He had never proposed to drive the trade to Buffalo; but he did propose to make it pay all the tolls he could. The hon. member, like the hon. member for Lincoln, seemed never to think of anything else but canals; but there were railroads in the present day, and it was worth while to think of the interests of railroads. Now, what was the position of Canadian Railroads? At present, goods passing over them paid higher tolls than those passing over the Ogdensburgh road. He wanted instead of that to make the latter pay as high tolls as the former. Unless you could do something like this you could never induce American statesmen to do anything, for they never could carry any measure unless they showed the people that they were going to get something in return for their concessions. The Oswego people believed they would be ruined by the adoption of this policy; but his answer to them was, go to your own government and influence it, and do justice to Canada. The hon. member for Montreal admitted that the route by the St. Lawrence was as cheap as by New York; but he said that the Montreal merchants would get all the difference between the duties by the two routes. He believed, on the contrary, that this matter would be regulated by the legitimate profits of trade. The hon. member, however, admitted on a former occasion that he did not value reciprocity. That was just where he differed from the hon. member. He did not want, for a political reason, the farmers of Canada to think themselves worse off than those in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG stated that he had never said reciprocity was worthless; but that we had a much higher prize to gain than that. Twenty per cent, on all our exports, would not come to the amount of the tolls on the Welland Canal alone.

Mr. HINCKS placed a high value on reciprocity, and if he showed, as he thought he had done, that this was so, then he asked what hope there was for reciprocity from the course his opponents had adopted? There was none. He asked too, whether there was any free trader in England, who pushed free trade to its legitimate extent? Were they not all inconsistent? Was not the hon. member for Montreal inconsistent in advocating the admission of raw materials duty free.

Mr. YOUNG—you advocated it yourself.

Mr. HINCKS—well, gentlemen were welcome to show whatever inconsistency they pleased in his opinions, that was not the question; but rather what was for the good of the country. He had, however, always vindicated the admission of raw materials duty free; but what he contended for, was that this policy was a protection to the manufacturer in this country over the manufacturer in the U. S., and this was inconsistent with Mr. Young's ideas of free trade. He considered reciprocity then, of the highest im-