

"He thought that they had abundant proof that whereas in this case on the raw material 50 per cent. duty was paid, only 40 per cent. was paid on the refined article, affording to foreigners a very considerable advantage. The Government would be justified in asking the House to authorize them to impose on refined sugar a duty equal to the bounty granted their refiners by foreign governments. He was willing that we should trade with the United States on fair terms, but if by a bounty system they tried to control our market and utterly ruin our interests it was the duty of the Administration to levy such duties as to place Canadian on an equal footing with foreign manufacturers. He gathered from the observations of his hon. friend that the abolition of the sugar duties had had the effect on the sugar refinery at Montreal which he had anticipated, and the result had been an advance of 1½ cents per pound on the sugar manufactured in this refinery. This was natural and was sugar which had been manufactured in Montreal were excellent; and it was to be remembered that inexperienced people could with ease be led to believe that sugar was of high, when it was in reality of a very inferior, quality."

He said again:—

"If the refinery in Montreal could have been worked under the present system, no application would have been made; but it had been sufficiently demonstrated that it was impossible to keep open refineries in the face of the bounty allowed by the United States. It was no use tinkering with the tariff, but the Government should be prepared to deal with the American system which was annihilating our trade, when \$2.50 duty per 100 pounds was paid, and a drawback of \$3.60 was allowed, which was equal to half a cent per pound. It was plain to be seen that no tariff would enable a refinery to exist in Canada unless a duty was imposed equal to the bounty; it would be no use trying to do anything."

So much for the hon. gentleman's views in 1876. I will now show that these views were not changed in 1877, when the hon. gentleman again reiterated his sentiments in the strongest terms on this subject, and declared that a West India trade of three or four millions, in which his own constituents were vitally interested, hung in the balance. We will now see what the views of his colleague, the hon. the Minister of the Interior, was on that question. They were as follows:—

"He was unable to perceive that any drawback was given in the States, and he would quote figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns which proved that this was the case. No refinery in the Dominion

could be closed owing to the policy pursued by the American Government. Supposing the American refiner obtained 55 cents of drawback per 100 lbs, this put \$2.50 into the public treasury. What system must be followed in order to secure instead of 70 lbs. or 88 lbs. of the highest quality—13½ lbs. of inferior variety and 11½ lbs. of syrup from 100 lbs. of the unrefined article? and if an inferior article was used, a larger quantity must be produced to obtain the same result. This was sufficient to show that the statement with reference to the bounty afforded under that system was preposterous."

And the hon. the Minister of Finance told him it would take \$600,000 a year out of the treasury of Canada for the purpose of building up and supporting a refinery in this country, so that on a question of the greatest import to the whole country—a question, regarding which, according to the hon. gentleman, every person in this country was to suffer by having the price of sugar increased, after the refineries had been crushed by the policy of this Administration—he was at variance with the Government. The hon. gentleman, when an Independent member of this House, maintained that the interests of his constituents were intimately and largely connected with this subject; and that the whole of the West India trade of this country was going to be sacrificed unless the hon. gentleman opposite could be induced to change their policy. But suddenly—at the very time when he was putting forward to the electors of Halifax, as one of the reasons why they should elect him, the fact that he was one of the Independent members of the House—for as an Independent member of the House he was fighting against the Government on that question at that moment—the hon. gentleman has office presented to him, and having office presented to him he forgets his declarations on the floor of this House; he forgets his antagonism with the Government on this important public question; he forgets the interest of his own constituents; he accepts the shilling and enlists to serve under the banner of the Government whom he himself declared was, on a vital and important public question, utterly in antagonism with the interests of this country, and especially with the interest of his own constituents. I say that was a reason why the hon.