

As to the general principle of the proposal, I call attention to the fact that it involves the direct payment of bounties, neither more nor less. The precedent thus to be established is one of very great importance. In some respects I, individually, would prefer to see bonuses given to protective taxes, but for this reason only: the country would know what exactly the protective system costs it; but that has not been the guiding principle of Ministers. If this system were adopted and the resolution carried out, it would undoubtedly astonish and probably alarm even the most strenuous advocates of Protection. The duty is, I think, 25 per cent. on iron bridges.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This iron bridge over the Ottawa, above the Chaudiere, cost, I think, \$300,000 or \$400,000, and the duty amounted to \$75,000 or \$30,000. I merely raise the question in order that the House may clearly understand what it is about. It appears to me seriously objectionable for two reasons: first, that we do not know what amount of cost will be involved; and, in the next place, it is a direct application of the system of bounties.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This calculation is made as for 800 tons of either bolts or nuts, required for the construction of wooden bridges. There has been no statement made with respect to iron bridges, because it has not been decided whether the Company will build iron bridges or not, although, if they do so, the desire of the Government will be carried out. We, therefore, do not know the probable cost of such bridges. It was stated by the Minister of Railways, in the discussion on the subject, speaking of the arrangement made by the late Minister of Public Works as to the railway along the north shore of Lake Superior, there was no provision made for a single iron bridge. It was, therefore, uncertain, at the present moment, whether the Company would build iron bridges at all, and if so, what rivers would be spanned by them. The allowance would amount to 25 per cent. on all bridges built in the country. Iron bridges for British Columbia would require to be shipped from England. If bridges were built here the country would receive 17½ cents duty on the iron entering into them, and the difference would thus be the amount between that rate and 25 per cent. on the manufactured article, and the compensation for that loss of revenue would be the employment given to the people and the encouragement of the industries of the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not further from Halifax to British Columbia, by way of Cape Horn, than it is from England.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Practical men say that iron bridges could be as easily sent from Canada as from England.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Finance has stated that the only difference in regard to the duty on iron bridges is the difference between 17½ and 25 per cent., inasmuch as the Government will collect 17½ per cent. on the iron. That is true as to the raw material, but the hon. gentleman should be able to inform the House what proportion of the total cost is represented by the raw material. Such structures involve a great deal of work unless, indeed, the Company should bring in the bridges in parts and simply put them together in this country.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If bridges in pieces were brought in under the present Tariff a duty of twenty-five per cent. would be levied, except on some portions not made in the Dominion which, would be admitted at a lower rate.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What estimate does the hon. Minister make as to the relative value of the raw material? Will the value of the raw material amount to one-third of the value of the structure?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the raw material will be equal to one-third, probably three-fourths.

Mr. BLAKE. When spikes are imported will the duty be levied on the bar iron or on the spikes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The duty will be paid on the finished spike.

Mr. CASEY. This is a valuable admission on the part of the hon. Minister of Finance. We have always been told that the consumers did not pay the entire amount of duty imposed for protective purposes. Now the hon. gentleman admits that the manufacturer does gain by the whole amount of the duty, and if it were removed he would just be where he was if no duty had been put on.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The manufacturer has to pay on the raw material while the English manufacturer has not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to point out that if the manufacturers of iron bridges are treated as some other manufacturers have been treated, they may enter into contracts based on this resolution only to find that by some regulation or Order in Council they could not get the drawback upon what they depended, and a great injustice might be done to them in that way. I think we ought to know whether there is a mere temporary expedient to tone down the ire of the manufacturer, or whether it is a regulation which will be fairly and permanently carried out. I have frequently called the attention of the Government to the fact that from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods have been exported from Canada upon which the Government agreed to give drawbacks, but upon which, although the Tariff has been in force twenty one months, drawbacks have not been paid.

Mr. BOWELL. I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman is like a good many others, who are constantly demanding that drawbacks should be allowed to their friends, but who fail to look into the facts connected with the demands they make. Neither the Government as a whole, nor any of the departments, have made arrangements with which it is impossible to comply. With regard to the instance to which the hon. gentleman refers, no claim has yet been made to the department or to any of its officers upon which it would be possible to come to a correct conclusion as to the amount of the drawback which should be paid upon those articles for which drawbacks are allowed. If my hon. friend knew that among the demands made are demands for drawbacks upon pig iron and iron purchased in Londonderry, he would see how difficult it is for the department to satisfy these parties. There is not in the demand to which he refers a single paper or document upon which it would be possible for any accountant to come to a correct decision as to the amount of the drawback which should be allowed. In the last interview we had with the gentleman in question, he admitted that a portion of the articles were manufactured in Canada, and yet he demanded a drawback; and when he is refused, he says it is impossible for him to comply with the regulations, and he always finds a defender on the floor of this House ready to condemn the Government for not distributing the public money merely at the demand of those who ask for it. The regulation is as simple as any regulation can well be. The manufacturer is asked to lay before the department the amount and the cost of articles imported, as raw material, and which articles have gone into manufacture. Upon a reference to the Tariff the amount of duty he has paid is easily ascertained, and then, upon evidence being received that the articles have been exported, he gets the drawback. The Government has been desirous, and I may say over anxious, to meet the just views of the manufacturers; but I do not think that even my hon. friend