

asks what about last season. After the opening of navigation—or after July—there was a falling off, but what was the cause of it? There was a decreased export from the United States ports during that period. At New York there was a falling off of 22 per cent., Baltimore about 24 per cent., Philadelphia 40 per cent., and Boston, which was the lowest, I think, something like 16 per cent. More than that there was what seldom occurs. There was a ring which had been in existence for two years by which the grain trade of Chicago was controlled, and which kept up prices, and this ring stipulated with the railway companies, such was the competition among the roads, for largely reduced rates, which had the effect of sending the trade by way of New York rather than by the St. Lawrence. It was to these exceptional circumstances, especially the reduction of the exports of United States grain, that the falling off of nearly 32 per cent., as compared with the previous year, was due. It was not due to the fact that the produce of the United States had to be passed through in bond and shipped in bond at the different ports of the Dominion. I give these figures to show that the fear, expressed by our friends opposite that the St. Lawrence trade would be diminished by the change in the fiscal policy, has not been realized. Now, Sir, the next objection raised by hon. gentlemen opposite was, in their own language, that the Tariff would dismember the Union. How was it to dismember the Union? Because, as they alleged, that the imposition of the new Tariff would increase the taxation of certain of the smaller Provinces, and that they would be knocking at the doors of the Dominion, demanding to be relieved of the burdens imposed upon them by the operations of that Tariff, or permission to withdraw from the Union. Let us place together for purposes of comparison the two Provinces of Quebec and Ontario—for a large portion of the goods consumed in Ontario are entered at the Port of Montreal—and place together the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, because New Brunswick receives from the western portion of Nova Scotia a large part of her natural products, while the merchants of St. John supply largely the merchants of the western part of Nova Scotia, the revenue being collected in New Brunswick, and paid by the consumer in Nova Scotia. If you take these two Provinces together and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec together, what do we find? That under the Tariff of the hon. gentlemen opposite, there was collected $14\frac{1}{2}$ cents per head for Customs in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, during those five years, more than were collected from the people of Ontario and Quebec. Now take up the last Trade Returns, and see what is the operation of the new Tariff, as far as the people of those Provinces are concerned, and you will find the difference in the last two years is that, instead of being $14\frac{1}{2}$ cents in excess, it is largely below the amount that has been paid by Ontario and Quebec. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Anglin) claps his hands, and I am very glad he is pleased with such results. We must take into consideration that in 1879-80 the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick paid into the Treasury a considerable sum of money in the shape of duty on the sugar they consumed and refined in Montreal, but, during the present year, that has been reversed, and the tables will show, from this time forward, that the refiners of Nova Scotia and those of New Brunswick, will pay to the Customs officials of those two Provinces a large sum of money for goods consumed in Ontario and Quebec, and, therefore, making every allowance for the duties that would have been paid by the people of the Lower Provinces upon the articles that are purchased from Ontario and Quebec, it will be found that this Tariff, instead of having an injurious effect upon Nova Scotia and New Brunswick it has had a beneficial effect in reducing the comparative taxation, and it has had a still more beneficial effect on the Province of Prince Edward Island. It will

be found that, if any section has to complain, it is not the smaller Provinces, and on behalf of whom the sympathies of this House were invoked; for the practical effect has been a comparative reduction rather than an increase of their taxation under the operation of this Tariff. Then, Sir, we were told that this Tariff would be oppressive to a certain section of the Dominion of Canada by the imposition of a duty on coal, while it would do no good whatever to Nova Scotia or other portions of the Dominion where there are large coal deposits. When I was asked by an hon. gentleman opposite in 1879 what increase of the consumption or what demand the Government expected to create for Nova Scotia coal by the operation of the Tariff, I stated that probably within a short time the consumption of Nova Scotia coal in the Dominion of Canada would increase to the extent of 400,000 tons.

Mr. ANGLIN. And displace American coal to that extent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I did; "to a very large extent" I said; or, if it will please the hon. gentleman more, I will say to that extent. I did not suppose, Mr. Speaker, sanguine as I was, with reference to the effect of this Tariff, that in three years, by the increased industries and by the increased demand for steam power, it would make a demand which would require over 400,000 tons to meet it; but we find that these industries have been growing up all over the country to such an extent that it has required more than 400,000 tons from the Nova Scotia miners, and has also caused a largely increased amount to be imported from the United States as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman state where that coal was distributed in the other Provinces?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot now say where, but I know some of it reached Cobourg.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How much?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know that, because I saw it going into a factory there. It was 800 tons I think they told me they had purchased from Nova Scotia, and I heard that some Nova Scotia coal was furnished to a factory in Kingston, and it was declared to be the cheapest coal for steam purposes; and at Guelph, also, I am told there was some consumed. But there is this on record: that in 1877, 757,000 tons of coal was raised in the mines of Nova Scotia; in 1878, 770,603 tons; in 1879, 788,271 tons; in 1880, 1,032,710 tons; and in 1881, 1,116,248 tons; and to be added to that, there was in British Columbia, 214,243 tons, against 145,542 tons in 1878, or a total of 916,145 tons in 1878, against a production in 1881 of 1,333,391 tons, being an increase of 417,246 tons per annum.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman now state the amount of export in each of those years?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. To the United States it was just about the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE. To all quarters?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is just about the same, leaving the consumption in the Dominion of Canada, increased by that proportion, 400,000 tons.

Mr. BUNSTER. Mr. Speaker, might I—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BUNSTER. I have a right to put the Finance Minister right. Were it not for the absence of the Island Railway we would have had over a million tons of an increase.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It only shows what is in store for us then. There was another very grave objection