

	<i>Ocean</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>freight.</i>
		38,005,423	18c \$6,840,976
Total freights '75-'78.		11,252,442	

If, Sir, the House will consider how largely our own products are set free for the foreign market, the carrying of which is wholly in our own hands, we will see how much we have gained. We would have shipped across the Atlantic about 31,000,000 bushels of agricultural products, instead of 71,450,000 bushels, and the ocean freights earned would have been \$5,800,000, instead of \$12,300,000. We import from the United States about 15,000,000 of bushels of grain annually. Except the corn used for purposes of distillation, it all goes abroad or sets free some product of this country, which takes its place as ocean freight. The average annual surplus of agricultural products at the cities upon the lakes for the last four years has been 66,000,000 bushels of wheat, 5,000,000 barrels of flour, and 65,000,000 bushels of corn. That is from the United States cities of the St. Lawrence—for the lakes are but a part of this great river—153,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn are carried to the European markets. By whom is this to be done? At one time you thought it was a wise course to put forward an effort to secure this mighty trade of nearly five millions of tons of freight yearly. You ran into debt to obtain the money to enlarge your canals, in order that you might secure this trade. You are paying yearly the interest upon this money. How have you succeeded? You have carried one bushel in seventeen of the wheat, and this you did mainly through the agency of your millers. Apart from these, you have done nothing. They have given additional freights to your railways, and to your shipping. They have given employment to your coopers. They have given better prices to your farmers, because they have been enabled to make a better article of flour than they could from the Canadian wheat alone. You say here that this is hurtful, and in order to cripple the business you tax it. You know this tax does no good, and great harm. It does not advance the price of wheat or flour one cent. The United States tried it, and had it been successful neither their wheat nor their flour would have

been brought here. Men do not buy in a dear market to sell in a cheap one. Why then do you persist in ruining the trade to keep up the delusion of your being the farmer's friend? If your tax comes out of the producer, why do you remit duty to your millers when they export the produce they have imported? You forbid the cooper and the carrier to buy the article upon which his labour has been expended, and by which his wages have been earned, and you do this to give the idle employment, [the] employed better wages, and the capitalist larger profits! But we see, in this case, how it produces the very reverse of what you promised. And what about your canals and the carrying trade? You see how great it is. You see how little you have secured; upon that little you now propose a war of extermination. Is this wise? Why then did you burden the people with the canal debt? Was the hope drunk in which you then dressed yourself? Has it slept since, and is the scheme you now present your sober, second thought? I do not think the public will long agree with you. I am consoled by thinking so, for I regard this tariff on economic grounds, on general grounds of public policy, and on social and moral grounds, as the greatest calamity that has ever befallen this country. I pass on, Sir, to another feature of this tariff—that connected with the sugar trade. I find that the changes in the tariff are very far from being in the interest of the people of this country. It will give them an inferior article at a higher price. It will largely diminish the revenue from sugar. The tariff which has been superseded was framed by Sir John Rose in 1868. It remained in force for ten years. A slight reduction was made in April, 1875, upon the lower grades of raw sugar—25c. per hundred pounds. The duty imposed upon sugars imported into the United States are remitted when the sugar is re-exported. It is precisely the same to us or to any others who purchase it as if no such duty had ever been imposed. The quantity of sugar imported into the United States is very large. The quantity exported is very small. They import about 1,500,000,000 pounds annually. They export to this country about 45,000,000 pounds, and to

all other
the 1,5
not mor
—about
be seen
slightly
that it
affect
finer.
1876 t
sible to
porting
degrade
dard by
far as t
by the
being d
dyed
from O
West l
very d
of whi
their i
have b
proves
the pro
tions of
come el
there w
receiving
under a
standar
refined
coloured
some
part of
small p
this ap
United
people
import
1,500,
their
of po
alread
port w
portat
from t
very h
sion to
probab
again
tariff
cent.,
dyed
intrin
per ce
con'ta