

from Brant would justify the Government in paying these drawbacks out of the public moneys without proper data for such payments.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman thinks that every time I speak upon this subject I have reference to a particular claim.

Mr. BOWELL. I know you have.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I have several times spoken of the general fact that three or four millions dollars worth of goods have been exported upon which the Government pledged themselves to give drawbacks, but upon which no drawbacks were paid. I moved for a return to show the names of the firms exporting these goods, but when it was brought down there was a rather curt note appended, saying that as rejected claims were not a matter of account they could not be given. I submit that this is not a proper way in which the business of the country should be transacted. I think, in the face of this fact, the position I take is a strong one, and it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. the Minister of Customs to ask me whether there has been a claim presented by those individuals. I venture to say this: that there are far more claims than the one he would lead the House to believe has been the only one. He has the means of knowing; I have not. I took steps to find out and I was told that no record was kept. I would ask him whether there have not been many more claims than those whose demands have been satisfied. He says, with reference to that claim, that he had put in Londonderry pig iron along with his other pig iron; that the boiler tubes were a manufactured article while the pig iron was not. Here, to-day, we have a direct contradiction of that statement. We have the hon. gentleman telling us that pig iron is a manufactured article in Canada as well as the article of boiler tubes. Yet, forsooth, the Ministry have adopted a system of regulations whereby they will give a drawback on pig iron which is manufactured in the country; while boiler tubes are not manufactured in the country and no drawbacks shall be given on boiler tubes, because, they say, these are manufactured articles and pig iron is not. Why, the whole thing is an anomaly. The whole thing is in such a shape that it is impossible for men to get their rights. Take it again with reference to this bounty to bridge manufacturers; if carried out it is giving to them the whole claim that can be preferred by any manufacturer in any direction. Why, under this regulation the iron bridge manufacturer will get by way of bounty the total amount of duty on pig iron that enters into the construction of that bridge, whether made in Londonderry or made in foreign countries, because it is the amount of duty that would have been paid on the manufactured articles that he gets back, the finished article; so that under this heading he is giving to the bridge manufacturer, about the only ones who supply material to the Syndicate, a drawback of the full amount of the material that enters into the construction of their work, whether that material be made in Canada or in any other country. There is another point upon which I would ask him to draw a straight line. I want him to understand that I am not speaking in reference to the claim of the one firm that has been referred to. Neither have I gone into the question of the alarming decrease of our export trade, a decrease which ought to be a subject of alarm for the Ministers. There is no argument more telling against their National Policy. If they would strengthen their position they must look into this question, and if they would not destroy their export trade they must take steps whereby the matter will be better arranged in the future. Again, I point out to the hon. Ministers that the resolutions now before the House give, by way of bounty, what would be given, by way of drawbacks, on all the material

entering into the construction of their work, whether made in the country or out of the country, and yet he gives no drawback on iron manufactured in Canada, though it is a raw material, and he cares not whether he may injure or cripple the export trade thereby. With reference to the claim I mention, I did not intend to allude to it personally, but I intended to go to the hon. Minister himself, who is always so courteous in his department, and point out to him that it ought to be recognized. But I now deal with the general principle, and I am pointing out how it is affecting the whole export trade of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. It is quite evident that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), is a protectionist, but having voted for all the Free Trade motions that were ever presented, is now trying to make his peace with the manufacturers in his own county by advocating a drawback on articles which no Government ever contemplated allowing. The hon. gentleman has, with a good deal of tact, mixed up articles actually manufactured in this country—the pig iron of Londonderry, the tubes manufactured in the United States, and the saws manufactured somewhere else—and has then attacked the Government because they do not pay a drawback on the whole. I have always been under the impression, and, I think the manufacturers of this country understand it very well, that if a drawback is to be paid, it is to be equal to the duties paid on the article which goes into the manufacture; yet he condemns the Government because we refuse to pay a drawback upon an article manufactured in the country itself. That is the position my hon. friend took a few minutes ago.

Mr. PATERSON. If it is raw material.

Mr. BOWELL. How can you pay a drawback upon an article which never pays any duty?

Mr. PATERSON. How are you going to do with this bridging?

Mr. BOWELL. That is for special purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh! that is an easy way of solving the difficulty.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend may fancy that "oh!" means argument. The hon. gentleman ought to know that these resolutions were not even proposed when the regulations were adopted.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not blame you personally.

Mr. BOWELL. I take it for granted the Government is responsible for what I have done, and have approved of it in every instance, so far as they are cognizant of it. But I find fault with the hon. gentleman, because he says that regulations have been adopted which prevent manufacturers from obtaining a drawback. I challenge him to prove it. The resolutions proposed by the Government are so simple in their nature that no person who desires to obtain a drawback, and desires to obtain it honestly, can fail in obtaining it. I say, further, that in no single circumstance where a proper demand has been made has it been refused. We only refuse where such a demand has been made as that we have under now our notice, in which drawbacks are asked to be paid upon articles made in the country, and upon which, consequently, no duty could possibly have been paid. That is the objection I take to the hon. gentleman's position. Whether, as I stated the other night, it is proper to carry the principle of drawbacks to cover manufactured articles brought into the country, is a debatable point which I am willing to discuss with the hon. gentleman privately or in any other way. But I deny positively that the charge which has been brought against the Government by the hon. gentleman has any foundation in fact—I do not say he wilfully misstates the facts. On the contrary, I know manufacturers who have made statements that they could not get further drawbacks. When the gentleman to whom