

quarter, and goods are exported in large quantities and sold at such prices that outside competition is effectually counted out. English manufacturers have been known to export goods to a distant market and sell them under cost for years, with the view of getting the market into their own hands.

Take away the protection which our industries enjoy, and our markets will be slaughtered; in two or three years our industries will be killed, and then prices will be raised and the consumers of Canada will be, as they were from 1875 to 1878, entirely at the mercy of the American and English and foreign manufacturers. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to laugh, but they ought to have learned by their experience. They ought to have learned by the election of 1878. In 1874 I ran for the second time for a seat in this Parliament, and I declared myself, in my address to the electors, as a protectionist, at a time when the party to which I belonged had not yet declared in favour of protection. The hon. Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Opposition to-day, was then in favour of protection. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) was also in favour of protection. So was the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine), and Mr. Devlin, and Mr. Jétté, who formed the so-called National party on the principles of protection, and the hon. Mr. Joly. But Mr. Mackenzie was not in its favour, and therefore these protectionists became free traders. I have remained ever since a protectionist, and when, in 1878 I saw protection introduced, not only to foster, but to create national industries, I was certainly in favour of it. To-day, we have a very serious difficulty to meet with—the difficulty of re-adjusting the tariff. In 1879, the tariff was a relief to everybody. All the existing industries—and there were very few—were then closed up. Even the sugar industry was closed up. The tariff we brought forward in 1879 was a relief to every one. There is no necessity to disturb it to-day; and if you touch one corner of that tariff which has been in existence for years, you disturb a great many interests. The hon. Minister of Finance ought, therefore, to be very careful not to disturb the very industries he and his predecessors have created. Destroy those industries, and what will be the consequence? In consequence of the bankrupt markets of the United States, and the eagerness of the Americans to sell at any price, even below cost, there will be no chance to compete against these prices here, and in three or four years we will find ourselves at the mercy of the American manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen opposite should have learned by the experience of 1878 and 1882 and 1887 and 1891. They should know that the people are in favour of protection. Take the farmers in my county, whom I see every week. They are in favour of protection for the produce of the farm, but, at the same time, they would

be very sorry indeed to see any of our manufactures destroyed, because they know that these furnish them with a market for their products. I hope the Minister of Finance will consider seriously before he decides to close up any manufacturing establishments in this country.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). This is an industry which was called into existence by a National Policy Government. We are now revising the tariff, in the light of the National Policy, and if it is shown, as the manufacturers of these bolts are prepared to show, that the proposed change will damage their business and cause them to close up, it is our duty as a National Policy party and Government to give them sufficient protection—to give them the protection they had under the former tariff. I would ask the hon. Minister to hold this over until the manufacturers can make their representations known to him.

Mr. McKAY. I would also ask the hon. Minister to let this item stand over, and see if he cannot restore the protection which these manufacturers enjoyed before. I am in a position to say, from the knowledge I have acquired, that the protection they have hitherto had was not more than they actually needed. It was higher than at present, but still not high enough to keep American goods out of the market. I do not agree in the opinion that the people of this country should take advantage of the abnormal state of the market on the other side. That is the time our workingmen should be protected. I hope the hon. gentleman does not want to see our workingmen driven out of this country and placed in the position in which the American workingmen of the United States are at present. We should keep them employed and give them sufficient protection to insure their being kept employed. Two of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me in the representation of the city of Hamilton were elected in 1874 as protectionists, on their appeal to the city as protectionists. They came to Ottawa as ardent protectionists to represent that city; but when they found that Mr. Mackenzie and his party were not in favour of protection, they abandoned their principles. Consequently, in 1878, the country, and the city of Hamilton in particular, had become reduced to such a condition that the people saw the necessity for a protectionist Government, and drove those representatives out, and elected protectionists in their place. I think the National Policy should be maintained, and trust the Finance Minister will take heed of the representations made to him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a very interesting discussion which the hon. gentleman and his friends are carrying on. We have been here two and one-half months and the hon. gentleman has not progressed sufficiently to satisfy those on the other side.