

pocketing \$1.50 per barrel more than the American refiners are.

Mr. FOSTER. Is $\frac{1}{8}$ c. per pound the only protection ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One-eighth of one cent on refined and the 40 per cent on raw sugar. The protection they get is $\frac{1}{8}$ c. per pound. The charge I make against the National Policy is that we pay millions every year in the shape of taxes which do not go into the treasury, and that this applies to sugar as well as to other articles. During the year 1893-94, we imported 2,800,000 pounds of refined sugar, on which the duty paid was \$22,230, that is at the rate of 8-10c per pound. That is what the treasury got. On the raw sugar imported, 300,000,000 pounds, which was imported free, the protection of 8-10c. per pound amounted to \$2,400,000, or, at the rate of $\frac{2}{3}$ c. per pound, to which the protection was reduced a year ago, it amounted to \$2,000,000. Where did that money go? Did the sugar refiners make a present of it to the people of Canada? Is not the thing ridiculous and absurd? Are they different from other men? Will they not make anything they can out of the consumers? They will; every one will. It is no wrong to be charged against them. I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) attempt to make the public believe that some serious charge was made against the gentlemen engaged in the refining of sugar. We make no charge against them. They are doing what anybody else would do under similar circumstances. We make our charge against the policy which enables them to tax the people for their own benefit. The hon. gentleman talks of the Hon. Mr. Boak, of Halifax, being attacked in this House. I fear that that remark was made by the hon. gentleman for a political purpose, and a political purpose only. I have sat in this House for thirteen or fourteen sessions, and during that time I have never heard a word said against Mr. Boak or any one associated with him because of their connection with the sugar industry. If the protective policy enables him and others who have invested their capital in the sugar industry to charge two or three million dollars a year to the consumers more than they would otherwise be obliged to pay, they are not to blame; but the men who are to blame are those who maintain that policy upon the country. It is the policy we protest against which enables us to impose upon the people every year millions of dollars of taxes, not one dollar of which goes into the treasury. The product of the refineries is shown by the census of 1891 to be equal to \$17,000,000 in value. Suppose we had imported that quantity from Great Britain free of duty, you would have saved exactly one-eighth of that amount, because you would have got the sugar one-eighth cheaper, that is, \$2,125,000. That is nearly exactly

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

the sum you compelled the people of Canada to pay on refined sugar in 1893-94, and not a dollar of it went into the treasury. That is the charge we make. We do not complain of taxing cotton or wool or sugar or anything else such reasonable sums as they ought to bear to discharge the burdens of the state. That has to be done. We are not fools; we know that a revenue has to be raised, and we are prepared to levy the necessary taxation to produce it. But we are not prepared, as my leader says, to impose one dollar of taxes on the people unless that dollar is paid into the public treasury.

Now, I want briefly to show the House how the public have been fleeced in the matter of coal oil. I will not speak of the amount the Trade and Navigation Returns show was paid by the people in direct taxes. I will show from certified invoices, which I hold in my hand, that the rate of taxation we pay in the maritime provinces is over 150 per cent. These invoices, which were made last October, were handed to me by the importer, and they are certified by the customs officer with the seal of the Customs Department upon them; and what do they show? Four tanks of refined oil were imported, valued at \$791, on which the amount of duty paid was \$1,130.28, a duty of 150 per cent. Another invoice, two or three days afterwards, was for six tanks of refined oil, valued at \$1,077, on which the duty paid was \$1,538.70, a duty of 150 per cent. If there are gentlemen in this House who can uphold or defend the continuance of such a wrong as that, I have nothing more to say. I say it is unjust, and they know it is unjust; it is taxing the people unduly and unfairly on one of the most ordinary necessities of life.

But hon. gentlemen say, "Oh, well, if you have to pay more for your goods, our policy protects the farmer"; and I want rapidly to say one or two words on that. I do not think any more silly argument is used or could be used by hon. gentlemen in support of the proposition that the protective system should be continued than that it protects the farmer. How can it protect the farmer? What are the facts? Look at the Trade and Navigation Returns: Is Canada or is it not an exporter of a surplus of farm products? I hold in my hand an extract made from the Trade and Navigation Returns, which shows that in butter, cheese, lard, bacon and hams, shoulders and sides, salted beef, mutton, salted pork, poultry and game, canned meats, and other meats, we export an enormous quantity, amounting in value to nearly \$18,000,000. What do we import of these products? We import \$575,000 worth. Now, can any gentleman argue without laughing, that a country that exports that quantity and imports practically nothing can be protected by an import duty? What do you do with your barley,