

I apologize to the House for the time I have taken, and I thank the House for the kind attention it has given my remarks. We are willing to bear all the necessary burdens in order to pay our debts and maintain our credit and good name. We are willing to bear the taxation imposed upon us to meet the necessary expenditure of this country; we are willing to give our native industries every benefit of that protection up to that extent; but for myself I am not willing that any man should deliberately put his hand into my pocket and take more or less money out in order to bolster an institution that has not backbone enough to stand on its own legs, and I shall be found voting for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) I have listened with a good deal of interest to the address of the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. I do not know whether it is in very good taste, on either side of the House, to find fault or to try and exaggerate in any way the distress prevailing in Great Britain to-day. But I think that when hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to rebuke members on this side for telling the country that there is distress prevailing in Great Britain and that things are not as they should be in that centre of free trade, they ought not at least to depreciate the institutions and condition of their own country. When I entered the Chamber, I think the first remark I heard the hon. gentleman make, who has just taken his seat, was with reference to the Hon. Mr. Mercier, of Quebec. I do not know whether he felt happy that the proceedings which were taken against him were not successful, but he was careful to tell us that Mr. Mercier was not convicted. Whether the hon. gentleman meant that Mr. Mercier was not guilty or whether he meant to express his pleasure at Mr. Mercier escaping conviction, I cannot say, but anyhow it seemed very gratifying to him that Mr. Mercier was not convicted. And no doubt he was very happy to taunt this side of the House with the fact that he was not convicted. On the other hand, he told us that the late contractor escaped, and that we had failed in convicting him. Well, I believe that the evidence was presented in both cases before the tribunals in the province of Quebec; and I may say for myself, and I think I speak for every honest man in this Dominion, that, whether it was the fault of the evidence, or whether it was the fault of the tribunal, or whether it was the fault of the laws, if we believed the evidence against them, it was a great pity the contractor and Mr. Mercier were not convicted of offences of which, I think, they were guilty, according to the evidence given against them. The hon. member told us first that everything was produced in Great Britain much more cheaply than it was here, owing to free trade. He said the

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

people over there could manufacture to greater advantage than we could. Then he went on to tell us that in the republic of Argentine the people could produce wheat much more cheaply than we could—I think he said from 15 to 20 cents a bushel cheaper. Then he told us the manufacturers here were not prospering as well as they should, and that our farming was not paying those engaged in it. And, as well as I could understand, the only remedy that he proposed was that we should open this country to the manufacturers of Great Britain, and to the wheat growers of the Argentine Republic. He found fault because the Government allowed, on articles exported, a rebate of 99 per cent of the duties paid on materials entering into the production of those goods. Sir, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that manufacturers should come into this country and manufacture for the republic of Argentine or for the United States or Great Britain, and not charge them a cent of duty on the materials they use in the production of their wares. I am perfectly willing that we should manufacture for the whole world, if possible, and that to the extent that we do manufacture for other countries we should return duties paid by the manufacturer. I believe that in the case of liquors sent abroad, the excise duty is returned: I know that it is so in the case of tobacco, because a common way to evade payment of the duties is to send the tobacco down to St. Pierre and then smuggle it back into the country. That was at one time quite an industry in the maritime provinces, and in some parts of Quebec, though I understand that it is now very largely put a stop to. Now, I propose to show that in the period of distress that we had from 1873 to 1879, in the highly protected country to the south of us, the export of home products increased year by year, while our exports of home products decreased:

	United States.	Canada.
1873	\$505,000,000	\$76,538,000
1874	569,000,000	76,741,000
1875	499,000,000	69,709,000
1876	525,000,000	72,401,000
1877	589,000,000	68,030,000
1878	680,000,000	67,989,000
1879	698,000,000	62,431,000

These figures show that while the exports of home products of the United States increased \$193,000,000, ours decreased \$14,000,000. In the highly protected country to the south of us, these exports increased by almost two-thirds, while ours decreased almost one-sixth. Now, let us make a comparison between Great Britain and Canada, during these years. I will give you the figures of the export of home produce for these countries, 1874 and 1879:

	Great Britain.	Canada.
1874	\$239,000,000	\$76,741,000
1879	191,531,000	62,431,000