

Montreal and elsewhere, when they have attempted to bring in sugar, have learned to their cost that these men lower the price for a time, and then it is advanced again. I have thought it proper to say this with reference to the excess of duties imposed not only on glucose, but on another article which is quite as important to the country, and of which a great deal more is consumed.

Mr. STAIRS. In reply to the hon. gentleman who has done me the honor to mention my name, I take issue with him in the statement that we must take granulated sugar as the basis of calculation, because, in charging the duty on granulated sugar he is charging the duty on an article coming from the United States, and calculated on the fair market value in that country, which is very much higher than the price at which it can be purchased for export. But if you go across to the old country to purchase, you find that you pay the duty on the general market price in that country, which is very much lower. The export price there is invariably about the same as the home price. Therefore, our *ad valorem* rate of duty upon the price in the old country is not so excessive as it is on the price of the article coming from the United States. But I wish to point out that if there be over protection to granulated sugars at present, hon. gentlemen opposite and their policy are just as much to blame as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and for this reason: The protection the sugar refiners of Canada have at present on granulated sugar is due, not so much to the increase of 10 per cent. in the rate of duty, as to the enforcement of that principle in the tariff which was the law of Canada when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Any hon. gentleman who takes the trouble to look into this matter, will find that what I say is true. According to the figures given the other night by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), the difference in the price of granulated sugar for export and for home consumption in the United States is somewhere in the neighborhood of from  $2\frac{3}{4}$  to 3 cents a pound. Now, the enforcement of the *ad valorem* duty upon that difference is not due to anything in the tariff so much as to the enforcement of the general law in Canada, which was in operation before the present Government came into power in 1878, and hon. gentlemen opposite are just as much to blame for that law being on the Statute Book as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But it may be said that they did not enforce it. Well, that is true. If they choose to plead that they are quite welcome to the plea, because they only accuse themselves of having an Act on the Statute Book which they did not put in force. They can take either horn of the dilemma they choose. The hon. gentleman says I was unfair to him when I charged him with saying that granulated sugar could be purchased in Great Britain at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents. I did not charge any such thing. I had no intention of doing so. I understood just as clearly as the hon. gentleman himself, that granulated sugars could not be purchased in Great Britain; I admit that he is correct, although I do not know much about the sugar trade. The hon. gentleman himself said that he was glad to see the *Mail* admit that sugars could be purchased at that price outside of Canada, and I accepted that as an admission that that was a fair price to work upon; but I had no more intention to imply to the House or the country that granulated sugar could be purchased at that price in Great Britain than he had himself. He may be correct when he argues here to-night that granulated sugar cannot be purchased in England; but I believe it to be the case that sugars of a very much higher quality than those mentioned the other night as having been purchased at 8s. 3d. per 112 lbs. can be purchased in England—sugars which practically, so far as the general trade of Canada is concerned, will come into competition with a very much larger portion of our output of sugar. Now, if you really look at the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

increase of the duties on sugars under the present tariff as compared with that of the ex-Minister of Finance, you can see, without very much consideration of the question that, taking into account the sugars which can come in under the present tariff from Great Britain, and which constitute about  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the volume of sugar consumed in the Dominion, that the difference in the rate of duty between the two tariffs is not more than 5 per cent. at the most on sugars costing from 8s. 6d. to 10s. or 11s. per 112 lbs.; and therefore the additional duty cannot be much more than 9 to 15 cents per 100 lbs. as I argued the other night. Now, I do not wish to go into the question of sugar to-night; but I shall be very much pleased at any time, to enter into a discussion with the hon. gentleman or any other hon. member of this House on this question, which is a most important one to the country. I believe it is very much in the interest of the Dominion that the refineries should be in operation. I agree with the hon. gentleman in that; but I disagree with him entirely that we must take the market price of granulated sugars in the United States to calculate what the people of Canada are paying for sugars at present. It does not give this House and the people of Canada a fair impression, because, no matter if you do turn the theoretical consumption of sugar into granulated, you do not get a fair idea of the increase in the rate of duty. You get an idea probably five or six times as great as it really is on four-fifths of all the sugar consumed in Canada.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The drawback allowed to the exporter of sugars in the United States, as the hon. member for South Brant knows, is \$2.85 on every 100 lbs., which would bring sugar in this country down to \$3.15, while the consumer in the United States has to pay \$6 per 100 lbs.; so that the people of the United States, with the view of crushing out Canadian industries, offer a bonus for every 100 lbs. of sugar sent to Canada of \$2.85. That is an incontestable fact, and I ask the hon. gentleman, that being true, if he would advocate a return to the Cartwright tariff, so that the interests of Canada could be crushed out of existence by a policy like that of the United States?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is utterly mistaken. The Americans do not give a bonus at all; they return the duty to all these sugar refiners according to a certain scale.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is the same thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not the same thing by any means. It is quite true, in certain European States, under the guise of export duty, substantial bonuses have been paid, and it may be true that a good many years ago, under the same guise, bonuses were paid by the Americans, but the Americans made a most careful and exhaustive examination into that question, and if the hon. gentleman chooses to examine the subject at leisure, he will find that the return which they make, barely equals the amount of duty which was paid. As to what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) said, I take it that the way to ascertain what is the weight of taxation in this matter upon the people of Canada, is to ascertain this simple fact: Were we purchasing this sugar, which we consume, in England, where there is no duty at all, what would we have to give for it? The weight of evidence, as far as I have been able to ascertain from my own researches and from gentlemen conversant with the trade, is entirely this: that on the quantity of sugar which is now imported into Canada we are obliged substantially to pay 3 cents per pound, on an average, more than we would have to pay were there no tariff of any kind. That is the weight of taxation under this tariff. That amounts, supposing our 172,000,000 lbs. were reduced to any standard, say granulated, on an average to \$4,500,000 which the people of Canada have to pay for the 170,000,000