

worth of goods on which they paid a duty of \$219,000—that is a duty of about 12 per cent. Last year they only imported \$481,811 worth on which they paid a duty of \$142,000. Although they imported one-fifth of what they had imported before, they paid about half as much duty on that one-fifth. Of course it will be said that the reductions in the importations was due to the fact that they were buying in 1893 very largely from Ontario. They bought those agricultural implements that my hon. friend has lauded so much, giving the manufacturers the benefit of 30 or 35 per cent that the tariff of this country enabled them to charge over and above the fair value of the article in a free market; but I find also that, taking the five years from 1873 to 1878, the first five years after Prince Edward Island came into confederation, they sold abroad \$7,500,000 worth, and during the last five years from 1889 to 1893, they only sold \$5,500,000 worth—\$2,000,000 less in the last five years than in the former period. That must have had some effect on the island. I think Prince Edward Island is situated, for the purposes of trade, for opportunities of reaching the world's markets, in a more favourable position than any other part of the Dominion. It is within easy sail of the markets along the New England coast, and it is nearer the markets of Europe, and, therefore, the progress of Prince Edward Island ought to be great, but if we want the clearest evidence that the growth is not there that it is entitled to expect, we have only to point out the fact that her sons have emigrated to other parts of this continent. The census of 1881 showed a population of 108,000, and in 1891 there were only 187 more persons, men, women and children in the island than there were ten years before. In the face of that fact, the hon. gentleman required a great deal of faith in the policy, in the tariff, and all the other acts of the Administration to laud them, as he did, in ascribing the success that this country has achieved, in the last ten or fifteen years, to their policy. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to prove to us—and he quoted figures from Sir Richard Cartwright's speech—that Canada was not unduly taxed. He pointed out that, apparently, the taxation was not greater in 1893 than it was ten years ago. But there are other ways of paying taxes than paying into the Treasury. If the hon.

gentleman were to enumerate the taxes that we pay on our cotton goods, which go to swell the dividends of the cotton lords, and if he were to mention the taxes that we pay on all the iron used in this country he would find that the burden is very much greater. For instance, if he will take the taxes which we pay on sugar to the refiners of Canada and the taxes we pay on our coal oil—I will not go on and enumerate a long list of articles—he will find that the \$23,000,000 that we pay in customs and the six or seven millions of dollars that we pay in Inland Revenue, are very small items in the amount. Take sugar as an illustration, because while he was speaking it occurred to me that I might quote the figures. The average amount of sugar that we consume is about 150,000,000 pounds. An hon. member near me says it is more than that. It is put in the official return at 200,000,000 pounds, but that includes some of the coarser kinds that we would not use, those below 14. There must be a large loss in refining such sugar, but I will put it at 150,000,000 pounds. The refiner gets eight-tenths of a cent—that is the duty on sugar, the quality which is consumed in a country like Canada. If that four-fifths of a cent went into the treasury it would mean \$1,000,000 or a little more added to the revenue. But what went into the treasury last year for sugar? I have just turned up the amount on sugar and it is \$9,000. Somebody must get the benefit of the balance. The refiner has to get his prices a shade below foreign prices in order to keep out the foreign article. Suppose he takes only a half cent (and the figures I have given are within the mark) we should receive three-quarters of a million dollars. Now that is quite plain. My hon. friend shakes his head—it seems to me that if he were to try to experiment we would find it so. Between 1873 and 1878, we derived a considerable revenue from sugar and closed the refinery in Montreal. But is it not better that we should get a revenue from sugar and the people have their sugar cheap than that we should have a few people employed in refining sugar in this country? Would it not be better, if need be, to pension off the few people employed in refining sugar and let the people have cheap sugar? The same argument applies all through. I might go on and illustrate that every other article which is protected imposes an indirect tax on the consumer. What is the object of a