

in order that I may be successful with him for the future. These are being rocked in these cradles—it seems to me it is a pity that they should be held responsible for this deficit to the extent of \$500,000, to meet which they will have to wait when they grow to manhood and manhood, without inflicting on them a burden while yet in their cradles. How must the strait be in which the Finance Minister finds himself when, in addition to compelling them to shoulder the burden when they reach mature age, he actually, while they are sleeping peacefully in their cradles, according to his graphic description of last year, increases the taxes on the toys and playthings these little ones have. Even these childish playthings are not exempt from the hand which a remorseless fate compels him to stretch out and tax everything it can grasp, in order that he may reduce somewhat his deficit. After taxing flour and coal and leaving a part of the deficit to be paid by those children when they reach maturity, he goes to work and adds to the playthings already covered with a 20 per cent. duty, 40 per cent, in order that the poor little creatures may feel the burden in their cradles. He has adjusted the

Sugar Duty.

We will discuss that matter more particularly in committee, when we will get some information from the hon. gentleman as to how he considers his new arrangement will work. I, looking at the matter, and subject to revising my judgment when we have more information from the hon. gentleman, and time to examine more closely in the committee, incline to this view, that he has materially enhanced the duty on sugar. My impression is he may secure something like \$500,000 extra duty out of it, and while he has done that, he will have increased the consumer, great as was the amount of duty he paid on that article before, to pay more actually in the future, as borne to a few refiners in this

country. Be that as it may, Canadian American granulated sugar was taxed up to the extent of 96 per cent, and I have figured it out correctly and it intends to exact a duty on American granulated on the long instead of the short price, which is, I suppose, his intention, and which, I suppose, if the refiners ask him to do he will do—the duty on American granulated sugar coming into this country, under this tariff as now arranged, will be more than 100 per cent; and the people can have some idea of what they are paying towards the taxes of the country on that one article. Yet, I suppose I will find gentlemen here who will not hesitate to risk the statement that sugar is as cheap as ever.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. A gentleman opposite says "hear, hear," and he is one of the gentlemen I would expect to hear it from, and he is about the only gentleman. What has the question of whether sugar or any other article is cheaper now than it was seven or eight years ago to do with the question? Do not values rise and fall? That has nothing to do with it, but the question the people are interested in is: If that duty were wiped off American granulated, they would get it at one-half the price than they can under the tariff. Hon. gentlemen have spoken of the effect of their policy upon the

Working Classes.

They claim the working classes have been greatly benefitted by the introduction of their tariff. The Finance Minister also made that claim; and in order to strengthen himself with reference to it, he was bold enough to do what no other hon. gentleman in this House has ventured to do since the Budget speech was made last year, so far as my recollection goes. We have a long Session, yet, if I remember right, the Finance Minister (Sir Leonard Tilley) last year was the only gentleman in this House that ever dared to make a