

under the previous system so far as the shipping interest of the country is concerned with the United States. Our vessels take sugar from Cuba and the West Indies to the United States; most of them are engaged in that trade. We build vessels thus to do the carrying trade of our own and that country. A large portion of the trade of the United States is done in British bottoms. We are told that as regards St. John, N. B., the effect of the change in the sugar duty has been to increase its shipping business. I suppose the hon. the Finance Minister thought he was supported by authority in that statement, but he was entirely in error. I have learned that in the months of January, February, and March, not one single vessel cleared from St. John to the West Indies, although the hon. gentleman states that that port has never done so much business before. My hon. friend informs me that only one vessel cleared from the West Indies to St. John, while during that time six English vessels engaged in the trade with the West Indies cleared from West Indies to New York. This shows conclusively the change is of no benefit to our shipping. There may be half-a-dozen small vessels in Halifax which take away cargoes of fish and shooks to the West Indies and bring back sugar, but the greatest portion of sugar comes now to Halifax. Merchants then telegraph to Montreal to see if they can send it there, and if no orders are received they despatch it to New York. A great deal of sugar goes from Halifax to New York, much more than to Montreal. It has been stated by the hon. the Finance Minister that the people did not pay any more for their sugar than before, that, in fact, it is cheaper at present. He said that the kind of sugar that can be used by the common people, and the grades above that, were even cheaper than ever. If that be true, why did the refiners want this present Tariff, and why unless it were beneficial to them. It is stated the Red-paths make from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 a year by it. Has any hon. gentleman been authorised to deny that statement. None so far as I know. The hon. gentleman has referred to the elections in the Dominion since the present Government took office, and claims as a compliment to it a few iso-

lated cases. He seems to ignore entirely the elections in Ontario, and to think that they had no significance whatever. The greater Province, Ontario, has reversed this National Policy. Did not the hon. the Finance Minister go to the Ontario constituencies before the last Provincial Elections and tell the people that if they supported the Mowat Government that there would be a practical reversal of the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government. He told them so in so many words, as did also the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. the First Minister also visited that Province and endeavoured to enforce his policy upon the people, saying that the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government was imperilled if they sustained Mr. Mowat. That was the key-note this Government sounded. I could refer to many other matters in reference to the hon. the Finance Minister so far as New Brunswick is concerned, and the course he has taken since he entered Parliament. He must know that it would be impossible for him to be re-elected for St. John; the people of New Brunswick are adverse to his policy. I will undertake to prophesy that he will never run an election in St. John again. The power will pass from the hands of these Ministers as surely as the sun sets in the west, at the first chance the people have. Ministers think the people are with them, as do some of their followers on the back benches, but I would like to see the question tried, and, as the Finance Minister and other speakers on the other side have said that our manufactures have not increased as rapidly as they would have done, inasmuch as uncertainty exists in the public mind as to whether the present policy would be permanent, and there may be something in that view, would it not be in the interest of the country to try the question before the people; then, if sustained, the present policy would be considered permanent. It seems proper and wise that we should have an election now, but I think the hon. the first Minister has no desire for it. He knows better. He knows that he would be beaten. The hon. the Finance Minister seems to think that my re-election in my county would not be certain. I would like to try the question, practically with him. He says the sugar