

a little while ago speak of the free trade policy of the Government. He should like to know whether this was the part of the free trade policy which the member for Sherbrooke, in proposing his Bill last session, said was to lead to entire free trade throughout? The whole tariff of the present Minister of Customs seemed to be adopting a reactionary policy; he would like to know whether their free trade views were to be abandoned.

Hon. Mr. Tilley did not know that he had said anything about free trade. If the policy of last session was a free trade policy, then this was also.

Hon. Mr. Holton said this was a proposition to increase the discrimination between customs and excise. We had been led to believe Government intended to assimilate the commercial policy of the Dominion to that of the Empire, and now the first proposition was founded on a reversion of the old exploded protectionist policy.

Hon. Mr. Rose contended that it was impossible under the existing rate for distillers in Canada to compete with distillers in the States in consequence of their being able to manufacture whisky from damaged wheat.

Hon. Mr. Galt could not concur in the view of the Minister of Customs, nor was he convinced by the argument of the Finance Minister. The duty on corn was equal to 2½ cents per gallon, and he believed returns would show that the larger part of the whisky was produced by Canadian distillers. More than that, the returns of imports of whisky would not bear out the statement made by the Finance Minister. He (Mr. Galt) was reluctantly brought to the conclusion that the Government had decided to increase the protection to Canadian distilleries, and he thought it was a move in the wrong direction. One reason why customs and excise duties were placed on a par was to encourage our foreign trade, especially with France from which country we had received every facility to prosecute that trade.

Mr. Read could not agree with the member for Sherbrooke, practical experience teaching him that this small protection now proposed was essential to enable a Canadian distillery to continue operations with any profit.

Mr. Kirkpatrick took the same view. Without this slight protection, local distilleries could not be kept working, and one of the great markets for farmers would thus be cut off, leaving them to the mercy of speculators.

Mr. Anglin could not pretend to enter into a consideration of the subject without some time for examination, and he hoped the matter might be left over till to-morrow. The duties could be enforced in the meantime, and if any portion of the tariff was not adopted they could be refunded. A great deal of additional taxation was proposed which would prove very burdensome to the people of the Maritime Provinces. He felt bound to resist by every reasonable effort, every endeavour to increase taxation on the people. He argued that the duty on flour would press very heavily on the people of the Maritime Provinces.

Hon. Mr. Rose agreed with Mr. Anglin, that the House was not prepared to discuss the resolutions, and he thought that the Government should at once be empowered for the protection of the revenue to put it in force, leaving to the House an opportunity of discussing the several items at a future stage, and in case of change, parties could have the benefit of the refund.

Hon. Mr. Tilley felt the full force of the remarks just made, especially with respect to the Maritime Provinces, and if the House would pass the resolutions to-night, so that the tariff might at once be put in force throughout the whole Dominion, the Government would be prepared to allow the fullest freedom of discussion on the motion for concurrence.

Hon. Mr. Smith protested against the burdens about to be imposed upon the Province of New Brunswick. He instanced the increased duty on spirits, the tax on flour, on bank note circulation, postage on newspapers, etc., additional imposts, and desired to see the votes of members recorded on every item.

Hon. Mr. Rose said this could not be done in Committee—it could only be done when the Speaker was in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Tilley said, as Parliamentary practice had been entirely different in New Brunswick, he could well understand the position of his friend (Hon. Mr. Smith). Here, however, the practice was entirely different. If the House would accept the resolutions to-night, then they would be put in force to-morrow by means of the telegraph, and honourable members would have an opportunity of dividing the House upon each item on the motion for concurrence.

Mr. McLellan argued that the tax on flour was a discriminating impost in favour of