

in Ontario. The following is the table from which I have been quoting :

Province.	Year.	Tons.	Total Cost.	Cost per Ton.	
				\$	\$ cts.
Ontario.....	1877	261,895	1,163,944	4	43
	1878	266,434	1,022,816	3	85
	1880	335,794	1,022,055	3	04
	1881	357,524	1,522,375	4	25
Quebec.....	1877	117,124	468,759	4	00
	1878	105,384	333,836	3	15
	1880	142,239	378,150	2	65
	1881	161,449	608,813	3	77
Nova Scotia.....	1877	11,877	44,560	3	74
	1878	10,592	31,169	2	93
	1880	12,513	32,467	2	58
	1881	15,969	54,661	3	70
New Brunswick.....	1877	23,223	92,823	4	00
	1878	21,240	73,555	3	46
	1880	24,232	63,095	2	81
	1881	28,243	104,807	3	70

It will be at once apparent that the price of coal in 1880 was less than in 1878, the first named year being the year after the imposition of the duty, and the second named year being the year immediately preceding it. So you here have that additional fact; in other words, there was a drop in the price as invoiced to Canadian dealers immediately after the National Policy was adopted, just as the Grand Trunk Railway puts its fare up when the St. Lawrence is closed, and puts its fare down when the St. Lawrence is open, simply because in one case they have to meet competition, and, in the other case, they have no competition. Bituminous coal followed the same rule, and the United States practically ceased sending any into the Dominion, with the exception of Ontario, where the invoiced prices, as per Customs returns, show an average of \$3. 3 per ton for 1881, as against \$3.67 for 1877. That shows the United States coal owners feared less the competition with Nova Scotia, because they found that it had not been sent forward to the extent they feared it would be, and they increased the price to a certain extent. Now, Sir, I think I have shown that the price of coal varies in the United States according to the degree of competition experienced by it from the coal from Nova Scotia and Great Britain; otherwise you would not have coal sent to Quebec at a lower price, you would not have coal sent a longer distance than it is to Toronto from the Pennsylvania coal fields. In Boston, a sea-board city of the United States, the price of coal is \$6.50. In the inland city of Chicago the price is \$8.50. How do hon. gentlemen account for that? The cost of carrying to the city of Boston, and the cost of carrying to Chicago is the same. I have under my hand a periodical published in New York, called *Coal*, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to verify the statement, he will find that the cost of carriage to Chicago and to Boston is the same—\$2 in each case—yet the price of coal in Boston is \$6.50, while in Chicago it is \$8.50, showing that the price of coal is fixed by the coal dealers and by the amount of competition. In Chicago there is no competition with British or Nova Scotia coal, and the consequence is that the price is put up to just the highest point the coal dealers can place it; showing again, Sir, as I have stated, that this question of its being placed on the competitive, or the non-competitive position, affects the price of coal. My authority for the statement I have made as to the freight rate to Boston is the *Boston Herald's* commercial report, and a periodical published in New York called *Coal*, and dated the 25th of January. The receipts of Nova Scotia and English coal into Boston, in 1880, were 54,781 tons. In 1881, somewhat

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

more; and a large proportion of the coal import in 1881 was from Nova Scotia, as Cape Breton coal owners endeavored to force it into that market at \$3.50 per ton. No coal was supplied to Chicago from others than the Pennsylvania coal fields. I think, under these circumstances, the House will have no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the several ports of Canada (and of Ontario especially) were, by reason of the duty imposed upon foreign coal, removed by the Pennsylvania coal owners from the list of non-competitive points to the list of competitive points. The proof of this is the fact that the Boston wholesale price, to dealers of anthracite, in 1881, was \$4.20, while the wholesale price in Toronto, of the same kind of coal, was, in 1881, \$4.20. The authority in this case is the *Boston Herald's* commercial article for the Boston price, and, for the Toronto price, the Customs returns and the following table, which gives the total import of coal into Ontario, and the price of anthracite, compared with Philadelphia—a non-competitive point:—

Year.	Quantity.	Cost of market of purchase.	Price per ton.	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	Philadelphia
				wholesale price.	more than Ontario.	less than Ontario.
	Tons.	\$	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1877.....	420,010	1,793,407	4.27	2 59	1.68
1878.....	406,971	1,476,022	3.62	3.22	1.00
1879 to March 15.....	322,528	1,252,703	3.88	2.89	1.00
1879 after March 15.....	93,895	245,255	2.71	2.37
1880.....	516,729	1,509,960	2.92	4 53	1 61
1881.....	344,833	1,499,143	4.34	4 90	1 00

This table shows, first, that prior to the 15th of March, 1879, the Philadelphia dealer purchased his coal at a cheaper rate than the Ontario coal dealer; second, that after the imposition of the duty, the average price of the Ontario coal dealers was less than that of Philadelphia in 1880, by \$1.61, and in the fiscal year of 1881, by 56 cents. If we compare Toronto with Philadelphia, we find that Toronto coal dealers obtained their supply during the calendar year 1881, at \$4.20 per ton against Philadelphia at \$4.90, or 70 cents less than Philadelphia; and if the duty were added to the price of the coal, there would still be a large margin in favor of Toronto against Philadelphia. Further evidence is to be found in the fact that coal sold at Ogdensburg, in the winter of 1880-81, for \$5.90, while at Prescott the retail price was \$6 per ton; the cost of freight to Prescott, harbor dues and unloading is 68 cents. If the duty were added to the cost of the coal, it ought to have sold at \$5.90 plus 68 cents plus 50 cents, or in all \$7.08. At Oswego, coal sold during the present year, at \$5.75; freight, from Oswego to Belleville, 40 cents; harbor dues and unloading, 28 cents; if duty were added to cost, 50 cents, the coal ought to sell at \$6.93, while the price at Belleville was \$6.50, showing that the result of the duty has been to decrease and not to increase the price of coal. At Buffalo, coal sells the present winter for \$5.70; the freight to Toronto is \$1; cartage 30 cents, or equal to \$7. The freight in this case is given on the authority of railway companies, that being the rate from the Bridge to Toronto for all quantities of coal under 10,000 tons. In summer rates are lower, Mr. Nairn, a coal dealer of Toronto, placing the freight at 70 cents during the summer. The price of coal then was \$6.50, in Toronto. During the present month the price of coal, in Toronto, was advertised at \$6.50, by P. Burns, a leading coal dealer. At that price, with winter rates of freight, coal is obtained by consumers at 50 cents less than the consumers of Buffalo pay for it. At Chicago, coal retails at from \$8 to \$8.50, or an average of \$8.25. The rail freight from Buffalo is \$2