

Canadian consumers, and he placed half a cent on sugar that he knew they could not escape, and when they take a drink of whisky they have to contribute another 20 per cent to the purpose of creating this revenue.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. That is not enough.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have no objection to the whisky men contributing it. But I have to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this, that if the principles expounded by the Finance Minister in the early and callow years of his political life were correct, we are making it more and more difficult every year for the people of the Dominion to reach that point which the hon. gentleman formerly said meant the well-being of the people, wiping out this revenue from liquor and prohibiting its consumption in our midst. That is the direction in which we are drifting.

But this does not cover the whole of the question. I want to draw attention to the difference between the policy of the Liberals and the National Policy, and I think the sugar question will illustrate it about as effectively as anything I can present to the House. The Americans under the McKinley Act of 1891, struck off the duty on raw sugar and sugars up to No. 16 Dutch standard, and left the duty of half a cent per pound on refined sugar for the benefit of the American sugar trust. At one operation they took \$60,000,000 of taxes off their people. What is the position to-day of the sugar tariff here in Canada? Does the half cent a pound going into the treasury represent the amount of duty that the people of this country pay for their refined sugar? No. We have another tax, and it does not come out of the Americans either, it comes out of the consumers of sugar in Canada—it is a tax of 64 cents additional on every 100 pounds. For the protection of whom? The Canadian consumer? No—the Canadian refiner of sugar. Let us apply that to the sugar imports of last season, and see how it will operate. We imported in round numbers a little over 300,000,000 pounds of raw sugar in 1894. Say that 50,000,000 went direct into family consumption for ordinary purposes, and that 250,000,000 of that importation passed through the hands of the refiners. What is the result of the application of this system of protection to-day? Why, Sir, the McKinley tariff, as an engine for securing revenue for the sugar trust, is nowhere, it is not in it; and I will show you why. Take 250,000,000 pounds of raw sugar imported into Canada last year. The protection to the refiner on that sugar under the American tariff would have been \$1,250,000. What is it under the tariff we are operating here to-day? No less than \$1,600,000. Last summer when the fight was on in Washington with the sugar trust, and it took all summer to settle the question, the difficulty was over the amount of protection

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

the Americans would give the sugar refineries; and at the close of that contest where were the sugar refineries placed? They were given one-eighth of one per cent of duty extra on refined sugar imposed for their protection; instead of 64 cents per 100 pounds given in Canada, they were only allowing 12½ cents per 100 pounds. We sometimes reach results better by comparison. For the last three months the dividend of the American sugar trust, with that protection of 12½ cents per 100 pounds, was 3 per cent in the quarter on a capital of \$75,000,000, and experts on the American side say the whole of the sugar could be refined with a plant not costing over \$15,000,000. Yet one-eighth of one per cent gives a sufficient return to pay on this enormous capital 3 per cent per quarter, or 12 per cent per annum, whereas our refiners are protected to nearly five times that amount, and instead of getting \$312,500, as the American extra protection to the trust would give them on our imports of sugar, they received \$1,600,000 protection from this Government. There is a line of cleavage between the policy represented on this side of the House and the policy represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not object to bearing the burdens sufficient for the necessary maintenance and for the expenditure of this country; we are willing to carry the burdens necessary to pay interest on our public debt, heavy as it is; we are willing to bear the burdens imposed for the necessary working expenditure, but we are not willing to become burden bearers for specially protected industries after this fashion.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that free trade as spoken of in Britain is impracticable here. I, for myself, and I speak for myself, say we are perfectly willing to bear the burdens imposed on our goods by a tariff that will enable us to meet our current expenditures; but so long as I am in a position to protest I will protest against being called on to maintain industries that cannot stand on their own legs. On this point I desire to draw the attention of the House to an article printed in the "Mail" a short time ago, an organ that cannot be accused of leaning towards popular sentiment, and this article was printed after it became the organ of the Government. It is as follows:—

The plea of those who want to locate newcomers here at any cost is, that we cannot expect them to come unless inducements are offered. This policy has been sufficiently illustrated in Ontario. Again and again it has been necessary for the legislature to do something to check the evil.

There have been peripatetic industries, the proprietors of which looked out for a "good bonus," started their mills, worked up the subsidy, and then looked out "for fresh fields and pastures new."

If the natural and commercial advantages of a place are not sufficient to attract manufacturing enterprises, it had better wait till they are.