

ernment was responsible for the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty.

Hon. Mr. HOPE—Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. FLINT asked if it were true that the action of the late Government in raising the tariff brought about that result, what would the honorable gentleman say of the present Government, who, while they had a Commissioner at Washington begging for a Reciprocity Treaty, raised our tariff two and a half per cent.

Hon. Mr. HOPE—I consider it was an error.

Hon. Mr. FLINT said the honorable gentleman had admitted that, but very faintly. The late Government could never have made an arrangement with the United States which would prevent this country from imposing such taxation as might be necessary at any time for the administration of our public affairs. The true cause of the abrogation of the old Reciprocity Treaty was the desire of our neighbors to annex this country to the Republic. They admitted at the Detroit Convention that was the reason, and that their intention was to "starve Canada into annexation." But instead of forcing us into annexation, they had simply diverted our trade from their country, and Canada had never done better than since the repeal of the treaty, before this crisis came. New markets were found, and they had proved very productive. Our people established new industries when they were thrown on their own resources, and the country had experienced great prosperity. The honorable Senator from Hamilton seemed to have considered his mission in this House was to defend the Government by casting blame upon their predecessors. Like the old woman who found her husband's pants ripped in the same place every night, notwithstanding her daily mending, the honorable Senator seemed to think it his duty every day to sew up the same old rents in the Government. If the honorable gentleman would confine himself to this he would accomplish more than by making speeches against the Opposition, and stand in a better position in this House. The honorable Senator had advocated the imposition of an excise duty on boots and shoes, but if an excise of fifty cents per pair were imposed to keep the duty down to fifteen per cent, what benefit would it be to our manufacturers? A pair of boots worth a dollar could be imported, paying only fifteen cents duty, while, if manufactured in the country they would have to pay fifty cents. It would really be a discrimination against our own manufacturers and in favor of the Americans, of thirty-five per cent. Then, again, with respect to books

and paper; the former were admitted at a duty of only five per cent., while the paper, which is the raw material of the publisher, was taxed seventeen and a half per cent. These facts showed the necessity of re-adjusting the tariff. He would refer again to the question of the balance of trade. It had been said that when we imported \$76,000,000 and exported \$50,000,000 we were \$26,000,000 better off, and in support of this argument the honorable Senator from Hamilton had furnished an illustration—that if a Canadian merchant shipped 100,000 bushels of wheat, worth one dollar a bushel, to the United States, and sold it for \$1.50 a bushel, paying 25 cents per bushel for freight and handling, his profit would be \$25,000, though in purchasing \$125,000 worth of goods to bring home, there would, apparently, be a balance of \$25,000 against him. That was all very fine in theory, but any one in the grain trade knew that it could not be done in practice. There were no such chances for speculation, as he and his honorable friend from Belleville knew to their cost, by actual experience. With respect to the tea trade, the tariff discriminated unfairly against the poorer classes, the addition to the duties being specific, thereby compelling the poor man to pay as high a tax on his cheap tea as the rich man on the more expensive grades. It was the same with sugar and rice. Silks, velvets and articles of that description, used by the wealthy classes, could bear heavier duties, while the tariff on the necessaries of life he had enumerated, which could not be produced in this country, should be lowered as far as possible. He thought our manufacturers might receive more protection. The honorable Senator from Kings had asserted that if we put 40 per cent. duty on stoves it would not prevent American manufacturers from sending them into our markets. That was a very strong reason why the duty should be imposed. If it did not protect our manufacturers we would have the duty at any rate. Then, with respect to furniture, he knew an instance of a man who was furnishing a house near Belleville, who bought his furniture in Rochester, and had it delivered \$40 cheaper than he could purchase it in Canada. Yet the manufacturers in Rochester had to buy their wood in Canada, while our manufacturers have it at their doors.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—We imported last year \$267,000 worth of furniture; we exported \$87,000 worth, and we manufactured over \$3,500,000 worth.

Hon. Mr. FLINT said he had related a fact which showed that the money was sent out of the country to purchase what we