

by-and-bye, for returning a portion of those duties. On articles used in the construction of ships no drawback, as far as he (Mr. Anglin) could see, would be paid, unless these articles were imported. On articles manufactured in the country, no drawback would be allowed, and so the cost of construction would be very greatly increased. The cost of production of agricultural implements, of sewing machines, and other articles which we now exported, would also be greatly increased, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the amount of drawback to be paid. He doubted very much if the hon. the Minister of Finance would be troubled very much about drawbacks upon these articles, because the cost of production would be increased so much that it would be perfectly impossible for the manufacturers of Canada to compete with those of other countries. In fact, in all probability the increased cost of production would prevent exportation altogether. The whole system of drawbacks propounded by the Minister of Finance must have the effect of encouraging imports, and discouraging the manufactures of this country. A drawback, if it could be given at all, would only be given on the articles imported. No benefit whatever was conferred on the shipowners, and the effect of this tariff would be very detrimental to the carrying trade of the country. He believed the tariff proposed would bear most oppressively and unjustly on all the great interests of this country—on the farmers, on the lumbermen, on the shipowners, on the fishermen, on the mechanics, and on all workmen who would not get so much additional employment as would compensate them for the additional burdens. It would cripple all industries, and force capital into less productive channels than it would seek if left to pursue its natural course, and he thought it would prove absolutely disastrous to the country as a whole. It would stop the expansion of our manufactures, and render impossible such an arrangement as that suggested by the hon. member for Halton. He opposed it because he believed it would be particularly unjust to the people of the Province one of the constituencies of which he had the honour to represent in this House. As a whole, it meant and promi-

ised nothing but additional taxation. He intended to say a word about sugar, merely to point out that the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell was more than corroborated by the hon. member for Kingston, who was one of the first authorities on that question in the Dominion. That gentleman spoke as an importer, and he told them that the effect of this tariff would be to compel the people to pay on their sugar \$1,116,000 more than would go into the Treasury, for the benefit of a few refiners who would employ some 500 men in the work of refining. It would be better for this House to give those men a pension of \$1,000 a year each, than to find them employment in the sugar refineries at such a price. This was but one of the many burdens imposed by this tariff, not for the general welfare of the people, but for the advantage of a few individuals, making the rich richer and the poor poorer. For all these reasons, he should, vainly, perhaps, but most earnestly, oppose this tariff.

SIR A. J. SMITH.

April 10th, 1879.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the question under consideration was admitted to be one of very great importance. It seemed to him, although much time had been consumed in its discussion, that he would fail in his duty if he did not make some observations before it reached its finality. This question revived the memory of events of very considerable consequence and importance in the Province of New Brunswick. It reproduced, naturally, from the attitude of the hon. the Finance Minister, the recollection of events which took place in the early stages of this Confederation, and it was natural that his colleagues from New Brunswick should have adverted to the attitude of the Finance Minister in connection with the agitation incidental to the accomplishment of Confederation, which took place at the time in his Province. In 1864, the Finance Minister, being then a member of the Government, was appointed with one or two others, by the Government,