

of the number they employed in 1881 as a basis. How will I do that? The Finance Minister told us in 1881 that there was 78 per cent. of raw sugar imported and 22 per cent. only of refined, while in the year 1889, which was the year he took for comparison, he said we imported 95 per cent. of raw sugar and only 5 per cent. of refined. The difference then between the importation of 78 per cent. and 95 per cent. of raw sugar would be 17 per cent. more sugar which would be refined in the Dominion of Canada in the year 1889 than in the year 1881. That 17 per cent. would be equal to 22 per cent. upon the 78 per cent. raw sugar imported in 1881 and upon the quantity refined in Canada in that year. Therefore, if to the number of hands employed in 1881, namely 723, I add 22 per cent. increase to account for the number required to refine the extra quantity of granulated sugar, it would make 159 more hands employed in 1889 than in 1881. Taking the census of 1881 as a basis and adding the proportionate increase of hands necessary to refine the increased quantity refined in 1889, the total number of hands now employed in these sugar refineries would be 882. The total yearly wages as given by these manufacturers in 1881 was \$363,000, and I have to add 22 per cent. additional to that to cover the wages that would be paid on the increased quantity that was refined in Canada in 1889, which would make \$79,680 more, or a total of \$442,860 per year. I have shown that by the quotations today, 30 cents more per hundred pounds is charged in Canada than in the United States, and on a consumption of 200,000,000 lbs. per year that makes \$600,000; so that you could afford to pay all these hands which are employed in the sugar refineries at a rate of nearly \$500 a year each and then make a saving besides. In other words the \$600,000 represents extra cost of sugar to the Canadian people; the amount of wages paid to the workmen in these sugar refineries amounts to \$442,860, and if you deduct one from the other you still have a loss of \$157,140. The country might, out of the public treasury, pay all the hands engaged in the sugar refineries for doing nothing and then save \$157,000 per annum besides. That is the position in which the sugar question now stands, and the Minister of Finance asks us to rejoice with him and to give him credit for having wiped out the taxation that was upon the people of this country with reference to the article of sugar. No, Sir. If he had followed the principle adopted by the United States, which is the example he uses of the highest protected country we have in the world, in the adjustment of their sugar duties, he would find that they give  $\frac{2}{10}$  of a cent per pound to their manufacturers, but the hon. gentleman gives  $\frac{8}{10}$  of a cent per pound protection to the Canadian refiners. They have allowed the people of the United States to bring in No. 16 Dutch standard free, but our Minister of Finance has reduced the standard to No. 14 under which our people are allowed to bring in raw sugar. Therefore, instead of reducing the protection, he has relatively increased the protection he has given to the refiners. In spite of the fact that sugar is now being reduced in price by the amount that went into the public treasury, the people will still have to contribute a burthen somewhere else. Sugar has still to pay a tax upon the tribute that is placed upon it by those refiners, in asking a higher price than that for which sugar can be

imported from a country where the price of sugar is fixed under a protective tariff as it is in the United States. No, Sir, we cannot give him all the credit we would like to give him in this matter; and we have this to say, that while the moral sense of the people of this country would be shocked if a Minister controlling a department should be found varying the terms of a contract so as to make it more profitable to the contractor, and receiving from that contractor at different times sums of money to be used as an election fund to corrupt the electors of this country, and while individual members of Parliament would shield themselves behind the statement that if done at all it was done by the Minister on his own authority and unknown to them—I call to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite that, in criticizing the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, if there was one statement made by him that called for notice at their hands more than another, it was his declaration that it was well known that these sugar refiners were the largest contributors to that corrupt election fund. The hon. gentleman who last spoke should have given some answer to that statement; he should have been in a position either to deny it or to state that it was well founded. Sir, am I to understand that he dare not deny that statement?

Mr. WELDON. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to make a denial? I know as little about it as he does.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he is in a position to deny what the hon. member for South Oxford charges?

Mr. FOSTER. You will get the denial in due course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A denial of that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. You will get all the denials you deserve, and there will be a good many.

Mr. BOWELL. If you charged it, I think it would receive a little more attention.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, it would be a very sad thing indeed if, following upon these people contributing largely to an election fund for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors of this country, it should be found that a Minister of Finance, not in the secrecy of his own department, but in the broad light of Parliament, should come down with a proposition to so adjust the tariff that those men should get hundreds of thousands of dollars for themselves, if they saw fit to use the machinery provided by him. If the moral sentiment of the community would be shocked by a Minister changing contracts for the benefit of men from whom he had received election contributions, what shall be said of a Minister who would ask Parliament to sanction tariff changes for the benefit of those who were the largest contributors to the fund for carrying the elections of this country? Now, perhaps, I have spent more time on this sugar question than I ought; but my hon. friend was very emphatic in claiming credit for the Government on that point, and I want to give the hon. Minister of Finance full credit for the reduction he has made in the sugar duties. He has thrown off, as the hon. member for South Oxford has said, all the revenue that went into the public treasury, and he has so adjusted his tariff that what was taken out of the