

get better prices now as compared with the prices in former days, when they had the American farmer to compete with. Still, hon. gentlemen will be found to rise—and to-night, probably, some one will follow me, and repeat that fallacy, which has been exposed over and over again. Sir, in reply to the question, What has this Government done for the people of Canada? I say they have given back to the people a duty on tea of \$1,184,016; a duty on coffee of \$76,313; a duty on tin of \$91,719; a stamp tax, a most objectionable tax, as every hon. member will agree, has been taken off, affording the people a relief of \$200,000. They have been relieved from the postage on newspapers and periodicals to the extent of \$64,250; there has been a reduction of the wire, turpentine and scrap iron duty, \$31,000; and of the Excise tax on tobaccos, \$700,000. Will hon. gentlemen say that that is not doing something for the people of Canada? On these items alone that I have enumerated—and I might go on and extend the list—the Government have remitted to the people of Canada \$2,027,298 in duties on these goods that enter into the consumption of the people of Canada in their daily life. But some gentlemen may say: You have taxed the farmers' coal. This has been frequently repeated, not only during this debate, but in the debates of former years. I was led to enquire as to whether that was really a fact, and could be substantiated by the circumstances of the years gone by. I had the patience to refer to the quotations in the *Globe*, that very excellent newspaper which hon. gentlemen opposite will not discredit, and which I will not discredit when questions of prevailing prices are at issue. I say I considered it advisable, when hon. gentlemen opposite made that statement, to enquire into the facts; and what did I find? I take a period of the year when the coal is laid in by the poor man, and when it is consumed, namely, in December. According to the *Globe* the price of coal on 30th December, 1874—and I will take the last week of each year—was: hard, \$8; soft, \$7. 1875, hard, \$8.50; soft, \$7. 1876, hard, \$6.50; soft, \$7. 1877, hard, \$6.50; soft, \$6.50. 1878, hard, \$5.50; soft, \$5.50. The average is \$7 for hard coal and \$6.50 for soft coal during the term of the Reform Administration. I now come to the time during which the National Policy was in force, and a tax was imposed on coal. I am not going to debate again, as it has been debated here and throughout the country, as to who pays the duty in that case; but after I have submitted the figures and compared the two periods, I think every intelligent citizen, if not hon. gentlemen opposite, will arrive at the conclusion that the tax on coal has not been actually charged to the consumer. I find, according to the *Globe*: in 1879, hard coal, \$4.75; soft, \$6.50. 1880, hard, \$7; soft, \$6.50. 1881, hard, \$7; soft, \$7. 1882, hard, \$6.50; soft, \$6.50. 1883, hard, \$7; soft, \$6.50. The average price of hard coal during the time of the National Policy and when a tax was imposed on coal, was \$6.45 per ton, against \$7 under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite; and for soft coal the average price was \$6.60 against \$6.50 during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The figures actually show a difference of 10 cents for soft coal in favor of the time when the Reform party was in power; and, singular to say, that difference is the exact amount of the difference in the duty between hard and soft coal, the duty on the former being 50 cents per ton and on the latter 60 cents. Those are facts gleaned with a great deal of care from the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I warrant them to be correct, as having come from that source. I now come to another part of the subject, which has been discussed until hon. gentlemen have been able to get as near the facts as they will be ever likely to do. We have heard a great deal about the exodus, and if the House will pardon me for a few moments, I will deal with that matter as it is reported on by the secretary of the Department.

Mr. HESSON.

ment, Mr. Lowe. In his report presented to this House, dated 20th February, 1885, we have the following remarks:

"Sir—I have the honor to report that, in obedience to your instructions, I have again made an examination into the figures published by the Washington Bureau of Statistics, as representing the alleged emigration from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1884.

"The figures given are 60,584, including 124 from Newfoundland, against 70,241 the previous year, showing a decrease of 9,657, or 13.07 per cent., under the heading of 'Dominion of Canada.'"

Those figures are taken from the United States Bureau of Statistics. They are not of our furnishing; they have not been obtained by this Government; and hon. gentlemen opposite have been in the habit of quoting American figures as being more correct than our statistics, and they should be willing to accept that part of the statement, coming from that source. The report continues:

"The way in which the figures are alleged to have fallen off at Port Huron is, at least, a curious circumstance. They stand as follow since 1880:—

Years.	Total alleged immigration.	Huron Port.
1880 .....	99,706	94,375
1881 .....	125,391	111,170
1882 .....	98,808	71,422
1883 .....	70,241	45,393
1884 .....	60,460	22,801

I think this is worthy of some little consideration. When it is observed that an enormous number had crossed at Port Huron, and that after this Government had made enquiries for themselves, and sent the secretary of the Department to spend a long time enquiring into the fact and examining as to the manner in which the Americans obtained those statistics, it is most remarkable that ever since that work was undertaken by this Government the number of persons passing at that particular point, where nearly all the immigrants crossed, according to American statement, only 22,000 crossed in 1884, as against 99,000 in 1882. The explanation seems quite clear. It is simply this, that our Government have found a way of verifying the figures as regards this matter. And that leads me to another point, which I think of considerable importance—the best method of ascertaining the exact state of affairs, as regards the alleged exodus. I come to the intimation on the part of our Government to ascertain for the themselves the exact state of affairs. The secretary reports in this way:

"Before coming to the examination of the question as it actually exists at Port Huron, I think it is better to point out the leading fact, which is established by the figures representing the total movement of passengers from Canada and to Canada by the whole of the Grand Trunk system in the east and in the west.

"The figures are as follows:—

Total outs from Canada to the United States....	210,941
Less—European passengers.....	9,010
Total net outs .....	201,931
Totals ins to Canada from the States.....	206,616
Less—European passengers.....	1,778
Total net ins.....	204,838
Net gain to Canada of difference between ins and outs.....	2,907

I hope I have made that clear, as it was intended to be by the secretary in his report. I think, if we take the whole of the passenger traffic on the Grand Trunk and Great Western, east, west and south—I think, if you take the entire travel out and in, and strike the difference between the two, you must arrive as close to the facts as ever you will be able to do, unless you have men placed there taking an actual count of them. These facts are taken from the Grand Trunk Company, and the exhibits are in the Minister's report, marked from "A" to "G," showing the official report by Mr. T. B. Hawson, the Traffic Auditor of the Grand Trunk. As they have to account, not only for all