

make our trade with them a one-sided reciprocity? You know that this is a part of your policy that you concealed—that you denied; for we told the people that the instruments of gain into whose hands you had fallen would lead you irresistibly forward into a policy of the deepest consequence. But you vehemently protested your innocence. That policy is now upon us. The Finance Minister informed the House that, under the system of taxation adopted, a large portion of the taxes were to be raised upon imports from the United States. He said that this was the proper course to pursue. He said that this House would not object to taking a larger proportion of the additional taxation out of the people of the United States than out of the United Kingdom. Why? Because the people of England receive everything we send them without taxation. In my opinion the hon. gentleman, by this scheme, taxes neither. He proposes to burden most heavily the people of Canada. It's we, and not they of England, or of the United States, who will have these taxes to pay. Yes, Sir, and millions more, for I shall show that by this fell measure many millions will be taken from the pockets of the people that will never reach the public treasury. This measure imposes a tax upon the entire trade of the country—domestic and foreign. But I deny that the hon. gentleman has, by this measure, placed his burdens mainly upon our trade with the United States. Let me, for a moment, examine the scheme of taxation here submitted for our approval. The hon. gentlemen, I suppose, does not claim the tax imposed upon wheat, flour, corn and oats, which are re-shipped for the European market. These taxes, if paid, are to be returned, and if hon. gentlemen are right, most improperly returned to the exporter. There may be serious impediments in the way of trade, but they are not sources of public revenue; and, therefore, must be left wholly out of the calculation. On the quantity of brandy imported last year the present tariff will impose \$84,173 additional taxation. Of this sum, \$23,018 will fall upon English and \$1,162 upon United States trade. Upon gin you impose an additional tax of \$42,400, \$12,800 of which falls upon

English trade, and \$247 upon the trade with our neighbours. Upon whisky, \$13,800 additional taxation, of which \$12,800 will fall upon the trade with England, and \$1,000 upon that with the United States. At your proposed rate of taxation, we would have paid on iron and other metals imported from the United States last year, \$100,000, instead of \$16,500; and upon similar imports from England \$655,000, instead of \$86,000. You would have imposed upon metallic imports from the United States \$83,500 additional taxes, and upon metallic imports from England \$569,000—nearly twenty-five per cent. of the whole sum that you propose to raise. Last year you collected a Customs tax of \$108,500 upon woollen goods imported from the United States. You, at the same time, collected \$1,416,000 upon woollen goods imported from the United Kingdom. You have changed a tariff of 17½ per cent. into a tariff varying from 20 per cent. to nearly 40 per cent. You have scrupulously provided that the best goods shall pay the smallest tax. I assume that you did this in the interest of the workman, since you have proceeded upon the theory that it is the man who is most burdened that is most benefitted. As you have put these burdens on, not to meet the public necessities, but to promote the private interests of the population, it is plain that you have not overlooked the poor man, the widow, and the orphan. You have carefully provided that they shall feel the weight of your paternal hand. I find that if we should import from England and the United States under the new tariff the same quantities of woollen goods that we did last year under the old, that \$57,000 of additional taxation would fall upon the imports from the United States, and \$614,000 upon woollens imported from the Mother Country. Let me now, Sir, refer to the tax upon cotton goods. Last year we collected upon cottons imported from the British Isles a tax of \$770,549, and upon cottons imported from the United States \$470,185. Under the proposed tariff you would have imposed upon the same goods from England \$1,491,000, and upon those from the United States \$828,000. How, then, does your tariff stand so far?

Englis
tion
liqu
whit
Upon
Upon
Upon

When
upon
the U
ferent

The
liqu
Upon
Upon
Upon

I nee
ject f
this I
burde
comm
hand
like t
have
the c
State
Canad
ous k
Under
two-t
import
taxat
Why
becau
but y
do yo
to pa
Upon
mit.
ports
not c
manu
and
upon
will
ties
much
rever
tax t
Mini
have
duce
this
cotto
that