

hear.] I know he was debarred from such information. It would have been imprudent in him to have sought it. And the greatest allowance must be made for a Minister of Finance who sits down to make a tariff, necessarily debarred from consulting with those who can best give him information, because, if he does so, he may give advantage to one class or interest over another. Whoever may be in power, I shall always be disposed to make great allowance for any man placed in that most difficult and responsible position. So far as any minor matters of detail in this tariff are concerned, I should be disposed therefore to allow the greatest latitude and the greatest consideration. But, coming back to the sugar duties, does the hon. gentleman mean to deny this, that the imposition of specific duties is antagonistic to the encouragement of direct trade?

Hon. Mr. GALT—I say this, that the trade, not merely in Montreal, but elsewhere, have sought a change. The hon. gentleman is aware that the existing tariff was found to operate very injuriously, and the matter was referred by the Montreal Board of Trade to a committee. The committee have made a report, in which they say they would prefer *ad valorem* duties, but that there are certain objections to them which, they think, will outweigh the advantages, and they would prefer the duties on sugars should be made specific, and should be made to apply to different qualities. The only point of difference between myself and the Board of Trade in Montreal is in reference to the classification of sugars. They agreed to the duties being specific, and they agreed there should be a graduated scale of quality.

Hon. Mr. ROSE—My hon. friend is entirely wrong. I shall read what the committee say in their report :—

"But the true remedy we think would be found in making all sugar subject to a uniform *ad valorem* rate of duty, the simplest of all plans, and the fairest to all classes. Objections to this we see only two,—possible undervaluing which efficient appraisement would prevent, and the aggravation of high prices in dear times, by high duties; an objection applying equally to nearly the whole tariff. Should these be deemed sufficient reasons for another course, then we would as the best alternative recommend a scale of specific duties, at many different rates proportioned to different values, and for this purpose would suggest adoption of grade well known as 'Dutch numbers,' &c.

They first say a uniform *ad valorem* duty is the best of all, and then state that there are but two objections to it, one in reference to the undervaluing: and the other in case of high prices. Then they add—if you consider these two objections which they say can be met, to be insur-

mountable, they would say, the best alternative lies in levying the duties at different rates, proportionate to the different values.

Hon Mr GALT: That is my view.

Hon Mr ROSE: Well, you have acted very differently. Now, I would urge the Hon Finance Minister not to trammel this question with any sectional views or considerations. I ask him is an Upper Canadian merchant precluded at this time from dealing in any foreign market. Is there any advantage accruing to him through trading by way of Montreal, any more than by New York, under our existing law?

Hon Mr GALT: Not when importing; but if he buys it is different.

Hon Mr ROSE: It is the same thing whether he imported by Montreal or New York. It is open to the importer to use whatever route he pleases if he imports directly, and even the buyer has now the benefit of two markets. I feel it is indispensably necessary we should have more time to consider what the practical effect of these changes is going to be on the commercial interests of the country. It is no light thing to make alterations in the tariff of a character to disturb existing commercial regulations, and deter merchants from embarking in great trading enterprises, which tend to build up the general prosperity of the country. He must feel some sort of confidence in the stability of our systems, and and not be left to fear all kinds of violent and unexpected changes. (Hear, hear.) I think that such considerations as these should not be lost sight of by the Government of the country.

Hon Mr GALT—These objections do not effect the consumption of the country. It is not to be affected by the importations by any particular route. It is quite immaterial by what country the importations come here.

Hon Mr HOLT—That is not the doctrine of a few years ago.

Hon Mr ROSE—I venture to enter my solemn and earnest protest against this doctrine. I say it concerns very much the interest of the country. (Hear, hear.) The agriculturist cannot flourish without commerce; neither can one or other of them flourish without manufactures. The interests of any one are not opposed to those of any other. No country can flourish unless these three interests go hand in hand. To say that it is a matter of indifference whether we have a foreign trade or not; whether we import ourselves or depend altogether on New York or Boston, is quite extraordinary, and a statement against which I protest. (Cheers.) Look at the amount of capital being disseminated in Montreal at this moment by means of our foreign trade through the St Lawrence. Why, at the present time there are some 70 or 80 ships in that port which, after bringing cargoes from Europe and elsewhere, are loading the coarse grains and