

fill up the outlets of the harbors. It has been so at Goderich, Kincardine, Port Elgin, Bayfield and Port Albert, and dredges are required almost every season for the purpose of removing the *debris*. At Goderich a dredge is required for the purpose of removing the bar formed there during the spring. I specially drew the hon. gentleman's attention to the importance of something being done to this harbor, I think when I spoke the other evening in connection with Port Albert Harbor, which is ten or twelve miles north of Goderich, the hon. Minister was kind enough to say it was one of his pet works, and I was led to believe that it would receive his favorable consideration. I can assure the hon. Minister that Bayfield Harbor is of as much importance as the harbor in my riding; and I hope the hon. gentleman will take both of the works under his charge, that they will both be his pet works, and that he will be able, during this Session of Parliament, to place some amount in the Estimates to carry out the necessary works there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The attention given to these works by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) will induce me, most likely, to look more favorably on the works to which he has referred. The hon. gentleman has evidently studied the question, and, for my part, whether it is a work in his own county, or in the next county, if it is a public work requiring improvement, I will give it my attention. The fact which the hon. gentleman has stated to the House, that at Kincardine and other harbors on that shore there is every spring a large deposit of sand and other material at the mouth of the harbors, shows it is a difficult question with which we have to deal. I suppose that though we have extended some of these piers, we will always have to have dredges at the mouths of these harbors every year, or every second year, to remove the deposit of the twelve or twenty-four months previous. At Goderich, as the hon. gentleman has just stated, the same difficulty has occurred; but we have tried—although I do not know how far the experiment has yet gone; but we are trying at all events—to avoid that by a catch pier placed farther west, I think, towards Kincardine.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is to the north.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to the northwards, perhaps; and if we succeed in this, it will probably avoid the difficulty against which we have to contend there for a number of years; but eventually it will come again, because we dredge in that direction, and I suppose we will always have to count on a certain expenditure every year in this relation. I shall give my special attention to this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The drift of Goderich Harbor is not now at all where it was. The level was changing, and we had to go in at the mouth of the river proper.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was speaking from the lake. The hon. gentleman remembers that there is a drift coming in from the lake.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the direction of Kincardine towards Goderich.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was just about to remark that it was where the chief trouble rose. The pier built north of the harbor and south of the river will no doubt obviate some of the difficulty that exists.

Motion agreed to.

DUTIES ON AND IMPORTS OF CEREALS.

Mr. GIGAULT moved for a statement showing: 1st. The amount of duties collected, between the 15th March, 1879, and the 1st January, 1883, on the cereals comprised under the head of "Grain and products of grain," in the

Trade and Navigation Returns of Canada; 2nd. The quantity of grain and products of grain imported and entered for consumption in Canada during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the motion be amended, perhaps with the approval of the hon. gentleman who has moved it, in the following sense: Add after the word "Canada," in the first paragraph, "the total quantity of grain and the products of grain imported," and add after the words "1882," at the close of the second paragraph "also a statement of the quantity of grain and the products of grain exported during the same years." The reason for making this proposed change is this: That the mode of entering grain for consumption was very different before and after the imposition of duties on these articles. Before the imposition of the duty on the 15th of March, 1873, all grains were entered for consumption, as will be apparent from the abstract of a table which I have here. For instance, the total imports for 1874—I will only give the round numbers—were valued at \$15,482,000, while the total amount entered for consumption was \$15,432,000. For 1875, the total amount entered was \$12,389,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$12,389,000. In 1876, the total amount imported was \$11,094,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$11,094,000. For 1877, the total amount imported was \$13,795,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$13,795,000. For 1878, the total amount imported was \$13,444,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$13,444,000. For 1879, up to the 15th of March, the total amount imported was \$9,756,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$9,756,000, showing that the imports for consumption were regularly the total imports. However, when the duty was imposed the mode of making these entries changed. I find that for the balance of the year 1879, from the 15th of March to the 30th of June, the total entries were \$1,581,000, and the entries for consumption were \$331,000. For 1880, the total entries were \$12,169,000 and for consumption \$1,804,000. For 1881, the total entries were \$15,059,000, and for consumption \$2,418,000. For 1882, the total entries were \$7,431,000, and for consumption \$2,298,000; so that unless the motion was made in this way, the inference drawn from it would very likely be a misleading one. I notice, in making up these figures, that the imports of grain for consumption have steadily increased since the National Policy has been in force. The imports for consumption were \$331,000 from the 15th of March to the 30th of June, 1879, and the annual imports were \$1,397,000 in 1879. The imports for consumption in 1880, were \$1,804,000; in 1881 they were \$2,418,000, and in 1882 they were \$2,998,000; showing a constant increase in the imports for consumption as shown by the amount upon which duty was actually paid. So far as the imports before that date are concerned, that, of course, will enable us to say what proportion of these imports were actually for consumption; but I find that in the year 1874, out of the total imports 8,611,000 bushels were exported, although entered for consumption. In 1875, out of the total imports, 7,050,000 bushels were exported; in 1876, out of the total imports, 7,139,000 bushels were exported, and in 1877, out of the total imports, 8,547,000 bushels were exported; showing that the reports of the Trade and Navigation Returns are totally unreliable; if we are governed by the amount nominally imported for consumption in our estimate as to the amount actually consumed in the country. By a report, which the hon. Finance Minister was kind enough to hand me during the discussion on the Budget Speech, I find that the export for the year 1878 was valued at \$7,433,000, and for 1879, at \$10,603,000, or nearly the entire amount for 1878, entered for consumption, and the entire amount for the year 1879, entered for consumption.