

lbs. or 150,000,000 lbs., whichever you like, more than they would require to pay if they were able to buy it in the Glasgow market or any other English market where there is no duty. That is the position I lay down, and it is, according to all the trade returns and circulars and evidence on the subject, a fair representation of the real state of the case. I state here to-day, and I think my hon. friend will find it to be the case, if he will go minutely into the question, that, as regards the grades which go into the consumption of the greater part of the people of Canada, you could buy them, without the tariff, at about 3 cents less per pound than are charged for them over the counter. That is the proper measure of the weight of the hon. gentleman's tariff. That represents on the 150,000,000 lbs. consumed, \$4,500,000, and as the Treasury has received but \$2,500,000 of this, the remainder, \$2,000,000, has been paid to the refiners.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to continue the discussion further than to say that I think the hon. gentleman is wrong, so far as his remarks apply to the principle upon which the Americans pay a drawback. My investigations have led me to the conclusion that they pay, instead of less, a little more than actual duty, and in arguing that question the American statesman—I forget his name—who, at the time, regulated the amount of drawback to be paid, claimed that though they paid to the manufacturers a higher sum than the actual duty upon the raw sugar, the country was more than compensated by the labor employed in the refining of the sugar. That is, according to my distinct recollection, the argument used, and though I think the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth), is not quite correct as to the amount \$2.85, my recollection being that it is \$2.70.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). \$2.79 now; it used to be \$3.20.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, some time ago; so that the hon. member for King's is substantially correct in his statement that while the amount paid is ostensibly a drawback, yet as the importer receives more than he actually paid, it virtually amounts to a bonus. The difference between the amount he paid and the amount he received—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that?

Mr. BOWELL. My recollection is 25 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 25 cents per hundred pounds is, I suppose, what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. BOWELL. That is correct. The American statesman I refer to, used the argument that the advantages received through giving employment to laborers in the country, more than compensated for the extra amount given over the duty paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt at that time the Americans did think so; but over and over again they have altered the amount they allowed as drawback; and, at present, it will be found they do not admit that they offer any bonus. I recollect distinctly the argument the hon. gentleman speaks of was used; and as far back as 1876 it was tolerably conclusive that at that time the Americans did allow the figure over the duty of which the hon. gentleman speaks, 25 cents per hundred pounds; but the hon. gentleman will find that since then the drawback has been very considerably reduced; and that whether it be the case or not, at this present moment, that there is a substantial advantage or not, the Americans do not admit that there is. I speak with some reserve upon that question, because I believe their duty is partly *ad valorem* and partly specific.

Mr. BOWELL. No; it is all specific.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I ask the question was when the duty is specific and *ad valorem*, no

doubt the drawback does afford considerable opportunity for evasion; but the Minister of Customs knows there is no question in the whole range of controversy which is more disputed, and as to which the refiners have told more fibs than the whole question of drawbacks. There is not one to be trusted in England or America or Canada on that question. I recollect well, the refiners utterly refused to give any statement as to how much refined sugar they could make out of an ordinary 100 pounds of imported sugar; and if the Finance Minister can find that out, he has found out what has bothered all the Finance Ministers of England and America for many a day.

Mr. BOWELL. I have tried to ascertain but have not succeeded so far; but I am not prepared to say that the sugar refiners in this country should be therefore designated as fibbers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not designate them in particular.

Mr. BOWELL. I have found that the different refiners, both in Halifax and old Canada, have given us, as far as they could, the facts upon which to base a drawback, but I admit there is a variety of opinions, and that this is one of the most difficult questions to solve. For that reason I came to the conclusion that it was impossible to establish an exact figure which would cover the exact amount of duty paid upon any sugar after it had been refined. You will have to guess, to a certain extent, and come to as equitable a decision as you possibly could; and with the fluctuations in the markets in the different countries in which the raw material is produced, the drawback to-day might be too little next week and too much the week after. The Americans, on that account, gave a very liberal construction in the ruling of the Treasury Department, and for that reason they gave no more than they thought the refiners entitled to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I certainly did not mean to say that our refiners would fib any more than their neighbors—I do not believe they do—but the hon. gentleman knows very well that the refiners all over the country, when they were demanding advantages from us, refused us information. They made all kinds of demands and they would not answer questions, they would not tell us the facts about it, and I do not suppose they have told the hon. gentleman any more accurately than they would me.

Mr. BOWELL. They have told me what they said were facts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows also that Mr. Gladstone and many others have made statements very much stronger than I did as to the *modus operandi* pursued by the sugar refiners in their various controversies with the Government, which are without end.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I thought it likely that we should drift into a general discussion on the sugar question, and that is why I desired that the discussion should be confined to the subject before the Committee. I am not going to be dragged into a general discussion. The hon. gentleman made his speech following the statements I made in introducing the Budget, and could then have dealt with this matter, but it appears that he has supplemented that speech now. If I do not enter into it now, it is because I do not wish to call off the attention of the Committee from the matter under consideration, and do not desire to be drawn into this general discussion at this time further than to say, that the statements made by the hon. gentleman are not, in my judgment, borne out by facts. If we get into a general discussion on the tariff, a general declaration in reference to it, as we may on going into Supply or on some other question, I will then devote some attention to the statements