

quantities were entered for consumption, be in round figures \$291,755.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is your calculation for this year?

Mr. BOWELL. We do not calculate on receiving this year more than \$150,000, and perhaps \$80,000 from brandy, for the reasons I have already indicated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you expect to obtain about \$200,000.

Mr. BOWELL. From \$175,000 to \$200,000. It may possibly be more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nobody will have any objection to these articles yielding as large a revenue as can possibly be obtained from them. The question the Government must consider is to what extent those heavy duties will promote adulteration and smuggling. So far as regards the inland waters there is not, I presume, much danger; but as regards the Maritime Provinces we know there is a certain amount of smuggling going on.

Mr. VAIL. No. It is charged against us sometimes; but there is none.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I think the circumstances have altered within the last half dozen years, or perhaps the people have all become such strong advocates of the Scott Act that they have set their faces against such liquors. As regards brandy, from which most revenue is expected to be obtained, I fancy a good deal will be smuggled in down in the Maritime Provinces. How do these duties compare with the duties levied in the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. In the United States the duty is \$2 per gallon on the whole. We considered that question when we fixed this rate of duty. The question of smuggling was one that entered into consideration, and I presume just so long as there is a difference of duty and articles can be brought in there will be smuggling. The principal smuggling that has taken place into the Maritime Provinces has been from St. Pierre.

On resolution 4, Spirits and tobacco.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On this item how much do you expect to get?

Mr. BOWELL. About \$60,000, thus making a deduction for entries that may possibly have been made from warehouse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has said nothing about one point to which I alluded, that these duties are undoubtedly somewhat absolutely larger, though not relatively larger, on imported spirits than on spirits manufactured here. There can be no doubt that the skill of the manufacturer has enabled him to convert native produce into tolerable or intolerable brandy, gin and other spirits. The hon. gentleman no doubt does not speak from practical experience, but perhaps some of his colleagues could advise him on that question.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose you are speaking from practical experience.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is that risk going on in increasing the duties, that the more you increase them the more likely they will be to turn round and produce an imitation of the foreign article, and it strikes me the hon. gentleman had not got to a point where the temptation will be considerable.

Mr. BOWELL. That is true, but it is hoped by a rigid enforcement of the provisions of the Adulteration Act, we will be able to put a stop to that adulteration, as far as possible. I believe what the hon. gentleman says to be

quite correct. There are a number of establishments in every city and town in the country where in their own cellars they manufacture from spirits, brandy, gin, and other medicinal cordials I will call them—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Pain killers.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I would not use that word, I think they generally have the opposite effect, particularly when adulterated. The intention of the Department is, as far as possible, to put the Adulteration Act rigidly in force, and more particularly is that necessary when the Department has come to the conclusion that whiskey shall not be allowed to go into consumption for some years after it is made, in order that some of the deleterious matter in it may evaporate. To be consistent with that policy, it will be necessary for the Government to enforce the Act providing against the adulteration of food and other articles. As to the reason we have put liquors as high as we have, we do not expect of course to increase the revenue very much on that point, relatively. But in the United States, where the production is so very large, as no doubt the hon. gentleman is well aware, the manufacturers are allowed to export from bond, without the payment of any Excise duty, and the combination existing among the distillers of the United States, give an additional bonus to the exporters of liquor in order to keep their own market, thus enabling American manufacturers to export to this country at rates so low that unless you put a high duty upon it, they can afford to send it in and pay the duty, thus preventing the consumption of the home made article which would of course decrease the revenue to that extent. That is one reason which induced the Government to raise the duty so high—to prevent if possible the importation of this liquor through the Customs at a rate which would drive the Canadian article out of the market, and thus decrease the Revenue from Excise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The American duty is only \$1, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. It is 90 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the hon. gentleman is right—it is 90 cents on the Winchester measure, and ours is Imperial; so it is about \$1 for the purpose of comparison.

On paragraph 5, resolution 4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know what revenue is expected to be derived from this, which will of course come into effect on a much larger quantity than of the preceding sections.

Mr. BOWELL. The revenue collected for 1884 was \$3,608,246, that is at \$1 per gallon. I am now speaking of the quantities entered for consumption. At \$1.30 per gallon, it would give an additional revenue of \$1,082,473, but we do not anticipate this year obtaining anything like that revenue for reasons that I need not repeat, as the hon. gentleman knows them and called the attention of the House to them a short time ago—that is, that very large entries of this particular article have been made all over the country. We may, however, I think, calculate on getting, during the coming year, at least half that amount of revenue and the year following. If the amounts entered for consumption are equal to those of 1884, they would yield an additional revenue of over \$1,000,000. Perhaps if we succeeded in obtaining \$500,000 this year, it will be as much as we ought to expect. There is very little duty collected on malt liquors—that which is manufactured of molasses upon which a difference of 2 to 3 cents per gallon is provided for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course I have no objection to getting all the revenue we can extract from