

lar a ton to send coal past these places, and the people of Quebec and Montreal now got their coal from Cape Breton. These hon. gentlemen spoke at times, a great deal about the desirability and necessity of sustaining intimate trade relations, and preserving, intact, our relations with Great Britain; but they were now asking that a duty should be placed on coal coming from Great Britain for the benefit of our people, though we were indebted to the people of Great Britain for defending us and sending out their soldiers —

MR. MITCHELL: Oh, nonsense; don't talk about that.

MR. JONES said he begged the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. gentleman might not attach any value to this matter, but he must know that Great Britain protected us with her army and navy.

MR. MITCHELL: Pull down the flag.

MR. JONES said he did not wonder that the hon. gentleman was restive under these allusions, as he was asking the House to impose a duty against the very country which protected us, and of which we now formed a part.

MR. MITCHELL: The hon. gentleman says I am asking for the imposition of a duty against the productions of Great Britain. I have declared that I will vote against the motion of my hon. friend and I oppose it.

MR. JONES said the hon. gentleman stated that he would vote for it.

MR. MITCHELL: On the contrary, I stated distinctly that I was going to vote against it.

MR. JONES: Against it?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes; against it.

MR. JONES said he understood the hon. gentleman to say that he would vote for it as part of a general policy.

MR. MITCHELL: Not at all, I stated distinctly that I was going to vote against it.

MR. JONES said that his remarks then applied to the hon. member for Cumberland. The hon. gentleman must know that, no matter what duty was imposed on coal, a certain amount of it

would come out from England. Ships brought it out as ballast; they got it for a small amount and they sold it at Montreal for about what it had cost. Even if \$1 a ton duty was levied, this coal would not be kept out; ships must have a certain amount of ballast, and therefore, they would bring it out no matter what the duty was. The hon. member for Cumberland had read an extract from the British *Trade Journal*, to which he attached very great importance; but here was an article in this publication which bore directly on the subject under consideration. This article appeared last month, and was headed "Does Protection protect." After quoting from the article, the hon. gentleman said that if the ship-owners sent their vessels to Montreal to carry away the products of the west, and had not something to bring out as ballast, or that would in some way compensate them, and pay part of the expenses of the voyage, then he laid down this proposition, that the shippers or the owners of the produce must pay the whole expense of the round voyage; and, therefore, it came to this, that the producers of the agricultural products of this country, the farmers and every man who raised anything to send abroad, by these steamers and sailing vessels, would then have to contribute so much more in increased freight under the system which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) would have introduced here. They must see that if these vessels could bring out a certain amount of coal or any other cargo, this would pay a certain proportion of the expenses of the round voyage, and just as certain as effect flowed from cause, so would natural competition give a lower rate of freight for the products of this country which were carried abroad; and there was no way in which the products in this country could be more directly interested to advantage than by having their products carried forward at a low rate from our shipping ports in this country; and, therefore, the hon. gentleman would see that on equally high authority as that which he had quoted few moments ago, a doctrine was laid down entirely opposite to the one which the hon. gentleman had quoted with refer-

MR. JONES.