course, it was nothing of the kind; it did not throw the slightest doubt on that statement. But it did show that for that and other causes there is a large demand for coal, either foreign or domestic. We know that on the Intercolonial also there has been a very large quantity of coal used of late years, and less wood than formerly; and then the revival of business and the opening of new establishments, including two sugar refineries in the Lower Provinces, has increased the demand for coal. But, except the sugar refineries, I do not know any case in which this increased demand should be credited directly or indirectly by the public to the National Policy. My impression is that the quantity of coal taken out of the mines was not very much, if at all, in excess of the quantity taken out a few years ago. The hon. gentleman would prefer, of course, to take in his arguments the average of the periods of greatest depression; or, as the Ministerialists sometimes do, one year of great depression compared with a year of prosperity. But I believe that the output of coal is not very much larger now than it was six or seven years ago. The Minister of Railways made another extraordinary statement—perhaps it was a *lapsus lingue*—that from the year 1878 to 1881, while the output was diminishing year by year, the number of people employed diminished to the extent of 1,200, and that since the increase commenced the number employed had increased, not by 1,200, but 400. My impression is, that there must be some mistake—that there must be as many men employed to-day taking out coal as there was some years ago. That, at all events, was the statement of the Minister of Railways. He did not show that any considerable quantity of coal ever reached the Ontario market. The great object of the imposition of the duty on coal was to give the miners of Nova Scotia control of the principal markets of Ontario. Ministers are now compelled to admit that it has not done that and will not do it. The Minister of Railways told us of some analysis of Nova Scotia coal made some years ago by the member for London, when a member of the Ontario Government, and of the admirable results of that analysis, as showing that this coal was very much better than any other. But we do not find that it is imported by Ontario, and the people of Toronto are so stupid, so regardless of their own interests, as to import an inferior coal at a higher price instead of a superior coal at a lower. There is a contradiction of facts here to be explained by the hon. Minister. It is amusing to hear of experiments made in the good city of Ottawa by persons who desired to introduce the Nova Scotia coal and encourage its use by the people generally, but who themselves chose afterwards for some reason to use American coal. But it is a remarkable fact that not very long ago, in advertisements, I presume coming from the Department of Public Works, calling for tenders for coal, I think for the use of these buildings and Rideau Hall, it was expressly stipulated that the coal must be American.

An hon. MEMBER. Patriotism.

Mr. ANGLIN. Patriotism of the purest water. While it is a fact that Nova Scotia coal does not find its way to Ontario, it is also a fact that it is coming more largely into use elsewhere—for instance, the railway from St. John to Shediac, which formerly used wood, is now using coal. But we do deny that the increase is attributable to the National Policy. The hon. gentleman made some broad assertions as usual. He asserted very lately,