

tons, and now, in a little over five years the increase has reached 900,000 tons, or 3,000 tons for every working day of the year 1884. I think some hon. gentlemen opposite will say: Well, if you have increased the imports of coal 3,000,000 tons, you have taxed the people 50 or 60 cents a ton on that increased import of coal. Well, I admit it. I will not undertake to prove—though it might be proved to some extent—that in some cases the duty is paid by the party selling the coal; I am not going to take any doubtful ground. I will admit for argument's sake, that the people pay every cent of that duty. But what does it enable us to do? It has enabled us—because the duty is just about the same—to take the duty off tea and coffee and place it on coal, which gives us an industry that has increased its output 900,000 tons in 1884 over 1878. Were that duty taken off coal to-morrow, the Government would have to come to Parliament and ask them to impose a duty on tea and coffee instead. Now, Sir, the next question is the question of sugar. That is a question which was pretty fully debated here. Very strong language was used by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the effect of our policy upon sugar. It was stated that we were enriching the sugar refiner and taxing the consumer. I should not at all wonder if we should now have from the same gentlemen the declaration that our policy has ruined the refiner, while, perhaps, they may not admit that it has benefited the consumer. The change in the duty on sugar has had this effect: It has restored to Canada an industry she had lost; it has led to the erection of two or three new refineries in addition to the old, giving employment to a large number of hands. I am not quite sure we have not one refinery too many; but if they are not making as much money at present as they did in former years will it not be right for hon. gentlemen opposite to take into account the