

Mr. HINCKS, though not ready to make any objection to the statement thus made, would offer a few remarks on the policy of the government.—His hon. friend had stated that the advantages of reciprocity had been overrated, and he thought it best to give up the attempt to obtain it. Now the difference between them seemed to him to consist exactly of the relative value which they respectively attached to reciprocity. For his own part he attached the greatest importance to reciprocity as respected Upper Canada, and as to what the hon. member said about prices, he was not prepared to admit that the prices of wheat were equal on the two sides of the line. A friend had just put into his hands a statement, by which it appeared that while wheat was sold at 77 cents on one side of the line, it was sold at 91 cents on the other. But wheat and flour were not the only exports from Canada to the United States. There is the value of £100,000 either of animals or the produce of animals, the entire duty on which appeared to him to come from the pockets of the Canadian exporter. His reason for this belief was that, in a large consuming population like that of the States, the imports from Canada were not large enough to affect prices at all. Last year Canadian exporters paid to the Americans \$300,000 on articles that were exported to the United States. He admitted that generally the duty on flour would not be greatly against the Canadian exporter; but under the present system of duties in England, it must be remembered that sometimes the United States became the best market, and that then the Canadian exporter had to pay the duty. Canadian flour was of very superior quality, like Genesee, and it would be a great thing to obtain for it a free access to the American market. Then, believing reciprocity to be thus advantageous, the next question was whether the proposed course was likely to obtain it. On free trade his views agreed with those of the hon. Member from Montreal; but he dissented altogether from the views of Sir Robert Peel as respected reciprocity. He believed that had Sir R. Peel taken the slightest trouble—had he written one despatch to the ambassador at Washington, he would have obtained all we wanted. He believed, too, that if at the present day we were to go back to the time when we removed the differential duties not one man would be in favor of that course. Now, he merely wanted to retrace our steps, and to put ourselves in a position to trest. To prove that the taxation of the people could not be increased by the policy the Government was now recommending, he would remark that it was proposed (as we understood) to take duties off sugar, molasses, &c., in such a manner as would give the St. Lawrence route an advantage in duties; but the fact was that these goods can be brought at present by the St. Lawrence as cheaply as by any other route. It must be recollected, too, that not merely the