ATION.

eady for Purchasers (general
a Large and Select Variety of
uitable for

New Year Presents
ES) CONSISTING OF

nd Card Receivers
Stands,

or Stands
eceivers,
d Receivers,
Trays,
Flower Holders,
y handsome),
erchief Boxes,
stands,
d Puff Boxes,
xes,

kets, &c., &c.

rtment of DRUGGISTS' SUN-

en expressly selected for the
ill be sold at a moderate ad-
H.
D. M. ARTHUR.
MEDICAL HALL,
Charlotte St., opp. King Sq.

LIFAX
ED SUGARS
RECEIVED:
AR LOAD,
OMPRISING—
d Yellow C.;
Yellow C.

RBOUR BROS.,
11 South Wharf.

Buckwheat, &c.

INDSAY & CO.,
eived from New York:—
CAN BUCKWHEAT.
d from London:—
TS: CAPTAIN BISCUITS;
do;
do;
ACCAROON do;
do;
OWROOT do;
do;
TSKS do;
LOGAN, LINDSAY CO

PRING GOODS.

Arrivals and now in Stock:—
S BLUE and BLACK WORSTED
OATINGS.
SCOTCH TWEEDS;
and Black BROAD CLOTHS;
and Black DOESKINS;
AD—Linen and Cotton;
COTTON—All Prices;
NS—All Qualities;
TE COTTONS;
s and Gents' HOSIERY;
ADIAN TWEEDS—All Quali-
all Wares, consisting of Braids,
ONS, &c., &c.
variety of other Goods suitable
. An endless variety of CLOTH-
rior make.
yle Felt Hats, &c., &c., &c.
every day rail, and English
c.

ONES & CO.
St., St. John, N. B.

Y IMPORTED!
LANDING:
lencia Raisins;
alencia Oranges;
xtra Fine Tea, for Family
se.
—ALSO:—
Starch;
Packages Tobacco.
n warehouse, for sale very low,
otes, by
GEO. ROBERTSON.
10 WATER STREET.

ion on Tea.
give our Customers the full ben-
duty off Tea and Coffee.
of Fine Retailing Grades
on Hand.

NS & FIGGURES
lesale Grocers,
k Street.

Lamp Chimneys.
Received:
amp Chimneys— All Sizes;
erican Oil--Best Q'lity;
CAMERON,
rince Wm. Street.

LE OR TO RENT.
h Dwelling House and Barn, situate
e from the City, on the Vil
of Rothesay, Kings County. The
100 acres of excellent land, fifty of
. Will be sold cheap or rented on
of splendid land, 30 acres of which
e on the same road, about nine
y, in Kings County. There is some
ls latter portion. For particulars
ER McMANUS, CLARENCE HOUSE
or to RITCHIE & DUFFY, Barrie.
apr 2 tf

NOTICE.
IN BROTHERS.
wishing clothing made to measure
le will please bear in mind that we
STOCK OF CLOTH on hand ex-
or that trade, and will furnish a
ort notice and at a moderate price.
MULLIN BROTHERS,
Cor. Dock st. and North Wharf.

n Breakfast Tea!
OR SALE BY
dington & Merritt.

IGHT!
liers, Hall Lights,
kets, Pendants.
AND LAMPS,
e, China, Glass, &c.
ERICAN AND CANADIAN.
R. CAMERON,
64 Prince Wm. Street.

TOMATOES.
CASES
—OF—
Canned Sugar Corn,
(2lb. Cans.)
s Windsor Tomatoes,
(3lb. Cans.)
d Retail by
GTON & MERRITT,
55 CHARLOTTE STREET.

JOHN WEEKLY FREEMAN
Saturday morning from the office
GERMAIN STREET.
ONE DOLLAR per annum in ad
or delivered in any part of the city
land.
ts inserted a reasonable rates.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE

Saint John Weekly Freeman.

DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

Hon. Mr. Anglin's Speech on the Budget Debate.

Mr. Anglin. The long personal attack made by the hon. Minister of Railways upon the member for Centre Huron has, perhaps, served to distract the attention of the House from the question we now have under consideration. It is not my purpose to take any part in the contest between these two gentlemen. I feel that the hon. member for Centre Huron is abundantly able to take care of himself in matters of that kind, and I am quite willing to leave it to him to defend his reputation against the charges made by the hon. Minister of Railways. I think, on the whole, it would be better that we should address ourselves to the subject-matter before the House. If we were to accept the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Finance as unquestionable—and I remember that only a short time ago it was said to be something quite improper for any member on this side of the House to question statements made by these hon. gentlemen or their subordinates—if we were to allow them to state our case as they pleased, and as they have chosen to do in more than one instance; if we were to accept as unquestionable, premises that we regard as absolutely false, we would then be compelled to accept also the deductions at which they have chosen to arrive. But we, on our side of the House, question almost every statement they have made, either as utterly inaccurate, or as a very skilful perversion of what we regard as true. The hon. Minister of Railways chose to commence his speech this afternoon by declaring that neither he nor the Minister of Finance was ever truly regarded as a Free Trader, that nothing could be found to prove that they had ever taken, in the Governments of the Provinces to which they both belong, a course as Free Traders, or advocated a policy that could be fairly called a Free Trade policy. Yet, a few minutes afterwards, with an inaccuracy, an inconsistency, a reckless disregard of self-contradiction, which distinguished that hon. gentleman this afternoon more than in any speech I ever heard him deliver, he told us distinctly that he had always advocated Free Trade in Nova Scotia as far as it could be carried out there, because in the peculiar circumstances of that Province Free Trade was a necessity. He told us, furthermore, that for many years before Confederation he was an advocate of a Union of the Provinces, and in that he told us what is correct; but when he proceeded to tell us that, in adopting a 15 per cent. Tariff after Confederation the hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House did not mean to adopt a policy of Free Trade, but rather a Protectionist Tariff policy, and that in framing that Tariff they had acted strictly upon the principle of Protection, he asked this House to believe what is impossible for us to accept. A 15 per cent. policy was adopted, I believe by the Parliament of old Canada, and that 15 per cent. became the Tariff after Confederation, avowedly for the reason that the people of the Maritime Provinces were known to be Free Traders; that it would not do to offend their Free Trade principles by asking them to accept even the old Tariff, but that the old Tariff must be modified in the direction of Free Trade in order to reconcile the people to Confederation, to which it was known a great majority was strongly opposed. That was the true reason why the rate of taxation on great part of our imports was reduced to 15 per cent. But they placed upon the free list a large number of articles, and he claims that as a measure of protection. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if it was a measure of protection, in 1868-69, to place a large number of articles upon the free list, how has it come to pass to-day that it is a measure of Protection to take off that free list so large a number of articles and reduce it to such insignificant proportions? How is it that the hon. the Minister of Finance has found it necessary, even this Session, to come down and add some of the articles to the free list, which, a short time ago, according to his principle of protection, he took off that list? No, Sir, it was not acting upon any principle of Protection; it was acting upon a principle which has always guided the advocates of a revenue Tariff policy, that that large free list was adopted in 1868-69, and was maintained from that time till the unhappy year of 1879. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman, after having contradicted himself in that extraordinary way, after having made those extraordinary statements, and placed himself in that strange position, proceeded to speak on the question of the coal duties. He told us truly that for many years he has been an advocate of a duty upon coal, and he told us, what we have heard from him often before, that he, for his part, could see no good reason why, for revenue purposes alone, a duty should not be imposed on coal. He added that one of the strongest objections against the duty on coal was the fact that it was a partial and a sectional impost and this he seemed to admit. But, he strove to contend that, although in some senses the duty is a sectional impost, nevertheless, it does not bear largely on the poorer classes, in any part of the country, because, forsooth, the poorer people use wood for domestic purposes rather than coal; and, when asked by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) what he thought of the duty as it affected Toronto, he scouted the very idea of having any regard for the working classes of even so large a city as Toronto, and overlooked the fact, that if the working classes of Toronto alone were affected by this duty on coal there would be a sufficiently strong reason why it should not be imposed. But, we all know that coal has been taking the place of wood in all our large cities and towns for many years past; that every day it is becoming more and more the fuel of the working classes—I will not particularly say of the poorer classes, because the hon. gentleman repudiates the idea that we have now any poor class in Canada. He speaks of those who were in want, several years ago, as shivering wretches. That is the language employed by these patrons of the poor—not the brothers or the protectors but the patrons of the working classes, and he speaks of those who, owing to circumstances over which they have no control, owing to the will of a Providence, who so directed the affairs of this country and of the whole world, that a few years ago we had generally wide-spread distress, so that many shivered for want of fuel—speaks of them not as men having the same feeling as himself—men as respectable as he would be if every charge made against him were proved a calumny; he speaks of them as an inferior order, as shivering wretches.

Sir Charles Tupper. The hon. gentleman will, probably, allow me to correct him. I suppose he does not intend, personally or unintentionally, to do me an injustice, but when he says that I used the expression "shivering wretches," he is mistaken, for I used that expression as a quotation from a speech of the ex-Finance Minister. I did not use the expression myself, so that the reproof falls upon his friend and not upon me.

Mr. Anglin. Then it is only to be regretted that the hon. gentleman, to whom I listened with great attention, did not use this expression so that we could understand it. Well, Sir, the coal duty is a sectional duty. It is true that a very large portion of the coal imported into the country, as well as produced in our own mines, is used for manufacturing and railway purposes; but it is also true that a very large portion of it is used for domestic purposes, and that a large number of the people of this country feel very severely and sensibly the burden which is imposed upon them by the tax on coal, unless, indeed, they can be persuaded, and they never have been persuaded yet, that the Americans pay the duty instead of their having to pay it themselves. I believe that the statement made to that effect by the hon. gentleman is one which will startle the country as much as any he ever made. He has never shown himself deficient in that quality which Danton has said is so necessary to those who would carry their purposes by means of strong assertions; but I do not think he has ever ventured to go much further in the way of assertion than he did when he said the Americans pay the whole duty on coal. The Finance Minister went so far as to say that the Americans pay at least one half the duty on coal; and I think we were a little startled in this House, and I think the business people throughout Canada were startled by that statement of the hon. gentleman, but the hon. gentleman is not advanced enough with regard to this coal duty to suit the views of his hon. colleague. The hon. gentleman told us, in the early part of his speech, that some time ago one of his colleagues, a gentleman who took a prominent position in discussing these trade questions, entertained the opinion that the tax on coal, and, I think, the tax on flour, as being sectional and oppressive in their nature, would lead to much trouble if imposed; but he says that that gentleman, like many others in his party, was not sufficiently advanced to know that the tax on coal, instead of being an injury to the poorer classes or to those who use coal for any purpose, would be a benefit, and would enable us to take money out of the pockets of the Americans for our own service and purposes. But, Sir, he has himself undergone a very material change of opinion upon that point, and within a very short time. I ever touched before. In reply to what he knew would be the answer to that, he used most extraordinary arguments in the hope of bringing the people of this country to believe that they do not suffer anything from the National Policy, because many staple articles can be purchased to-day at lower prices than they could four or five years ago. He thought that very conclusive and very convincing. It may be to those who are superficial enough to be led by the old *post hoc propter hoc* style of argument; but to the thinking business people of this country, arguments of that kind will not carry the weight which the hon. gentleman seems to imagine. The real question with respect to coal, as with respect to every other article is this: is it or is it not to-day dearer because of the imposition of these additional taxes? If, by reason of the additional taxation, prices have been increased 5, 10 or 20 per cent., to that extent is the National Policy a burden and grievance to the people. The hon. the Minister of Railways spoke about the price of coal in Chicago, and of the fact that railway competition reduces the cost of freight and that sometimes even prices at the place of production are reduced by competition, at the same time pointing out that there are competing points to which freight comes at lower rates than are charged for shorter distances. That was no doubt, the fact, but competition between water and rail routes existed before the National Policy came into force. Probably there have been some developments in American railways, which probably may have tended to cheapen coal at particular points; but competition has not been increased in the slightest degree by reason of the adoption of the National Policy by the people of Canada. The hon. the Minister of Railways has mentioned that the people of Chicago have to pay very much higher for their coal than those of Boston, because he says, there is some competition in Boston and none in Chicago. The only competition at Boston is the little that comes from Nova Scotia, and perhaps a few cargoes come from England, but I do not understand that coal is received there in sufficiently large quantities to compete with the coal from American mines. The competition to-day is less than it was a few years ago when coal was admitted duty free. No doubt, in the present state of things in the United States, if a higher protective duty on coal were asked, Congress would be willing to grant it; they got all the protection they chose to ask in the past. The hon. Minister has compared the prices at Chicago with those on this side of the line, and has declared that prices have changed since the National Policy was introduced; not merely to an extent equal to the 50 cents duty but to a very much larger extent. The operation of the National Policy, if we are to accept the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, are of the most extraordinary character, not merely mysterious and miraculous, but actually taking the place of Providence itself. Providence, according to those hon. gentlemen, is now but a minor influence in the affairs of the world. Indeed since the great National Policy has come into force, there is no longer, if we may believe them, a Providential controlling power over nations, producing abundant harvests in some countries when the harvests in other countries are deficient, and making peoples feel they are dependent on each other. Providence is now a minor power, and the National Policy of Canada is that which regulates the state of the crops in the Dominion, the United States and Europe, and regulates the commerce of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone so far as to claim that every commercial change which happens to prove advantageous to the Canadian people is the result not of the action and control of an over-ruling Providence, but of the National Policy of which they boast so much. The hon. Minister of Railways spoke afterwards of the prices of coal at Prescott and Ogdensburg. If I apprehend correctly his remarks they were to this effect: To bring coal from Ogdensburg to Prescott costs 67½ cents per ton for freight and more for port and other charges; but the price at Prescott is much lower than the price at Ogdensburg with freight and charges and duty added. It is well known, however, that it costs less to bring coal to Prescott in the first instance than to take it to Ogdensburg. In that way the hon. gentleman and those who have labored for him have endeavored to make a case in his behalf. Those assertions are so wide of the mark that they must have seemed absurd to hon. gentlemen opposite, although they were ready to cheer the hon. gentleman. They watched every opportunity to encourage their leader; no strong assertion was allowed to pass without its cheer, nothing that could be called a *bon mot* passed without a redoubled cheer. There was some little joke passed which we on this side of the House could scarcely understand, over which hon. gentlemen opposite went into ecstacies; but while the hon. Minister was reading his long elaborate calculations to prove that the Americans paid the duty on coal imported into Canada, his followers were silent. The calculations did not go down. They knew too well that these statements were not only incredible, but that the people would not be misled by them, that the Minister in making that statement was damaging their case before the intelligent constituencies of the Dominion, and they were silent because they were apprehensive. Glances were exchanged which indicated to us that they would very much prefer that the hon. Minister had not dwelt so long on that subject, and had not gone so far as he did. While the hon. Minister was talking an hon. member was prompted to send a telegram to ascertain the prices of coal at Detroit and Windsor, which are a mile apart. I did not think that it was necessary to send such a telegram. When I saw statements similar to those read by the Minister appear in some of the newspapers of the Tory party, I confess I was perfectly astonished to find that any person could write any such articles and hope they would be received with favor by any portion of the people. They were so palpably absurd, so utterly unwarrantable, and so intensely ridiculous that I never could imagine that the man who wrote them really believed they would be accepted by any large number of people. Perhaps they thought they could calculate largely on the credulity of the people, and indeed they showed this day after day, by the manner in which they dealt with this question. Therefore, I was not surprised to find hon. gentlemen opposite stunned by the course taken by the hon. Minister of Railways, nor was I much surprised to find the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who often owed his success to the audacity of his assertions, take such a course. It seemed infatuation it is true. It seemed to be one of those cases which prompted an ancient writer to say that, "whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad." Some demon must have taken away from the hon. gentleman that acuteness of intellect, that power of vision, that capacity for understanding how far he can traffic on the credulity of his audience, not in this House alone, but throughout the country when he ventured on such statements as those. They will be published broadcast throughout the country, and I hope every business man will get a copy, so that he may be able to judge of the character of the statements which hon. gentlemen opposite rely on as a means to carry the elections, about which they have been so talk so much lately. Here is a statement of prices in Detroit and Windsor, telegraphed while the Minister was speaking, by a gentleman whose authority is undoubted. The difference in price between Windsor and Detroit is 75 cents. At Windsor coal sells at $7.50, which, in Detroit, can be bought at from $6.50 to $6.75. Twenty-five cents, I presume will bring it across the river and the duty is fifty cents,—but I am told that a vessel could as easily turn into the harbor of Windsor as Detroit, so that in that case the carriage would add nothing to the cost.

Mr. McCallum. Will the hon. gentleman name his authority?

Mr. Anglin. He is Mr. A. A. Bartlett.

Mr. Mills. Perfectly reliable.

Mr. Bowell. Is he Police Magistrate at Windsor?

Mr. Anglin. Yes.

Mr. Bowell. That is all right, he is a very respectable Grit.

Mr. Anglin. All Grits are respectable. When they cease to be respectable they cease to be Grits. But the hon. gentleman said that after the imposition of the 50 cent duty, Toronto, Montreal and Quebec became competing points; and the dealers on the other side determined to sell to parties at those points so low as to enable them to pay the duty and compete with the home produced article. He did not tell us much about the prices of bituminous coal, but dealt more with the anthracite rather than the bituminous, part of which comes from Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. At all events, Quebec and Montreal and places between were points at which our coal competed with coal brought from the United States long before the National Policy was imposed. On former occasions when this question was discussed in this House, it was stated that coal could be brought up the Gulf of St. Lawrence at a considerable profit to Quebec and at a fair profit to Montreal, where it could fairly compete with the bituminous coal from the United States. I remember well that Mr. Mitchell, who then, I think, was interested in a line of steamers running to and from the Gulf, made that statement, which was also made by many other business men, so that Quebec and Montreal and intermediate places were as much competing points as they are to-day. In the Lower Provinces it is said we are still further from the coal-fields of the United States, than Quebec or Montreal. I do not know whether it costs much or anything more to bring coal to St. John or Halifax than to Montreal or Quebec, but judging from prices I think coal can be imported as cheaply to the former as to the latter points. According to the theory advanced by the hon. Minister of Railways there must be an understanding among the coal dealers of the United States to sell to owners in other parts of the country to know this fact, of which some of them have been wofully ignorant.

Mr. Bowell. I suppose they have been getting their information from you.

Mr. Anglin. They have been getting their information in a very telling way—through their own pockets—they have been paying the duty. Why, I notice that the tug owners of Quebec have been in the strange belief that the duties paid have been coming out of their pockets and not out of those of the Americans, and have sent a memorial to this House stating that this tax is a burden and interferes with their business, and that altogether it has been an injury and a serious detriment and loss to them.

Mr. Bowell. Do these gentlemen go to the United States for their coal?

Mr. Anglin. They can get it without landing it, I suppose.

Mr. Bowell. If the other got it, they could get it without landing.

Mr. Anglin. Then I suppose these gentlemen will be very much obliged to me for obtaining this information for them. The hon. Minister of Customs has come to the relief of the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), who wants to get his coal in free for the use of his tugs; and after the explanation of the hon. Minister, that hon. gentleman, I suppose, will not find it necessary to pay that money over to the Treasury, to which, according to the teachings of the hon. Minister of Railways, it most unquestionably belongs. The hon. Minister of Railways says that in a few months he has learned a great deal on this subject—new light has dawned on that wonderful understanding of his. I remember how, five or six years ago, when he was talking on this question of coal duty, it seemed impossible for him to know any more of it than he knew then. But he has received new light since, and this afternoon he read to us some most elaborate calculations and statements, which he says prove most conclusively—though I could not see the proof—that the Americans pay this duty on coal. I understood the hon. Minister to make this statement—that some years before the imposition of this duty on coal, the price in Toronto was very much higher than the price in Philadelphia, but that immediately after the imposition of the duty, the price in Toronto not only fell to the price in Philadelphia, but the price in Toronto actually fell to $1.64 a ton lower than the price in Philadelphia; and he asks the people of this country to believe that the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal has led to that extraordinary change. Well, Sir, if the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal has that extraordinary effect, why does not the hon. gentleman prove himself logically consistent for once, and ask this House to vote the imposition of another 50 cents on coal? If the Americans pay the duty, why should we spare them? Why should we be satisfied with taking a paltry 50 cents out of them if we can get a dollar or two? Besides, according to the hon. gentleman's reasoning, it will reduce the price to a lower point than it has ever touched before. In reply to what he knew would be the answer to that, he used most extraordinary arguments in the hope of bringing the people of this country to believe that they do not suffer anything from the National Policy, because many staple articles can be purchased to-day at lower prices than they could four or five years ago. He thought that very conclusive and very convincing. It may be to those who are superficial enough to be led by the old *post hoc propter hoc* style of argument; but to the thinking business people of this country, arguments of that kind will not carry the weight which the hon. gentleman seems to imagine. The real question with respect to coal, as with respect to every other article is this: is it or is it not to-day dearer because of the imposition of these additional taxes? If, by reason of the additional taxation, prices have been increased 5, 10 or 20 per cent., to that extent is the National Policy a burden and grievance to the people. The hon. the Minister of Railways spoke about the price of coal in Chicago, and of the fact that railway competition reduces the cost of freight and that sometimes even prices at the place of production are reduced by competition, at the same time pointing out that there are competing points to which freight comes at lower rates than are charged for shorter distances. That was no doubt, the fact, but competition between water and rail routes existed before the National Policy came into force. Probably there have been some developments in American railways, which probably may have tended to cheapen coal at particular points; but competition has not been increased in the slightest degree by reason of the adoption of the National Policy by the people of Canada. The hon. the Minister of Railways has mentioned that the people of Chicago have to pay very much higher for their coal than those of Boston, because he says, there is some competition in Boston and none in Chicago. The only competition at Boston is the little that comes from Nova Scotia, and perhaps a few cargoes come from England, but I do not understand that coal is received there in sufficiently large quantities to compete with the coal from American mines. The competition to-day is less than it was a few years ago when coal was admitted duty free. No doubt, in the present state of things in the United States, if a higher protective duty on coal were asked, Congress would be willing to grant it; they got all the protection they chose to ask in the past. The hon. Minister has compared the prices at Chicago with those on this side of the line, and has declared that prices have changed since the National Policy was introduced; not merely to an extent equal to the 50 cents duty but to a very much larger extent. The operation of the National Policy, if we are to accept the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, are of the most extraordinary character, not merely mysterious and miraculous, but actually taking the place of Providence itself. Providence, according to those hon. gentlemen, is now but a minor influence in the affairs of the world. Indeed since the great National Policy has come into force, there is no longer, if we may believe them, a Providential controlling power over nations, producing abundant harvests in some countries when the harvests in other countries are deficient, and making peoples feel they are dependent on each other. Providence is now a minor power, and the National Policy of Canada is that which regulates the state of the crops in the Dominion, the United States and Europe, and regulates the commerce of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone so far as to claim that every commercial change which happens to prove advantageous to the Canadian people is the result not of the action and control of an over-ruling Providence, but of the National Policy of which they boast so much. The hon. Minister of Railways spoke afterwards of the prices of coal at Prescott and Ogdensburg. If I apprehend correctly his remarks they were to this effect: To bring coal from Ogdensburg to Prescott costs 67½ cents per ton for freight and more for port and other charges; but the price at Prescott is much lower than the price at Ogdensburg with freight and charges and duty added. It is well known, however, that it costs less to bring coal to Prescott in the first instance than to take it to Ogdensburg. In that way the hon. gentleman and those who have labored for him have endeavored to make a case in his behalf. Those assertions are so wide of the mark that they must have seemed absurd to hon. gentlemen opposite, although they were ready to cheer the hon. gentleman. They watched every opportunity to encourage their leader; no strong assertion was allowed to pass without its cheer, nothing that could be called a *bon mot* passed without a redoubled cheer. There was some little joke passed which we on this side of the House could scarcely understand, over which hon. gentlemen opposite went into ecstacies; but while the hon. Minister was reading his long elaborate calculations to prove that the Americans paid the duty on coal imported into Canada, his followers were silent. The calculations did not go down. They knew too well that these statements were not only incredible, but that the people would not be misled by them, that the Minister in making that statement was damaging their case before the intelligent constituencies of the Dominion, and they were silent because they were apprehensive. Glances were exchanged which indicated to us that they would very much prefer that the hon. Minister had not dwelt so long on that subject, and had not gone so far as he did. While the hon. Minister was talking an hon. member was prompted to send a telegram to ascertain the prices of coal at Detroit and Windsor, which are a mile apart. I did not think that it was necessary to send such a telegram. When I saw statements similar to those read by the Minister appear in some of the newspapers of the Tory party, I confess I was perfectly astonished to find that any person could write any such articles and hope they would be received with favor by any portion of the people. They were so palpably absurd, so utterly unwarrantable, and so intensely ridiculous that I never could imagine that the man who wrote them really believed they would be accepted by any large number of people. Perhaps they thought they could calculate largely on the credulity of the people, and indeed they showed this day after day, by the manner in which they dealt with this question. Therefore, I was not surprised to find hon. gentlemen opposite stunned by the course taken by the hon. Minister of Railways, nor was I much surprised to find the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who often owed his success to the audacity of his assertions, take such a course. It seemed infatuation it is true. It seemed to be one of those cases which prompted an ancient writer to say that, "whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad." Some demon must have taken away from the hon. gentleman that acuteness of intellect, that power of vision, that capacity for understanding how far he can traffic on the credulity of his audience, not in this House alone, but throughout the country when he ventured on such statements as those. They will be published broadcast throughout the country, and I hope every business man will get a copy, so that he may be able to judge of the character of the statements which hon. gentlemen opposite rely on as a means to carry the elections, about which they have been so talk so much lately. Here is a statement of prices in Detroit and Windsor, telegraphed while the Minister was speaking, by a gentleman whose authority is undoubted. The difference in price between Windsor and Detroit is 75 cents. At Windsor coal sells at $7.50, which, in Detroit, can be bought at from $6.50 to $6.75. Twenty-five cents, I presume will bring it across the river and the duty is fifty cents,—but I am told that a vessel could as easily turn into the harbor of Windsor as Detroit, so that in that case the carriage would add nothing to the cost.

Mr. McCallum. Will the hon. gentleman name his authority?

Mr. Anglin. He is Mr. A. A. Bartlett.

Mr. Mills. Perfectly reliable.

Mr. Bowell. Is he Police Magistrate at Windsor?

Mr. Anglin. Yes.

Mr. Bowell. That is all right, he is a very respectable Grit.

Mr. Anglin. All Grits are respectable. When they cease to be respectable they cease to be Grits. But the hon. gentleman said that after the imposition of the 50 cent duty, Toronto, Montreal and Quebec became competing points; and the dealers on the other side determined to sell to parties at those points so low as to enable them to pay the duty and compete with the home produced article. He did not tell us much about the prices of bituminous coal, but dealt more with the anthracite rather than the bituminous, part of which comes from Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. At all events, Quebec and Montreal and places between were points at which our coal competed with coal brought from the United States long before the National Policy was imposed. On former occasions when this question was discussed in this House, it was stated that coal could be brought up the Gulf of St. Lawrence at a considerable profit to Quebec and at a fair profit to Montreal, where it could fairly compete with the bituminous coal from the United States. I remember well that Mr. Mitchell, who then, I think, was interested in a line of steamers running to and from the Gulf, made that statement, which was also made by many other business men, so that Quebec and Montreal and intermediate places were as much competing points as they are to-day. In the Lower Provinces it is said we are still further from the coal-fields of the United States, than Quebec or Montreal. I do not know whether it costs much or anything more to bring coal to St. John or Halifax than to Montreal or Quebec, but judging from prices I think coal can be imported as cheaply to the former as to the latter points. According to the theory advanced by the hon. Minister of Railways there must be an understanding among the coal dealers of the United States to sell to Canada, for the sake of the small quantity they do sell here, at lower prices than they accept for coal to be used in the United States. Business people will not credit that. For my part, I have to burn a considerable quantity of anthracite coal every year, and I find that the duty adds 50 cents to the price of the coal besides the 5 or 10 cents more additional profit charged by the dealer. The hon. gentleman compared the output of coal from 1873-4 to 1878 with the output from 1878 to 1881, and showed that the output is much larger at present than it was during the late administration, attributing the increase, of course, entirely to the National Policy. Now, it is always well, when we are discussing matters of this kind to ascertain what causes are in operation to bring about the results we are all agreed on. We know that of late years there has been a wonderful change in the carrying trade in the various countries of the world. We know that a very large number of steamers now go to harbors in Nova Scotia to procure an additional supply of coal, finding it profitable to go a little out of the way to get this new supply of coal rather than set out with a full supply, since, by taking the former course, they are enabled to start with a larger quantity of cargo. During the last year we had in the harbor of St. John, for the first time in my recollection, as many as fifteen or sixteen English steamers coming to take cargoes of deals, which had to procure additional coal. This is a portion of the additional output which is attributed to the National Policy. We might as well attribute to the National Policy the fact that they came to St. John to take deals and thereby did serious injury to the trade of wooden ships. We do not resort to any means of that kind in order to establish our case. We do not choose to be inconsistent, to be inaccurate, or to deal in incongruities, false deductions, or false premises. What we seek to establish, is the truth. We leave the public themselves, in most cases, to infer from what is known to be true what the natural and proper deduction ought to be. Other causes brought those steamers to our ports, not the National Policy. But there were in our port sixteen large steamers to be supplied with coal for the transatlantic voyage. And the output again was increased in another way. The hon. the Minister of Railways himself, talking of Grand Trunk management, showed us that they are abandoning the use of wood to a large extent and substituting for it coal. He read what he thought was a contradiction of the statement of the hon. member for Huron, but of course it was nothing of the kind; it did not throw the slightest doubt on that statement. But it did show that owing to that and other causes there is a large demand for coal, either foreign or domestic. We know that on the Intercolonial also there has been a very large quantity of coal used of late years, and less wood than formerly; and then the revival of business and the opening of new establishments, including two sugar refineries in the Lower Provinces, have increased the demand for coal. But, except the sugar refineries, I do not know any case in which this increased demand should be credited directly or indirectly by the public to the National Policy. My impression is that the quantity of coal taken out of the mines is not very much, if at all, in excess of the quantity taken out a few years ago. The hon. gentleman would prefer, of course, to take in his arguments the average of the periods of greatest depression; or, as the Ministerialists sometimes do, one year of great depression compared with a year of prosperity. But I believe that the output of coal is not very much larger now than it was six or seven years ago. The Minister of Railways made another extraordinary statement—perhaps it was a *lapsus linguæ*—that from the year 1878 to 1881, while the output was diminishing year by year, the number of people employed diminished to the extent of 1,200, and that since the increase commenced the number employed had increased, not by 1,200, but 400. My impression is that there must be some mistake—that there must be as many men employed to-day taking out coal as there was some years ago. That, at all events, was the statement of the Minister of Railways. He did not show that any considerable quantity of coal ever reached the Ontario market. The great object of the imposition of the duty on coal was to give the miners of Nova Scotia control of the principal markets of Ontario. Ministers are now compelled to admit that it has not done that and will not do it. The Minister of Railways told us of some analysis of Nova Scotia coal made some years ago by the member for London, when a member of the Ontario Government, and of the admirable results of that analysis, as showing that this coal was very much better than any other. But we do not find that it is imported by Ontario, and the people of Toronto are so stupid, so regardless of their own interests, as to import an inferior coal at a higher price instead of superior coal at a lower. There is a contradiction of facts here to be explained by the hon. Minister. It is amusing to hear of experiments made in the good city of Ottawa by persons who desired to introduce the Nova Scotia coal and encourage its use by the people generally, but who themselves chose afterwards for some reason to return to the use of American coal. It is a remarkable fact that not very long ago advertisements, I presume coming from the Department of Public works, called for tenders for coal, I think for the use of these buildings and Rideau Hall, and in these it was expressly stipulated that the coal must be American.

An hon. member. Patriotism.

Mr. Anglin. Patriotism of the purest water. While it is a fact that Nova Scotia coal does not find its way into Ontario, it is also a fact that it is coming more largely into use elsewhere—for instance, the railway from St. John to Shediac, which formerly used wood, is now using coal. But we do deny that the increase is attributable to the National Policy. The hon. gentleman made some broad assertions as usual. He asserted very lately, as the Finance Minister did before him, that this country is to-day enjoying a degree of unprecedented prosperity. I heard him say in St. John that it enjoys an amount of prosperity such as no other country in the world ever enjoyed, and this he declared from a balcony in front of an hotel, standing on which he looked into a block of buildings on the best business street, and if it were not dark at the time, he must have observed that two-thirds of the whole block were actually unoccupied, and that the ugly words "to let,"