opposite is only 9 cents per 100 pounds. Now, the hon. member has said an increased duty of 9 cents per 100 pounds has cost the people $1.28 per hundred pounds. Such a claim is too extreme to command any attention from moderate men. But let us see how he makes it up. The increased duty on the sugar he claims would be on about 30,000,000 pounds of granulated at 35 cts., or $105,000, and on 120,000,000 pounds of yellow sugar at 9 cents per 100 pounds $108,000 or $213,000 altogether, instead of $1,920,-000 at which the hon. gentleman estimated it. We know that if Canada were buying yellow sugars from Glasgow, they would on the average cost more than 8s 3d per cwt., but double that cost would only make $100,000 a year more than my figures above given, which the people under this tariff have to pay more than under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. But even that is more than offset by the sugar being made in our own country, and by the competition which is now so general among the sugar refiners of the Dominion in keeping down the price. It is utterly impossible then, as said before, that the tariff of the present Government could have increased the cost of sugar to the people of Canada to the extent claimed by the hon. member for South Brant. I am rather inclined to think that instead of the hon. member's figures proving that there is too much duty on sugar, they rather prove the reverse, and show that the protection to the sugar refiners is not sufficient. As I am talking on the question of sugar, I will, before passing to anything else, touch briefly upon some remarks which were made by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the same subject. The hon. member, referring to the Minister of Finance, says:

"The hon. gentleman boasts of his success in dealing with the sugar question, and in establishing the West India trade."

Thereby implying that the tariff has not improved the West India trade. Now, I will prove later on that the tariff of the present Government has done very much indeed to improve that trade. The hon. member says further:

"Whereas in Glasgow to-day you can bny a fair quality of sugar, I am informed, for $2 per 100 pounds, in Canada we have to pay $5 per 100 pounds for sugar of the same quality."

In this statement the hon. gentleman has made exactly the same error as the hon. member for South Brant. He says a little further on:

"Why, from the importation of a little over 100,000,000 pounds in my time, we got a revenue in excess of that which the hon. gentleman now receives from 170,000,000 pounds. True, that is not of first class quality; true, about 20,000,000 pounds of that is wasted in the process of refining; but even so, we are probably to-day importing the equivalent of 150,-000,000 pounds of refined sugar. Now, that sugar stands us at least 3 cents a pound more than it could be bought for in the open market."

Now, the hon. member for South Huron terribly exaggerated his case, for if he does not there intend to imply that this 3 cents per pound is in addition to the tariff put on the sugar by any Government in this country, there is no point in his remark against the National Policy at all. But we know that the price of sugar has not increased to the extent of 3 cents a pound over what it was under his own tariff. The difference in the cost of yellow sugars under the two tariffs, as I have already pointed out, is not more than 9 cents per 100 pounds in the cheaper kinds, and perhaps from 12 to 15 cents per 100 pounds in the better kinds that would come from Glasgow. Possibly, under the present tariff, we may be paying from 9 to 15 cents per 100 pounds more than we did under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. But let us look for a moment into some figures in connection with the trade in sugar during the last few years. In 1878 there was imported into Canada 101,000,000 pounds of refined sugar. There was imported into Canada sugar coming from the countries of production raw sugar 7,900,000 lbs., of which $92\frac{7}{10}$ per cent. was refined and $7\frac{3}{10}$ per cent. raw sugar. In 1880 a great change took place in these figures. Only $26\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. of refined sugar was imported and $73\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. of raw. In 1882 $10\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. refined was imported and $89\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. raw; in 1883, $6\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. refined and $83\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. raw; in 1884, $9\frac{5}{10}$ per cent. refined and $90\frac{5}{10}$ per cent. raw. I rather imagine that of this $9\frac{5}{10}$, some raw, might have crept into the returns which I have been obliged to assume as refined, coming from certain countries, probably England, and which is likely raw beet sugar. These figures prove beyond doubt that the policy of the present Government has not only stimulated the refining industry, but has also very much assisted trade between the Dominion and those countries in which sugar is produced. But they show something more; they show an increased consumption of sugar in Canada from 109,000,000 lbs. in 1878 to 171,000,000 lbs. in 1884, and that the people in 1878 paid a larger sum of money for 109,-000,000 lbs. of sugar than they did in 1884 for 171,000,000 lbs. In case it should be said in reply that sugar at present is much lower in price, I would also point out that we paid out in 1880 for 116,000,000 pounds of sugar about $2,200,000 less than we did two years previous for 109,000,000 lbs.; so that much less money went out of the country for sugar in 1880 than did in 1878. These figures further prove that our trade with the countries of production has been very much encourged, but I want to draw also the attention of the House to a phase of this trade in which the people of the Maritime Provinces are much interested, that is the amount of sugar that comes from the West Indies. In 1878, of all the sugar imported into the Dominion, 7 per cent. came from the West Indies, including British Guiana; in 1880, two years later, under the fostering policy of this Administration, this quantity had increased to 62 per cent. In 1881 it was 60 per cent; in 1882, 60 per cent., in 1883, 58 per cent.; and in 1884 it had fallen to 44 per cent. It will be worth while, I think, to enquire into the causes of this falling off in 1884. One of the causes undoubtedly is the very great production of beet sugar in Germany, Austria and some other of the European countries which have been competing very heavily with the cane growing sugar countries of the world and besides this the tariff, as arranged at present, operates, to a certain extent, against our trade with the West India Islands. The beet root sugar trade, as it injures for the present the West India trade, deserves the consideration of the Government. The tariff at first accomplished the purpose for which it was intended; it encouraged our West India trade, and a larger portion of our importation of raw sugar came from the West India Islands, but during the last few years a great change has come over the sugar trade of the world, sugar being produced in different ways and handled in different ways; it is being bought and sold in different ways; and these facts—the facts connected with the beet root sugar especially—affect our trade in sugar with the West India Islands. The East Indian archipelago has also been competing heavily with the West Indies; but if our West India trade suffers, no doubt this Government will seek a remedy, for if we are certain of one thing it is that there is now in power a Government who, when a case is clearly put before them and they are convinced that any particular trade in the Dominion is suffering, are not only willing but able to take steps to remove the difficulty. I am convinced hon. gentlemen on this side will take the proper steps. Can that be said to be the case with gentlemen opposite? It is known all over Canada that during the time they were in power numberless deputations waited upon them, numberless petitions were sent to them, in matters of trade, praying that they should do something to remedy the difficulties under which our manufacturing and other industries were laboring, but all the representations were unheeded by the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard