

expended in connection with foreign refineries. We have built up a West India trade and are building up a South American trade, which the hon. member for South Brant thinks is a matter of no consequence, and regarding which I venture to differ from him. (Hear, hear.) We have not materially affected the revenue, because, as I have shown, the difference in the revenue for 1878 and 1881 is only some \$140,000. We have done all this, sir, and we have secured for the people of Canada at the same time, as cheap—aye, cheaper,—sugar than they would have had if we had not refineries in Canada at all, and had been compelled to import our sugar from the other side. I think that in view of these facts, we may very fairly say that this is a policy which the people of Canada are interested in maintaining, and not in destroying; and I think that we may fairly, under these circumstances, vote down the resolution which the hon. gentleman has presented to this House. (Cheers.)

THE PRODUCTION OF WEALTH.

The hon. gentleman read a quotation from a speech I delivered, in which I referred to the fact, that the strength and wealth of a nation was to be found in the strength and wealth of the individuals in that nation, and he calls that Tory doctrine. I am bound to say that if it is, I am a Tory. I say most decidedly—and I repeat it here—that the strength and wealth of a nation is to be found in the strength and wealth of individuals in that nation. But this does not say, and it does not follow, that this only means the strength and wealth of two or three people; but what does it mean?

Mr. PATERSON—There are only four sugar refineries.

Mr. WHITE—The hon. gentleman exclaims that there are only four sugar refineries, but there were merchants in Canada who made more in a single year than those refiners did. I may be excused for alluding to the late Mr. Forster, of Hamilton, who, in a single year, made as much money in importing sugar, in watching the market and looking after it, as a single year's profit of a refinery and he employed nobody in the doing of it. There was no \$1,000,000 then expended among the people of this country. These hon. gentlemen consider that there is no merit in making money, by employing labor and taking a fair profit out of that employment. (Cheers.) They seem to think the money ought only

to be made by rigging the Stock Exchange, or in lending money on mortgages at as high a rate of interest as they can get, or in speculating in lands in the Northwest, as hon. gentlemen opposite are doing, and perhaps some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—I am not among the number—as well. They seem to think that the very moment a man undertakes to employ labor, and make a profit out of its employment, that instant he becomes an enemy of his country. That appears to be Liberal doctrine. Now, sir, if that is Liberal doctrine, then I am not a Liberal. (Cheers.) I prefer what the hon. gentleman has called the Tory doctrine: that the best interests of this country are to be found in the promotion of the wealth of the people of the country, and in the promotion of that wealth in such a way as to give employment to the people of the country, and to the largest possible number of them, instead of merely employing the comparative few who are used as middlemen in the distribution of the foreign goods which are brought into the country. [Cheers.] That, Mr. Speaker, is the distinction which I see between the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite and the policy which we favor on this side of the House. [Hear, hear.] I may say here, that when I was addressing the House on the Budget debate, I made some reference to Mr. Peter Redpath, provoked by the reference which was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Well, sir, I find that the story which has been going about as to Mr. Redpath having purchased Chiselhurst, has not a word of truth in it; neither as an owner, nor as an occupant, nor as a tenant, has he anything to do with that magnificent establishment. He has bought for himself a quiet, unassuming, modest residence on the other side of the water, where he is living; and I hope that before long we may have him back again amongst us. I do not desire to detain the House further, Mr. Speaker, but I think I have shown by figures, and not by fine-drawn theories similar to those of the hon. gentleman, that we are not promoting any injury to this country by the policy which has been happily adopted in connection with our sugar refining, but that, on the contrary, we are thereby securing the material advantage of the country, as well as of the great mass of the consumers, who are better off than they would have been if the old policy had been in force, and our refineries were all destroyed. (Loud cheers.)