

policy could only have the effect of excluding British coal, and the exclusion of British coal was thus brought within the scope of the hon. gentleman's policy. Last year they had a very fair criterion, showing what the effect of a certain amount of duty on coal would be. The Grand Trunk Railway had, shortly before the meeting of the Coal Committee of last year, issued tenders for coal contracts, and those tenders were opened, he believed, while that Committee was sitting. The tenders accepted for Montreal were for Nova Scotia coal, \$3.96 per long ton at the wharf, which with 27c. per ton for cartage, cost delivered in yard, \$4.23; for Toronto, American coal was accepted at \$3.40 per short ton, equal to \$3.78 per long ton, a difference in price of 45c. in favour of United States coal at Toronto. If to this were added \$1 per ton, the lowest rate at which coal could possibly be borne from Montreal to Toronto, the difference against Nova Scotia coal would be just \$1.50 per ton. This was in the absence of any special arrangements for securing round trip freights by direct water communication. This evidence, arising out of a transaction which came directly under the notice of the Committee, proved that Nova Scotia coal, even under a protective duty of seventy-five cents per ton, would still be excluded from the Ontario market; a duty of at least \$1.50 per ton, would be required to place it on an equality with American coal. What would this useless outlay of money mean? Something like a million tons of coal were, as he had shown, imported into Canada; at seventy-five cents per ton, the result would be that, not one ton more of Nova Scotia coal would be sold than before the imposition of the tariff, and the people of Ontario and Quebec would be saddled with a tax of \$750,000 a year, as the result of what was called a national, but was really a purely sectional policy. This tax would be one which would fall every year to a greater and greater extent on the mass of consumers, and the consumption of coal was by no means confined to the cities, for, owing to the increasing scarcity of wood, it was rapidly ex-

tending back into the towns and villages and country. But hon. gentlemen opposite talked of establishing an interprovincial trade, and argued that, if a duty were placed on Nova Scotia coal, it would enable the people of the Lower Provinces to consume so much more of the breadstuffs and other products of Ontario. They spoke of a line of steamers being projected to carry the interprovincial trade, which would be thus established. But there were already several means of communication with those Provinces, and, if a line of steamers were running from Hamilton or Toronto to Cape Breton, what benefit would that be to the people of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, or the western portion of Nova Scotia? It would cost them less to buy their flour and carry it by other and more direct routes. So far as a domestic trade was concerned, any ingenious scheme of interprovincial trade would be utterly impracticable, and would only prove to be an interference with the ordinary course of commerce. If it were true that they could bring cargoes of coal up from Nova Scotia and carry back flour and wheat to Cape Breton, or elsewhere, for foreign shipment, then the problem was solved. If they could by that means deliver coal so cheaply in Western Canada that no duty was wanted, why impose a duty? If, in any of these ports, such as Sydney, they could obtain such an amount of foreign trade as would carry away all the produce of Western Canada which they could send down, and take back coal, then there was, according to the reasoning of the advocates of such a scheme, no necessity for imposing a duty at all.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

ELECTION PETITION BILL.—[BILL No. 15.]

(Mr. Haggart.)

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MACKENZIE: This Bill must stand.

MR. BOWELL: Is any objection made to it?