

cents, and the selling price $10\frac{1}{2}$ cents, or in other words, whereas under the old Tariff there was $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents difference between the cost and selling price, or 28 per cent., under the present Tariff the difference is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, or as nearly as possible 39 per cent., making 11 per cent. difference in the prices of this article, caused directly by the hon. gentleman's Tariff. Take the case of flannels, which the hon. gentleman knows are largely consumed by the masses of the people. They cost about 19 cents in 1878, and were sold over the counter for 28 cents; they cost now 18 cents and sell for 30 cents, being a difference of 10 per cent. on that article as against the present Tariff. As regards the heavy cloth used for overcoats by the working classes, and for warm winter clothes for women, there was bought for 2s. 6d. sterling in 1878, while the selling price was 92 cents, it now costs the same, 2s. 6d., but the selling price is \$1.07, being an increase of 15 cents per yard, caused directly by the hon. gentleman's Tariff. And, Sir, I also have letters from men who are largely engaged in trade in this country, and this is what one of them writes under date no longer ago than 20th January, 1882. He is talking about the relative prices of American and Canadian cottons:

"One of the best known and most saleable American cottons is branded Atlantic A. Its width is 36 inches. It sold in New York formerly for 8 cents, now for $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Canadian cotton of similar width and weight, but not quite so good, is sold at wholesale for $10\frac{1}{2}$ cents."

Are we to understand from the hon. gentleman that that extra two cents will form no tax upon the purchaser or producer of that cotton. The writer goes on to say:

"Lower priced cottons are sold in New York for $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard, a similar quality of goods in Canada cost $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents; striped shirtings, largely used by workmen, the price in New York is $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents, but this class of goods being very heavily taxed under the hon. gentleman's Tariff it is sold over the counter here for 15 cents per yard, and even at that price is largely used and preferred by our own people."

It stands to reason, and I cannot see how the hon. gentleman can deem it worth his while to raise the question, where you have the same specific duties to pay on articles in cottons ranging from 4 cents or 5 cents a yard to 18 cents or 19 cents, that the cheap goods must pay an enormously heavy tax as compared with the more expensive ones, and in the case of woollens where you have the same specific duty on those costing 40 cents as on those costing \$2, the proportionate tax upon the poorer class of articles must of necessity be enormously heavy. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has certainly in the course of his four or five hour speech travelled over a great deal of ground, and I do not know that I would be justified in following him all through, but I would like, Sir, to say a few words on a question on which he laid a great deal of stress, that is, the question of the actual cost to the consumer under this Tariff of the sugar now consumed in Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman entered into a long and minute calculation to show that we were obtaining sugar under this Tariff as cheap, or cheaper—I think he said 7 cents a hundred cheaper—than we could obtain it under the preceding Tariff. Well, Sir, I say this: the measure of the tax on the people of Canada is the difference between the price at which they can obtain the sugar in Glasgow or New York and the price they have to pay to Mr. Redpath or anybody else in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, I offer here the statement given me by one of the largest and best known wholesale dealers in the article in Canada, and I find from it that in the last six months, between the end of July and the end of December, the average price of granulated sugar in Montreal, less the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. discount usually allowed to the trade, was \$9.50 per hundred. In New York, with the usual discount, the cost, exclusive of duty, was about \$6.35. Therefore, it follows that we have paid on an average \$3, and a trifle upwards, per hundred on all the sugar that was consumed in Canada in a refined state. Now, Sir, what was the amount of sugar imported

into Canada? The gross amount was 136,406,000 lbs. Of that all but about 16,000,000 lbs., or about 120,000,000 lbs., were imported exclusively for the use of the refiner. That would produce, at least, 110,000,000 lbs. of sugar, after making liberal allowance for the waste accruing in manufacture. What do we receive on that? From the hon. gentleman's own statement we receive \$2,459,000 duty; yet of that 110,000,000 lbs. we had to pay to Redpath & Co. \$3 and a fraction per hundred more than the price in New York and Glasgow. Had that money gone into the Treasury we would have received \$3,723,000 instead of \$2,459,000; and the result of this Tariff has been just what I told the hon. gentleman, that the people of Canada have paid \$3,750,000 more than they would have done if there had been no duty; and that \$2,500,000 have gone into the Treasury and \$1,250,000 have been paid to keep the thousand men he spoke of employed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That is the exact fact of the case, whatever the hon. gentleman may say to the contrary; and it was a most paltry quibble on the hon. gentleman's part to speak of receiving a revenue of \$2,459,000 with an import of 136,000,000 lbs., as if that was equivalent to a duty of \$2,600,000 on a total importation of about 108,000,000 or 110,000,000 lbs. When the people are better off they will undoubtedly buy more sugar and consume more than when they are not so well off. No thanks to the hon. gentleman or his policy for that. Had my Tariff been in existence we would have had \$3,250,000 in the Treasury instead of \$2,500,000, as the hon. gentleman or any of his clerks could easily have ascertained by a very simple computation. The amount of sugar consumed in Canada when refined is equivalent to about 126,000,000 lbs., and on that I say the old Tariff would have produced \$3,250,000. The people of Canada, I repeat, have paid \$3,750,000. Now, in the matter of ship-building, the hon. gentleman might have told us that the quantity of ship-building that is going on has been very considerably reduced under his Tariff. He might have told us that these direct imports of tea, these ships from China and Japan which were to come into the Dominion, have been conspicuous by their absence during the whole time of the hon. gentleman's administration. Now, Sir, as to diminishing our exports from Montreal, I think the Montreal Corn Exchange are likely to be quite as well informed as the hon. gentleman as to its causes, and I observe, in a recent report of theirs, they advocate strongly the abolition of duty on breadstuffs, and they do not hesitate to hint that there has been a great deal of fraud in connection with the alleged exportation of American flour ground in bond, to replace the American wheat brought into the country by certain millers. When we get down certain returns that have been moved for, we will be in a position to ascertain for ourselves more accurately how far the suspicions of that body are justified. Until then I do not propose to enlarge on that particular question. Now the hon. gentleman, in the course of his argument, advanced three claims on account of the National Policy, which appear to me to be specially deserving of attention. He has, first of all, claimed credit for the foreign demand which existed for our foreign exports as a result of that policy. Well, Sir, I fail to see how by any possibility the hon. gentleman can maintain that this policy could in the slightest degree ever contribute to the increase of exports of the articles I have referred to. Then I allege he is wrong when he claims that his policy has created an improved home market, that the men who produced these articles have obtained more money for all these manufactures through the operation of his policy and not through their own exertions or the prosperity