

Some little discussion took place as to the advisability of the measure.

**Mr. WILKES** raised, as a point of order, that it was a class of measure which could only emanate from the Committee of the Whole.

**The SPEAKER** concurred with Mr. Wilkes.

**Mr. LAFLAMME** withdrew the measure.

**Mr. LAFLAMME** moved for leave to introduce a bill regarding Banks, enabling them to divide their capital into shares of \$100 each.

The bill was withdrawn for the same reason as the previous bill.

\* \* \*

#### INSPECTION AMENDMENT BILL

**Hon. Mr. FOURNIER** moved that the House go into Committee on Friday (this week) to consider that it is expedient to amend the Act 36 Vic., Cap. 49, entitled, "An Act to amend and consolidate and to extend to the whole Dominion of Canada the laws respecting the inspection of certain staple articles of Canadian produce," and to incorporate the amendments of one Act with the remaining provisions of the Act amended.—Carried.

\* \* \*

#### NOVA SCOTIA SUBSIDY

**Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT** moved that the House go into Committee on Friday to consider the resolution declaring it to be the intention of Act 36 Vic., Cap. 30, that the increased subsidy to be allowed to the Province of Nova Scotia under the said Act should be based upon the said sum of \$9,186,756, as if that sum had been mentioned in the 114th section of the British North America Act, 1867, instead of the said sum of \$8,000,000.—Carried.

\* \* \*

#### LICENCES FOR WINE COMPOUNDERS

**Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT** moved that the House go into Committee on Friday to consider resolutions providing that all persons carrying on the business of compounding or mixing wine, brandy, or other articles containing alcohol and suitable for use as a beverage shall be required to take out a licence for carrying on such business, et cetera, et cetera.

\* \* \*

#### THE TARIFF

On the order for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means,

**Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT** rose to move that the Speaker do now leave the chair. He said that in resuming this discussion it would probably be advisable to refer to the criticisms that had been levelled at the statement which he had made a week ago. It could excite no surprise that that statement should be very violently

assailed. He had stated the facts as far as he knew them, and they had involved a very severe censure upon the gentleman who had preceded the present Government. It was, therefore, only natural that that statement should be criticised.

There were only two points upon which the statement could be said to depend. These were his assertions that the revenue to be expected under our old tariff of 1873-1874 could not reasonably be presumed to exceed the sum of \$22,000,000, and the statement that the Government were obliged, in order to fulfil the engagements made by their predecessors, to bring down the estimates of \$24,000,000 for the year 1874-1875. His objection to bringing down statements to the 20th April was that it would be of no use for the purpose of honest comparison, as it was utterly vitiated by the fact that everyone who had goods in bond would be desirous of removing them as soon as they observed the statement in the Speech from the Throne, and that they would be still more desirous when they saw the new tariff on the 15th April. The statement asked for would only have confused the minds of hon. members, because after hearing it they would have to go back to the statement of 1873 to get at the normal condition of things. Up to the 1st of April the comparisons were tolerably fair.

He contended, notwithstanding the statements of the hon. member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper), that there was no ground for expecting a larger revenue for 1873-1874 than he (Hon. Mr. Cartwright) had predicted in his financial statement, that is that the revenue for that period could not be expected to exceed in gross \$22,000,000. The argument which the hon. member used was not that it would exceed this estimate, but that it would exceed the revenue of 1872-1873. Now, that revenue amounted to \$20,800,000. No one disputed that the revenue for 1873-1874 was likely to exceed that for 1872-1873, but that had nothing to do with the matter. His (Hon. Mr. Cartwright's) argument was that the revenue for this year would not, under the old tariff, exceed \$22,000,000. That argument the hon. member for Cumberland laboured to meet by the counterargument that it would exceed that of 1872-1873.

He (Hon. Mr. Cartwright) said that our imports were comparatively declining, not largely, to be sure, but nevertheless declining. To this again the hon. member replied by stating that they were greater during the present year than they were last. This was a point upon which he agreed with the hon. member. Our imports, in the gross, were greater, but this did not affect the question of their proportionate decline.

Another statement of his to which the hon. member took exception was that 1873-1874 was not to be considered a very prosperous year. According to all the evidence he could procure—and he had been at pains to consult men whose opinions would be received with respect by the House—he considered he was justified in saying that the year was not prosperous. However, the hon. gentleman was at liberty to think otherwise if he liked, but it was against his own argument; the statement militated not against his (Hon. Mr. Cartwright's) argument. If the statement was correct, that our imports had relatively declined, the argument was all the