

say that the refinery had been compelled to close down. In the four years, when this refinery was in operation, our trade with the West Indies amounted to \$25,000,000, being \$16,000,000 exported against \$9,000,000 imports, leaving a balance in our favour of \$7,000,000. He then proceeded to show that after the closing of that refinery, the price of sugar instead of going down, had gone up. There was sitting in the House at that time, Mr. Jones, then representing Halifax, and who, I am sure, was not the least able among the members of the House at that day. Whether or not he was successful or a wise politician, he was at least a good business man. As far as I am concerned, in commercial matters I would rather take the opinion of a man holding the position he did, and does still, than all the authorities to be found on all the dusty books taken down from the shelves of our library. Mr. Jones said he regretted very much that as Mr. Desjardins spoke in French, all the members in the House could not understand him. He was very happy to be able to agree with Mr. Desjardins. This trade with the West Indies was not a provincial but a Dominion matter. Mr. Jones always held to the idea that schooners were better than sailing vessels, and objected to subsidizing steamers for the West India trade. The trade of the maritime provinces with the West India Islands, he said, amounted to \$2,500,000. Previous to the existence of the depression, this branch of our commerce had been in a flourishing condition, but the change in the tariff had considerably interfered with it. He had heard that since the change, consumers in this country had been obliged to pay a higher price for their sugar. The French and Belgian governments having established drawbacks in favour of their refiners, a deputation representing the British sugar interests had waited on Lord Derby and represented that the trade relations of Great Britain with the West Indies would be seriously affected by their continuance. It appeared, however, that nothing could be done, and the British sugar industry was threatened with annihilation. While a free trader, Mr. Jones thought 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 foreigners a very considerable advantage. He went on to say that instead of the people paying more for their sugar when refined in this country, he believed that they were paying less; and he put himself on record as admitting that notwithstanding the duty, if the refiners were given a preferential duty, he did believe that the price of sugar would not be advanced any way. I must regret what happened afterwards. He was taken into the Cabinet and nothing more was heard from him on this subject, but I believe that those were his honest

convictions at the time, and I am disposed to give them great weight because of his experience in business matters. But the Finance Minister of that day would not make the slightest change or give any preference to a home industry. Mr. Jones's statement with regard to the price of sugar corresponds exactly with what was said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) yesterday. Notwithstanding the small difference in the duty, the duty being rather greater in the United States than in Canada, that hon. gentleman showed conclusively that although the duty was slightly larger in the United States on entering than here, still there was a difference of 44 cents per cwt. in favour of Canada than there was in New York, allowing for difference in duty. Now, among the business men and clear-sighted men who had a seat in the House in 1876, was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I know that in this House there is no man who is listened to with more respect and attention. He then told us:

I am one of those who believe that to have the American market open to our products would benefit our farmers. I do not suppose there is any one in this House, and very few in the country, who would not believe that, if our farmers should send their products to the United States, it would be a benefit to them. We do not know whether negotiations tending in that direction may soon be opened or not, at least members of this House are not aware of it. The question is, whether, in the event of future negotiations, the imposition of a tax on grain would operate in our favour.

He goes on to relate what he supposed would take place between the commissioners from Canada and the United States:

Fancy the commissioner delegated by this House sent to Washington to negotiate such a treaty. The question would be asked, what he desired. He replies: I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our forests, fields and mines. The United States commissioner might ask: And what will you give us in return? Our representative would reply, offering our markets for the same products of the United States. The astute American would naturally say: We have that already; I do not see that you offer us anything. We must remember that we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up a new reciprocity treaty. I need not remind this House that the great lever we had before in negotiating reciprocity is no longer ours.

The hon. gentleman made, at that time, one of the best speeches on the question. He was frank, honest and sincere, and he opposed his party. Further on, when the motion was made to go into supply, it was supposed he would vote with his party in 1877-78, he said that he was of the same opinion still, that he believed the speech was perfectly correct, and the Government had plenty time to carry out his view, and he said that when he went on the hustings himself, when running his election, the peo-