

Year.	Tea.	Coffee.	Coal.	Tin.	Sugar.	Bill Stamps.	News-papers.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1882	682,300	36,344		57,480			
1883	999,571	37,076		103,848		180,000	55,000
1884	895,933	32,456		84,025		181,000	58,000
1885	1,032,040	51,988		91,402		182,000	61,000
1886	1,273,670	24,082		97,805		183,000	64,000
1887	1,020,313	24,106	312,360	104,094		184,000	67,000
1888	955,361	42,662	1,068,652	106,967		185,000	70,000
1889	951,417	52,420	638,043	115,038		186,000	73,000
1890	1,004,149	56,157	600,667	120,671		187,000	76,000
1891	978,977	60,642	699,533	116,049		188,000	79,000
1892	1,257,966	60,894	739,553	155,646	4,500,000	189,000	82,000
Total...	11,053,697	478,827	4,058,808	1,152,025	4,500,000	1,845,000	685,000

· Making a total saving in these twelve years of \$23,773,357.

In addition to the articles enumerated in the table which I have just read, there are on the free list to-day 113 articles more than there were in 1878, when the National Policy was first introduced, showing that the Conservative party did not lose sight of tariff reform, when such reform was necessary in the interests of the people. I notice that these gentlemen whenever they talk to the people of the country make no reference to the fact that in proportion to the increase of the revenue the Government have never lost sight of the important fact that they should relieve the people of duties upon articles which go into general consumption, and which the poorest person in the land has to buy, while keeping the duty as high as it ever was upon such luxuries as liquors, silks and other articles of a similar kind. I have dealt with this question of trade at sufficient length and shall now confine myself to a few remarks in reference to the criticism of the hon. gentleman upon the canal tolls and the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. I was surprised—well, hardly surprised—at the eulogy passed by the hon. leader of the Opposition upon President Harrison's message to Congress in reference to the imposition of canal tolls.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I passed no eulogy.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow me to explain what I considered was a eulogy.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I said that his proclamation was copied from yours.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—That was a compliment to us. The hon. gentleman said that

it was the most masterly piece of diplomacy that he had ever read. Then he said that it was an exact copy of the Canadian Order in Council.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I said it was on the same lines.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—The hon. gentleman paid us the compliment of saying that it was a masterly piece of diplomacy, and that it was on the same lines as the Canadian Order in Council, but if he had studied the question, and he will permit me to say so very respectfully, he would have learned that it was not on the same lines as the Order in Council issued in Canada, and that its provisions are not the same as ours, for it applies to all vessels passing through the Sault Canal bringing articles to any port in Canada, no matter for what purpose. There is no such regulation and no such provision in the Order in Council passed by the Government of Canada, and if the hon. gentleman had referred to the report made by the Interstate Committee, or committee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate (I am not sure which), on the trade relations between Canada and the United States, he would have learned that that report states distinctly and positively that the 27th clause of the Washington Treaty was repealed by the Government of the United States when they repealed the other clauses of the treaty; and consequently, no matter what we may have done in reference to the canals, it was not an infringement of the provisions of a treaty which had no existence, according to the report of that committee. I can tell the hon. gentleman further, that