

Canadian consumer as against the New York consumer, in comparing the two prices. I will ask the House to make another calculation. Assuming that the theory advanced by the hon. member for South Oxford is true, assuming, for the moment, that the consumers in Canada pay not only the duty imposed upon raw sugar, but also the protective duty upon refined sugar, which is given for the protection of the sugar refiners, if that theory were true, the price of sugar in New York at the present time would be the cost of raw sugar with the cost of refining added, and that would be increased, first, by the duty on raw sugar, which is 40 per cent, and which at the present time would average about 75 cents per 100 pounds; and, in addition to this, the price of the refined sugar would be increased, if the hon. gentleman's theory was sound, by the $\frac{1}{8}$ of a cent per pound, which is given as a protection to the refining industry. These two duties would increase the price of sugar in New York 87½ cents per 100 pounds. Upon the same theory, in Canada the price of sugar would be increased, first, by the duty on the raw sugar, which is 50 cents per 100 pounds, and again by the protection, which is 64 cents per 100 pounds; adding these together, it would be increased in consequence of duties imposed under our present tariff, by \$1.14 per cwt., as against 87½ cents in New York. Now, if that theory were sound, taking the cost of the raw sugar and the cost of refining to be the same, the price of refined sugar in Canada should be higher than in New York by the difference between \$1.14 and 87½ cents, which would be 26½ cents per 100 pounds. If the hon. gentleman's theory were correct, I say that I cannot see any possible reason why sugar in Canada at the present time should not be 26½ cents higher per 100 pounds than it is in New York; on the contrary, in the quotations which I have in my hand from New York, it is actually 44 cents per 100 pounds higher there than it is in Canada. Now, it appears to me that these figures, which are the actual market quotations of the day, give a clear and convincing answer to the arguments of the hon. gentleman, and they prove beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the theory he advances is not a sound one; but that the theory which the advocates of the National Policy advance is sound, and that in their practical operation, they realize the results which the promoters of the National Policy claim for it. I do not propose to discuss this point further, except to give my answer to one of the questions which hon. gentlemen opposite ask in connection with the statement I have just made. They ask, If this is the case, if the imposition of duties on manufactured articles for the protection of the manufacturers do not increase the price of goods, why impose the duty? In my opinion, there is more than one reason for imposing these duties. The first

benefit which results is that it gives steadiness and stability to the market. It enables manufacturers to estimate, with a very tolerable degree of certainty, at least, the demand upon which they can certainly rely. It gives them definite data upon which they can base their business calculations. A second advantage from the imposition of these duties is the protection which it affords from the disastrous competition which would at times result from over-production in foreign countries. This is especially important in times like the present, after or during a period of business depression. It is, as every business man knows, of the greatest importance in the early history of manufacturing industry, and while the capital is not large. It is absolutely necessary in a new country where the market is limited to the consumption of the people of the country, and where the population is not large, in order to induce capitalists to invest their money in manufacturing industries. There is a third reason for the imposition of those duties, and that is for the purpose of securing a revenue. While the prices of the leading lines of the manufactured goods which are manufactured in the country have not increased, while the wants of the great mass of the people are supplied by these manufactures, it nevertheless results that there is in all these leading lines a very considerable quantity of goods imported from abroad. This is a limited demand, it is not a large demand; it usually comes from the wealthy and independent class, it is a very proper class from which to secure a portion of our revenue. Take, for illustration, the manufacture of carriages. Every person knows that the carriage manufacturers in this country are supplying the bulk of the wants of our people, that they make the ordinary driving wagons, buggies, trucks, and those vehicles which the mass of our people use. They are supplying those goods as cheaply as they can be brought in from any other country. Nevertheless there are a considerable number of carriages imported, and I find, on referring to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that last year we derived a revenue of over \$150,000 from duties on carriages. It arises in this way: There is a certain class of persons who desire a particular make of carriage; it may be a barouche or a fashionable carriage of some kind. They do not find such a carriage at home, or they find abroad a vehicle which suits them better; they buy it, it is brought in and pays duty, and that duty goes direct into the public treasury. The same is true in regard to certain classes of woollen and cotton goods, boots and shoes, hats and caps, and every other leading line of manufacture. The revenue derived in this way amounts to a very considerable sum, and I claim that there is no class of goods and no class of persons from which the revenue could be