

In answer to Mr. DOMVILLE,

SIR A. J. SMITH said the duty on the imported goods required for a vessel of 1,500 tons would now be \$3,000, under the new tariff. Suppose he wanted iron knees, and got them from the hon. member for King's, who imported the iron and made the knees for vessels—who would get the drawback, the ship-builder, or the person who sold him the articles?

MR. TILLEY: That depends on the arrangement between them. The ship-builder obtains the benefit—gets the article at the lower price.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the matter was not provided for. A builder could buy iron in various places. He might buy from the hon. member for King's, for example. How was he to know? If the iron came from the Londonderry, N. S., works, would the drawback be allowed?

MR. TILLEY: No.

SIR A. J. SMITH asked was that a fair policy to the iron manufacturer at Londonderry, to refuse a drawback on his iron, while allowing it on imported iron? They would thus discriminate in favour of the iron-makers of foreign countries. Suppose a man could import iron, duty paid, for about the price of it at the Londonderry mines, and get a drawback of 10 per cent. on the imported, was not that an inducement to import the foreign article?

MR. TILLEY: Yes.

SIR A. J. SMITH asked was not that anomalous and a discrimination against the interests of the country in favour of the foreigner? He dared say the Finance Minister had overlooked that result, which he could hardly have intended. He would appeal to the hon. gentleman, representing, as he did, a Province deeply interested in shipbuilding, to repeal altogether that clause which would impose \$3,000 of duties on a 1,500-ton vessel. He had as much right to be heard on that question as a member of any of the manufacturers' rings they had seen at

Ottawa, and who had moulded the tariff policy to suit their own interests. The increased duties would embarrass seriously the shipbuilding interest. Did the hon. gentleman say that, when the ship had gone to sea, the builder would be refunded the duties on the materials? But much time might elapse before that, so as to make the loss of interest equal the refund. And yet the hon. gentleman claimed great credit for benefitting the shipbuilders. Did it require any argument to show that this was false, or that he was striking a serious blow at the best interest of the Maritime Provinces? Let him repeal that resolution, if he wanted to get anything out of ships without injuring the trade. Why embarrass himself with this drawback clause which must inevitably lead to fraud and inconvenience, and be found absolutely impracticable? The Finance Minister ought to have consulted men like his hon. friend from Yarmouth before making such a change, and formulated the mode of returning the drawback. He had evidently no adviser he could rely on.

MR. TILLEY asked how the hon. gentleman made it out that the ship-builder, on a 1,500-ton vessel, would have to pay \$3,000.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had not then the details, but would furnish them. In preparing his tariff, the hon. gentleman had listened to the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, but had not consulted the interests of the great body of the people, the labouring men and farmers. Rings of manufacturers had been in Ottawa of late, and the changes they had secured in the tariff since its submission were perfectly marvellous and magical. He knew a gentleman interested in pulp, on which the Finance Minister put ten per cent.; but it did not require his attendance in Ottawa more than half an hour to secure a change to 20 per cent. That was an example of the pressure brought to bear on the hon. gentleman, and its effect. He said that, in September last, the people had pronounced in favour of this tariff. He (Sir A. J. Smith) would like to know how, or what tariff, since a great many changes had been made in it. He had