country—even maple sugar—and were allowed all sugar free under 16. Is not that evidence that the consumers of this country did not pay the eight-tenths of a cent duty imposed on sugar? My hon. friend says wipe out the industry. You will have the opportunity then of destroying the carrying trade of our shipping to the extent of over 300,000,000 pounds of sugar a year. You will destroy all the industries connected with it—the cooperage industry, the wharfage, the cartage and others connected with it. What do with it, if has all that got to you can raise a cry and convince the people of the country that they are having taxes extorted from them that should not be? I have just one point more on this question I add here a statement of the prices of sugar every week from January to December in 1892, in New York and in Montreal. It is as follows:—

WEEKLY PRICES, New York and Montreal, Granulated Sugar for Year 1892.

Date.	New York, Net per lb	Montreal, Net per lb.
Jan. 8	4.00	4.39
" 15	4.00	4.33
" 22	3.93	4.33
" 29	3.94	4.33
Feb. 5	3.92	4.33
" 12	3.92	4.33
" 19	3.92	4.33
" 26	3.92	4.33
Mar. 4	3.92	4.33
" 11	4.13	4.39
" 18	4.24	4.39
" 25	4.29	4.39
Apr. 1	4.29	4.39
" 8	4.29	4.39
" 15	4.29	4.39
" 22	4.27	4.39
" 29	4.23	4.39
May 6	4.23	4.39
" 13	4.23	4.26
" 20	4.23	4.26
" 27	4.23	4.20
June 3	4.23	4.20
" 10	4.26	4.20
" 17	4.29	4.20
" 24	4.26	4.20
July 1	4.23	4.14
" 8	4.23	4.14
" 15	4.19	4.14
" 22	4.13	4.14
" 29	4.19	4.14
Aug. 5	4.23	4.08
" 12	4.23	4.08
" 19	4.44	4.08
" 26	4.47	4.14
Sept. 2	4.59	4.26
" 9	4.90	4.63
" 16	4.90	4.63
" 23	4.90	4.63
" 30	4.90	4.63
Oct. 7	4.72	4.39
" 14	4.72	4.39
" 21	4.72	4.39
" 28	4.72	4.39

WEEKLY PRICES, New York and Montreal, Granulated Sugar for Year 1892—*Continued.*

Date.	New York, Net per lb.	Montreal, Net per lb.
Nov. 4	4.72	4.39
" 11	4.61	4.39
" 18	4.59	4.39
" 25	4.59	4.39
Dec. 2	4.59	4.39
" 9	4.59	4.39
" 16	4.59	4.39
" 23	4.59	4.39
" 30	4.59	4.39

You will observe that for over six months of that period refined sugars were cheaper in Canada than they were in the United States, and that has all been done through judicious management of business under a protective policy. Now my hon. friend says the consumer pays all the taxes, that the imposition of the duty has but one result, and that is the bearing down heavily upon the poor unfortunate consumer. There was last year a deputation of English journalists to the World's Fair, and they visited Canada. Among them was a Mr. Carr, a very eminent literary man, who edits a newspaper in Cardiff, Wales. I met him at a club in Toronto, where he made a most violent free trade speech at a dinner given by the Board of Trade, in the course of which he told us that he looked forward at no distant date to seeing the period described by Macaulay when the New Zealander would be found sitting on the ruins of Blackfriars Bridge looking at the ruins of London. He said also that protection was a robbery of the people, and went on in a very learned style to show what a pair of trousers should cost a man and claiming that they should not be taxed. On his return to England he published a brochure on what he had seen while travelling on this continent and he did me the honour to send me a copy. He was horrified to find that under a protective tariff things were actually cheaper than in that elysium, as my hon. friend considers it, free-trade England. I will read one paragraph for the information of those who take strong views on the other side of this question. He writes in his letter upon "Economical Heresies in the United States," the following:—

Mixing as I have done of late amongst all classes of republican workmen and manufacturers—having witnessed the phenomenal prosperity alike of capital and labour—informed as I have been of the extent and strength of the enormous interests created by the American policy of protection, I cannot help realizing the fact that those of our