

"States, and when I cannot supply it to the Maritime Provinces as cheap as they can get it in the American market, then let them buy there."

It was the year when the Mayor of Montreal, at the head of a large delegation, met Sir George Cartier at the station and begged him not to starve the people by keeping up this taxation that the duty was taken off. That year's experience did away for a time with the duty on grain and flour, just in the same way as the Irish famine had produced the repeal of the English corn law. Then there was the sugar refining interest, of which they had heard much. He had ventured to state, in the early part of the session, that whatever had happened to kill the sugar trade, its death was not caused by the present Government. He did not blame the late Government nor any Government, for what had been done. He approved it; but whoever was responsible for any harm, if there were harm, it was not by the gentlemen who were now accused of it. At that time he had been told he did not know much about the matter; but since that time he had hunted up the statements of Mr. Drummond, who knew more about the sugar question than perhaps any other man in Canada. Now, Mr. Drummond, on page 108 of the Dominion Board of Trade report for 1874, said—"So far from the present sugar tariff giving me any protection in the manufacture of sugar, I will prove to you, beyond all question, that the business of sugar refining in this Dominion has for years been carried on in spite of a hostile duty. . . . You will be rather amused to learn that the tariff which is quoted as an advantage to the sugar refiners is, and was, intended to be a provision to hamper and cripple us. I say this advisedly, because the Finance Minister of the day (Sir John Rose) was good enough to explain to me the reason why that duty was imposed. At that time the Maritime Provinces were rather opposed to Confederation, and they had to be treated with a good deal of consideration. They were accustomed to get molasses at a low rate of duty, and it was not considered good policy to deprive them of the advantages they possessed. But, it was alleged, if we obtained the molasses at a low rate we could convert them into sugar and supply the market, thus depriving the Government of a large source of revenue. So the specific rate of 73 cents was imposed on molasses imported for refining purposes, which is equivalent to about 8 cents per gallon, a rate which produced most effectually the result intended; for,

"from that day we gradually worked off our stock of molasses, changed our machinery, and abandoned entirely that branch of our business." The House would see from this that it was the Maritime Provinces for which the sugar refining in Montreal was killed by John Rose, "as they had to be treated with a good deal of consideration." Then this same gentleman, when examined before the committee of the House of Commons last session, said as follows:—"For the last four or five years we have produced none of the leaf or lump sugar, and our principal production has been yellow. The kind of machinery used in making hard sugars has been idle and totally unused since 1870." The question was then put, "You find it more profitable to manufacture the other varieties of refined sugar than these?" to which the reply was:—"That was not the reason; the tariff discriminated against manufactures of such sugars, and after informing the Government (Sir John Rose's) of the fact and requesting them to make a change to meet it, we were compelled to abandon this branch of our trade which we would otherwise have very willingly continued." Then he said further on in the same evidence:—"It is capable of proof, for example, that under the old tariff of Canada, I have been paying higher *ad valorem* duties on raw material than I have been charged on refined sugar coming from Boston or New York. It must be admitted that I have been at a disadvantage, and have been carrying on my business, not in consequence of the tariff, but in spite of it, not in consequence of protection, but in spite of discouragement. That I believe honestly to have been the case under the tariff from 1868 onwards; and the best proof I can give is that I am now prepared to abandon the business."

Now he would take up the tea question. It had been stated that the duties were levied in such a manner as to be oppressive to certain classes, but it was worth remarking that the duties on tea were much less now than they had been during several years of the preceding Administration. He did not say this as a reproach, as he believed tea was a very proper thing on which to levy a duty, but he did not wish to hear this Government charged with sins—if they were sins, though he thought they were not sins—that were committed by the late Government. The grain and flour duties, part of the national policy, having been abandoned as soon as attempted, it was again renewed, and this time the breadstuff duty