

favoured by a high Protective policy. What had it done as compared with Free-trade England? Quotations without number might be found to show the injurious effects of Protection in the United States. Refutations of that policy came from many in the Republic, and he would read from an authority in St. Louis :

" Things here are dull, as usual, no signs of improvement visible to my naked eye in the business line. Land and property generally has fallen, on the average, 50 per cent. in the last four years, at the lowest calculation. The iron furnaces are closed, and other manufactures are in various stages of collapse, or non-prosperity. Not one in ten is making money. Protection, for some years, has piled up the filthy lucre in their pockets, but too many rushed in, and they are now in a most calamitous state. The manufacturers have not prospered under Protection, while the people here have been fleeced right and left, and have, in the last fifteen years, paid enough in the difference between a revenue and Protection tariff to have built all the mills in the country more than once."

Now, that gentleman's experience urged him to condemn Protection as most disastrous, ruinous, to the country. The hon. the Finance Minister had taken abundant credit for Protection to what he called the shipping interest. Had he considered that question thoroughly, and did he know the effect his tariff would have on it as compared with that of the old tariff? He could not think it possible. It might be that, with the multiplicity of his duties, he had been unable to give that attention to the subject which it deserved. That interest, however, was one of the most valuable in the country, and required every reasonable encouragement and protection. But still it was not more depressed than others, and did not ask special provision. In 1874, it was called upon to pay certain duties by the tariff of that year, but he had heard no complaint of them. They were only a trifle; but the Finance Minister proposed to abolish them or impose higher duties, giving the shipbuilder, at the same time, what he called a drawback. He (Sir A. J. Smith), however, had seen no provision for a drawback in the tariff resolutions. The shipping interest was, no doubt, in a depressed condition, but considering its development in the Lower Provinces, and its circumstances as compared with other industries, he

believed there was no other so prosperous. New Brunswick built, last year, 270,000 tons of shipping, and Nova Scotia 550,000 tons, which was equivalent to about \$3,000,000 thus invested. Each of those Provinces had more than a ton for every man, woman and child of its population, it being wonderful how the shipping interest in the two Provinces had kept pace, as to tonnage, with the increase of the population. The shipping had a light duty so far, but he was sure the proposed burden would strike a serious and deadly blow at it, instead of benefiting it, as the Finance Minister declared he intended it seemed to be natural for the people of the Maritime Provinces to build ships and invest their money in enterprises connected with shipping. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), who was thoroughly acquainted with shipbuilding, stated the old duty on this trade was comparatively nothing. For a practical illustration of the effects of the new duties, let them consider the case of a vessel of 1,530 tons, classing A 1 at Lloyd's; in nine years the duties paid on her materials, under the old tariff, would reach \$470.99, equal to about 31c. per ton, which was a mere trifle. The total cost of dutiable goods entering into her construction would be \$7,939, under the old tariff; the non-dutiable added, gave a total of \$23,208. The dutiable amounted to about \$5 a ton, and the non-dutiable to \$10. The cost of the vessel would be about \$88,000. Now, the old tax of 31c. a ton no shipbuilder complained of, all being willing to pay necessary taxation. But, in increasing it, the Finance Minister put 10 per cent. on cordage, upon which he understood there was to be no drawback.

MR. TILLEY : None.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the old duty was but 5 per cent., or \$100 for such a vessel, but the new would be \$200, and no drawback. The hon. member for Yarmouth, who knew all about shipbuilding, had condemned the drawback as anomalous, and stated it would be practically impossible to carry out that principle. The only way it could be done would be by giving a bounty of so much per ton in ships built.