

to cost the Dominion more when importers were restricted in their choice of markets. Furniture and agricultural implements, iron goods, boots and shoes, and clocks, were already sufficiently protected, and would be made dearer for the farmer as well as all the other classes of his constituents. The lumbermen, already borne down with a depressed market, would have to pay more for supplies, as had been clearly shown by hon. members on his side of the House who had preceded him, and which, notwithstanding other opinions expressed, still remained substantially uncontradicted, and higher freights on exports, if they continued business at all. The same would apply to mining, in which he might include the shipping of albertite coal, calcined plaster, gypsum, freestone, and the other products of that section of the Province. Under this tariff, labourers could not subsist on the wages heretofore paid them, their food and clothing being so heavily taxed, and, as before remarked, the small class of vessels which carried these exports to the United States markets must, of necessity, advance the freight rates or go at once out of employment. The tariff, as submitted by the hon. the Finance Minister, did not specify what was to be the system by which drawbacks were to be secured to shipbuilders. He hoped that the Finance Minister would so define it that the shipbuilder might be able to estimate the amount of the drawback before taking a contract. The article of cordage was made subject to a higher duty, and this was a burden that he thought should not have been imposed, as it not only affected the shipbuilder, but the sailing of vessels, from the largest ship to the smallest fishing boat that hugged their shores in search of a livelihood. And, though anchors, cables, oakum, foreign woods and salt were admitted free as before, he failed to find any compensating advantages for the greatly increased cost of living to the workmen employed. Those considerations in addition to the general restrictions of trade and commerce, clearly indicated, whether designedly or not, a blow at this staple industry, which had done so much to place "this Canada of ours" in a very proud position among the nations of the world. It was well known how a per-

nicious Protective system had, by adding to the cost of construction notwithstanding their many advantages, reduced the mercantile marine of the United States, so that to-day only about one quarter of the exports of the great Republic were carried under their own flag. Was it wise, was it patriotic that our onward march to supremacy on the seas should be checked and embarrassed by such an anomalous and partial method of raising the revenue? As had been correctly pointed out by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) and others, the fine articles of commerce, the ornaments and the luxuries of the rich were subject to less duty than the necessities of the poor and those in moderate circumstances. The chinaware and the broadcloths were admitted at a lower rate than the stoneware and the coarser tweeds and cloths. Then, again, the complicated nature of the tariff was a serious objection. They had *ad valorem* duties and specific—specific as to quantity, specific as to quality, specific as to size, and specific as to weight. All these would tend to embarrass and press unduly on the small importer, and must tend to concentrate the trade in the hands of the great mercantile houses, so that the competition essential to the good of the consumer would be checked. The tendency must be to centralise the importing business in the large cities, to the serious loss and detriment of the Maritime Provinces. As had been most truly said, the rich man would, by an Act of Parliament, be made richer still, and the poor man poorer still. The worst system of the United States system might arise. Lobbyists and rings of manufacturers, who could well afford to part with a percentage of their ill-gotten gains, would be enriched by successful political log-rolling, and would, in turn, protect and assist a Government which would continue to wrest for them the hard-earned savings of the poor. The hon. member for King's must have startled the House with the intelligence that the duty on tea was reduced two cents per pound, and he (Mr. Rogers) thought it would be interesting to his (Mr. Domville's) constituents, as well as the House, to know how such a desirable consummation was to be obtained under the present tariff. For, notwithstanding the desire of the members opposite to im-