

to the United States \$15,743,895 worth. In other words, Great Britain buys 3 per cent. of the quantity she sells to the United States, and this, too, in the face of heavy protective duties in the latter country, while the British market is free. There was a curious feature in this trade. England takes some bales of Sea Island cotton from the United States, manufactures it into thread, and sells to the United States \$564,421 worth of thread alone, thus paying for the whole cotton which she gets from them and clearing \$87,200 by the transaction. While the total exports of cotton goods from the United States in 1874 was \$3,569,512, the exports of cotton goods from Great Britain in 1875 were \$292,994,265. England imports 1,492,351,168 pounds of cotton, and will sell it to her customers any way they want it. In 1875 she sold  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of it in a raw state. She imported 2,038,369 pounds of yarn and exported 215,609,580 lbs. Of the manufactures of India and China, she bought 5,583 pieces, and she sold 3,562,462,166 yards. From the European States she bought \$6,259,210 worth and sold \$292,994,265 worth. The figures in the woollen trade told the same story. The following statement for 1875 would give an idea of the way Great Britain managed her trade:—

Imports.	Exports.
Coffee.... 178,049,984 lbs.	135,274,944 lbs. or 78 per ct.
Cocoa.... 15,873,624 "	10,464,139 " 66 "
Tea..... 197,665,816 "	32,226,698 " 16½ "
Spices... 38,974,636 "	23,998,364 " 73 "

This would show that England was not only a large manufacturing country, but that she also bought from every country to sell again. There was a singular fact in connection with her shipping. She owns 6,087,701 tons of shipping, and her colonies own 1,591,770 tons. Of the exports of the United Kingdom, 74 per cent. are British produce and 26 per cent. are foreign and colonial, the values being, British, \$1,117,329,815, and foreign and colonial, \$290,731,800. It would be seen, therefore, that Great Britain imports to export again just about enough to give employment to all the colonial ships, and it could be seen at once the benefits we derived from participating in such an extensive trade. Some reference had been made to the iron trade of England. She imported for her own use 105,505 tons, and exported 2,458,306; her imports being 5 per cent. of her exports. The imports of iron in bars, consisted principally of Swedish, of a quality that could not be procured in England. Deducting the value of this Swedish iron from her imports, in bars, it would be found she imported only £83,093 worth from other countries. He would refer to one

other remark of the honorable Senator (Mr. Wilmot) that the rich were getting richer and the poor poorer. On the contrary, it would be found that while the cost of living was decreasing in England, wages of artizans were increasing. In 1800, meat was worth £3 4s. 4d. per cwt.; in 1868, it was £3 5s. 8d. In 1800, flour was worth £4 16s 0d. per sack; in 1868, only £2 12s. 6d. In 1800 a carpenter received 3s. per day; in 1868, 5s. 7½d. A bricklayer in 1800, 3s.; in 1868, 5s. 7½d. A mason in 1800, 2s. 10d.; in 1868, 6s. 1d. A plumber 3s. 3d.; in 1868, 6s. 2½d.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said 1800 was a very bad time. England was at war, and the cost of living was high.

Hon. Mr. WARK said other years would show similar results. Of the imports of Great Britain, just eleven per cent. paid duty, while eighty-nine per cent. were duty free. What the working classes contributed to the revenue might be chiefly considered voluntary, being paid principally on tobacco and liquors. Of the £78,000,000 revenue collected, over £40,000,000 was derived from liquors and tobacco. If the working classes of the mother country could be induced to give up the use of intoxicating liquors and tobacco their taxes would be trifling indeed.

Hon. Mr. FLINT said the honorable Senator who had just resumed his seat had gone back to the year 1800. It was surprising that he had not recalled the time when, in England, a sheep was sold for two pence and an ox for a shilling. It was a long way to go back to prove that we should not have a national policy for this country. He had listened with great interest to the speech of the honorable Senator from Belleville and the honorable gentleman who seconded the resolution, but differed from them in reference to the question who paid the duty. He believed it was the consumer in every instance. When a load of lumber was sent from Canada to the United States, the purchaser paid the duty in addition to the cost of it, and in selling it to the consumer, added his profit, so that, in the end, the consumer paid both the duty and the profit of the middleman. When the supply exceeds the demand prices fall, but the producer only loses in consequence of over-production, and the consumer pays the duty. He concurred in the opinion that if we import more than we export, the balance must be paid, either in gold or in bills of exchange. If we cannot produce as much as we buy we must be growing poorer. The honorable Senator from Hamilton had given the House to understand that Sir John Macdonald's Gov-