here he must pay 5½ to 6 cents. In England the retail price of white sugar is 2d. or 4 cents, while here he must pay 6¾ cents to 7 cents, or an average of 2¾ cents more than in England, making on the 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar consumed in this country a loss of $5.500,000 to the consumer, or, deducting the duty of $3,200,000, a tax of $2.300 000 goes to the refiner. The immigrant is puzzled to know why he cannot get his sugar at 3 cents or 4 cents, and he will be told the Government tax for Customs is 1⅝ cents per pound, making brown sugar 1½ cents dearer, and white sugar 1⅝ cents dearer. That makes the price of yellow 4½ cents, and of the white 5⅝ cents, adding the duty to the English price. Where does the rest go? It is farmed out like the taxes in Turkey; it goes into second hands whose share is 1⅛ cents; or, on the quantity consumed, $2,250,000. There is another feature of this new tariff. In the proposed tariff, we say 15 per cent. may be brought in by the refiners over No. 14 and may be entered by the polariscopic test. At a test of 92, that would be a duty of $1.73 per 100 lbs.; 15 per cent of the entire consumption is equal to 30,000,000 lbs., and at the rate of $1.73 per 100 lbs. that would give $519,000. The rate on similar sugar to other importers is 35 per cent. and 1½ cents per pound, making a cost of 3½ per cent., or equal to $2.73 per 100 lbs., amounting to $819,000. This, therefore, gives 1 cent more duty to be paid by the importer than by the refiner, or an increase of $300,000. If we compare the enormous protection given to sugar, as compared to the protection given to other things, in which labor is more employed, we will find that the refining industry is protected beyond all reason. Take the case of locomotives built at Kingston, the constituency I have the honor to represent. A locomotive costs on an average $7,500; the duty imposed is about $750 or that much protection. The labor in getting out a locomotive is 50 per cent. of the outturn, or $3,750 in value, so that this labor value of $3,750 has a protection of $750 or 20 per cent. The cost of a locomotive in the United States now is $6,000, and the duty is 25 per cent., or $1,500. Compare this with the protection given to sugar, at 6 cents a pound, it would take 125,000 lbs. of sugar to equal $7,500, the price of a locomotive. The duty on that at $1.60, which is a little higher than the Department expects to get—but I will give them the full benefit of the tariff and it may be produced at that, if properly tested—would be $2,000. The duty on the same quantity of American sugar at 4 cents would be $5,000, or, at the exact rate of $3.96, the actual duty would be $4,950. Now the labor employed in the refining of sugar is not more than 10 per cent. of the output; that is, $750 on an output of $7,500. This gives a protection to labor in the sugar refineries of 400 per cent., or twenty times that given to labor in locomotive works. Our locomotive works have been closed up for the last two years, lying idle, at Kingston, but they have resumed work very recently to the extent of one-third of their capacity, and this may be said in their favor, that, besides employing so large a percentage of labor, they furnish a school in which young men will learn the highest mechanics, and after four years apprenticeship will go out and be able to earn high wages. I cannot understand, therefore, why the Government should not protect such works, if they are to carry out their policy of protection, more especially as this is an article which can well stand the tax, while the other article is an article of consumption which should not be taxed.

On resolution 5, export duty on logs.

Mr. McLELAN. I propose to amend this by striking out after "spruce logs, $1," and inserting "$1 per thousand feet," being the same duty as at present. In pine logs, I propose to strike out the figure "$3" and insert "$2." And I propose to amend the proviso that the Government may, by an Order in Council, at any time, increase the duty or strike it off. This is to enable us to meet circumstances that may arise in our relations with other countries in this connection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman has probably done wisely under all the circumstances in abandoning the proposition to increase the duty to $3 a thousand on pine logs, and I have no objection to offer to his suggestion for reducing that, but I doubt very much the propriety of the Government retaining in their hands the power, without the consent of this House, to increase the duties. That appears to me a very objectionable proposition, and against that I must protest. No doubt the hon. gentleman, like many other hon. gentlemen in this House, has received very strong remonstrances from the trade and those concerned in it as to the effect of his proposed legislation, which I took occasion to tell him at the time was dangerous; and I am glad to see that the Government have on second thoughts, wisely I think, abandoned their proposition in Parliament. I trust they will be still wiser, and abandon their proposition in part to keep in their hands the somewhat unconstitutional and certainly unusual power of increasing the export tax on these articles. That, if done at all, should be done, I contend, by consent of Parliament, and is not a fit and proper thing to depute to the Executive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, but, Mr. Speaker, the proposition as laid before the House originally was that the duty on pine logs should be $3, and the House would no doubt have sanctioned that. For reasons which the hon. gentleman no doubt quite appreciated, the policy of the Government is, on second thoughts, as the hon. gentleman says, to make it $2. The $2 per thousand duty on pine logs is not at all a protection against our forests being swept away and the logs being carried off from our own mills to another country. There is a possibility of restrictive legislation elsewhere in this regard, and it is well to leave us the power the House would have given us originally to levy the tax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the House has not given the power. The hon. gentleman proposes to take it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very much gratified that the Government have seen fit to reduce the export duty to $2 per thousand, a sum equivalent to the American import duty upon lumber. I do not think the Americans can object to that rate of duty. One duty equalises the other. Logs are introduced into the United States free of duty and lumber is charged a duty of $2 per thousand, placing Canadian lumber at a disadvantage of $2 per thousand, so that this export duty on sawlogs will equalise it. The Government have acted wisely, and I have no doubt they have received from the trade in nearly all parts of the Dominion representations as to the fear entertained by lumbermen that the imposition of a duty of $3 might be considered a discriminating duty and might lead to trouble. It is always considered inadvisable to fool with the heels of a mule, particularly if you are doing it with a stick, and we might have realised the truth of that adage if we had carried out what was originally proposed. The hon. the First Minister says that the duty of $2 is not a protection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not sufficient.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am unable to agree with the hon. gentleman in that respect. The fact is that practically we have no trade in the export of sawlogs at the present moment. The total exportation of pine sawlogs last year was 380,000 feet, and the duty collected was $380. That practically is no trade at all. The total revenue from export duties was $12,305. This was largely derived from spruce, to the extent of $11,165. From pine, $380 was received, and $756 from shingle bolts. Now, the fear enter-