

and who were satisfied that the tariff was one which would work to the good of our country.

MR. KILVERT said it was not his intention to discuss general principles, because, at this stage of the debate, they had been fully discussed. He would be excused if he referred very briefly to the position which the constituency he had the honour to represent occupied in reference to this important question. They all knew that the city of Hamilton was a very important manufacturing centre, that the majority of its people belonged to the industrial class, and that for several years this question had been widely discussed in that locality. The gentlemen who represented this constituency in the last Parliament were advocates of the policy similar to the one now under consideration. They made speeches in this House, and elsewhere, advocating their principles; there were other gentlemen, also, belonging to the Reform party, who made speeches affirming the principles of Protection to our native industries. These gentlemen were skirmishers who sallied forth in advance of the great Reform party, and were instrumental in the way of moulding public opinion in regard to this question; but, when the stern interest of the party required that they should abandon those principles, they, at the very first sound of the bugle, were obliged to retire from these principles, and return to the ranks of the party to fight the battle of Free-trade. He supposed there were no people more astonished than the gentlemen on the Opposition benches, when they heard the disclosure made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. He could not help noticing the dismay which it caused in the ranks of that party. They came here prepared to condemn the Government for not carrying out their pledges, but now that they had to abandon that line of argument they made other objections, to some of which he intended to refer. The first one to which he would call the attention of the House, was the loyalty cry. They heard from gentlemen on the Opposition benches that this policy was disloyal to the interests of Great Britain. This must be a new discovery on their part, because they knew from the leaders of

that party and their leading organs throughout the country, that they were clamouring for the introduction of that policy ever since the elections, and, if they now discovered it was disloyal, they did not so designate it before the Budget was brought down. He would refer to a few articles which would indicate the trade between Great Britain and Canada as compared with the trade between Canada and the United States, which would show the tendency of the policy of the late Government in favour of the United States:—

*Furniture*—In 1827-73, we imported from Great Britain to the value of \$37,378; from the United States \$104,221. In 1874-75, from Great Britain, \$20,732; from the United States, \$204,757. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$12,201; from the United States, \$387,270.

*Coach and Harness Furniture*—In 1872-73 we imported from Great Britain, \$50,941 worth; from the United States, \$89,365. In 1874-75, from Great Britain, \$45,425; from the United States, \$96,834. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$20,532; from the United States, \$96,029.

*Stoves and Iron Castings*—In 1874, we imported from Great Britain \$376,926 worth; from the United States \$360,717. In 1875, from Great Britain, \$344,032; from the United States, \$356,768. In 1876, from Great Britain, \$71,173; from the United States, \$318,560. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$34,058; from the United States, \$357,714.

*Spikes, Nails and Brads*—In 1872-73, we imported from Great Britain, \$94,015 worth; from the United States, \$55,693. In 1874-75, from Great Britain, \$66,036; from the United States, \$232,590. In 1878, from Great Britain, \$24,562; from the United States, \$154,679.

It indicated that, if this mode of business was to be carried on in the same ratio, the United States would have all the profit in connection with it. In reference to the loyalty of the people, he would not venture to say that gentlemen on either side were disloyal. They had several instances of the people showing their devotion to the Mother Country by coming forward in times of danger, and offering their assistance to the Empire. Therefore, it was unnecessary to go further into that question. Another objection to the tariff was the burden of taxation it would impose on the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, had ignored altogether the object and intention of the tariff. They assumed that all the goods on which the higher duties were placed would continue to be im-