

the difference in freight is 70 cents in favor of Toronto. If Toronto paid as much as Chicago it ought to pay \$8.25 minus 70 cents, or \$7.55; if the duty is added to the cost to the consumer, Toronto, to have its coal at the same proportionate rate as Chicago, would have to pay \$7.55 and duty 50 cents, or \$8.05. It actually pays \$6.50 to \$7. At Detroit coal sells at retail for \$6.25; freight from Buffalo 50 cents. The price at Toronto is \$6.50, with freight \$1, ought to be \$6.70, to be proportionately as dear as Detroit. In further proof that the duty is not paid by the people of Ontario see following table of the retail prices in Toronto at the several dates mentioned:—

	Hard Coal.	Soft Coal.
Oct 24, 1872 .....	\$7.00.....	\$8.00.....
" 23, 1873 .....	7.50.....	7.00.....
" 22, 1874 .....	7.75.....	7.00.....
" 30, 1875 .....	7.00.....	5.75.....
" 25, 1881.....	6.50.....	5.50.....

In 1881, with the duty of 50 cents in operation, the cost at Toronto of hard coal was \$6.50, and soft coal \$5.50, the lowest price at which this table shows it to have been purchased since 1872.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was it in 1884?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This table does not give it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it is a very convenient table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am taking the figures in this table from the prices furnished by the *Toronto Globe*—a table which shows that in no year between 1872 and 1875 inclusive, when there was no duty on coal, was coal as cheap in Toronto as it has been in 1881, with the duty fully established; so that the hon. gentleman will have to work at that table a good deal before he will be able to invalidate the conclusive argument which I have adduced therefrom—that the imposition of the duty on coal has been in favor of the Ontario consumer, so far as the price of coal is concerned. The *Philadelphia Ledger*, in December, said:

“Coal demand has been in excess of the ability of the companies to furnish it. It is really just cause for apprehension for the future, should the trouble of want of water or other causes continue to limit production.”

This was said because of the drought of last season; nevertheless, Toronto coal supply was cheaper to it than in full production years. Now, Sir, I have another table to which I wish to invite the attention of hon. gentlemen, as showing what the effect of the National Policy has been on this great and important industry. It is a comparative statement of the coal sales, labor, &c., in Nova Scotia, for 1873, the last year of the Macdonald Government; 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie rule; and, 1879 to 1881, three years under the National Policy. It shows the decrease under the Mackenzie Administration and the increase under the National Policy:

	1873.	1878.	Decrease in 1878.	1881.	Increase in 1881 over 1878.
Coal sales from Nova Scotia mines.....	881,106	693,511	187,595	1,034,800	341,289
The number of men employed.....	4,362	3,135	1,227	3,600	465
Number of days worked at coal.....	995,153	663,850	331,303	847,595	183,705
Tons of coal shipped from Nova Scotia to Montreal and Quebec.....	187,059	83,710	103,349	263,628	184,918
Total imports of coal at Montreal and Quebec....	415,380	328,074	87,306	529,091	201,017
Coal shipments from Cape Breton to Montreal and Quebec.....	80,213	28,108	52,105	146,122	118,014
Total tons of coal shipped from Sydney Harbor.....	253,396	128,061	125,335	258,961	130,900
Tonnage of ships arrived in Port Sydney.....	222,999	215,061	7,938	406,082	191,021

I give to hon. gentlemen opposite these facts and figures, which establish beyond question the fact that, so far from the people of Ontario having suffered from the imposition of a coal duty, the very reverse has been the case.

Mr. ANGLIN. By the Upper Provinces, I presume the hon. gentleman means Quebec and Ontario.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I mean Quebec and Ontario. At Cobourg, where I had the pleasure, at no very remote period, of discussing before the people—if not in the presence of the hon. leader of the Opposition—this very important question, I was able to deal with a very remarkable argument which he gave in favor of reducing the duty on coal. And what do hon. gentlemen suppose it was? And, Sir, I may say, while referring to that, that the ex-Finance Minister, the other night, gave us the same reason. He said, what a frightful injustice to railways. It was not the poor man then on whose behalf he complained—because I may say that these “shivering wretches” with whom the hon. ex-Finance Minister is so familiar, are not known to us. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the day is not remote when there were shivering wretches suffering from want of employment, and without the comforts of life. But I am happy to know that, under the policy now in operation in this country, all that is changed. Where there was misery and cold there is now comfort and happiness. But I say that coal is not the fuel of the poor man in Canada. I say that to nineteen-twentieths of the poor people of Canada wood is their fuel, and the price of coal does not touch the question at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman say that of Toronto, where the great consumption of coal is?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it of Canada. There are other places in this country besides Toronto, although the hon. gentleman does make it his home.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows that in the country districts the people have not the necessity nor the means of getting coal; but where coal is consumed, is it consumed by the rich or the poor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought I made it plain to the hon. gentleman that it is a matter of no moment to them, because I have shown that the poor man of Toronto gets his coal cheaper under the National Policy than he did before. But I say that, taking this whole Dominion, wood is the fuel of the poor man, and therefore it is a delusion for these hon. gentlemen to dwell on the price of coal as a hardship to the poor. I have shown that it is not a hardship but a benefit to the poor. The hon. gentlemen were greatly alarmed for two classes, and who were they? Why, Sir, they were the railways and the manufacturers. I thought these manufacturers were bloated aristocrats, that you could not take too much out of. But, Sir, it appears that these hon. gentlemen as the day approaches when they have to be put in the balance and weighed, are becoming very sensitive in regard to the manufacturers, and they want coal put on the free list in order to increase the enormous profits to these manufacturers. Suppose the manufacturer had to pay an addition of 50 cents a ton on coal, he was able to pay it, because we had given him an increased production. We had provided for fostering and protecting his industry against the slaughtering from the neighboring country that formerly crushed it out, and thus enabled him to pay this additional 50 cents a ton without feeling it. But, Sir, what about the railways? Have the railways any ground for complaint? How was the hon. the ex-Finance Minister able to make a case in respect to the railway? By quoting the speech of Sir Henry Tyler? No; but by misquoting the speech of Sir Henry Tyler. The hon. gentleman put words in the mouth of Sir Henry Tyler which he never uttered. I challenge him on this point. I say more. I say the hon. gentleman,