

ister of Agriculture, who was a great exponent of the principle embodied in that particular plank of the Liberal platform. I observe, in looking over this treaty, that the duties are very considerably reduced on the following articles when imported from France: gin of all kinds; rum, whisky, and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors; absinthe, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, shiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic liquors or beverages; and wines containing more than forty per cent of proof spirit.

Mr. FIELDING. What is the amount of the reduction?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That we will ascertain from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance later on. I have no doubt that it will be entirely satisfactory, so that the workingman with reduced wages, or possibly out of employment, will be able to lay in his store of champagne or angostura bitters at a very large reduction.

Mr. FIELDING. They will not get a reduction on brandies, spirits and the other articles which my hon. friend mentions, because there are no such reductions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I do not know for what purpose they are referred to in the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman does not know, he should not say.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend knows, perhaps he will say.

Mr. FIELDING. I say that there is no reduction on most of the articles which the hon. gentleman has named.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, why are they inserted in the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there no reduction on champagne?

Mr. FIELDING. No. There is a reduction on light wines. There is no reduction on champagnes at all. I think the hon. gentleman had better wait until we have the treaty before us in proper form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the present duty on champagnes?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a specific and an ad valorem duty. Some years ago the specific duty was retained and the ad valorem duty abolished. We retain the same rates of duty, the ad valorem duty being abolished. I forget the precise figures.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you strike off the specific duty?

Mr. FIELDING. No. There is no change in the rate on champagne.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I take the hon. gentleman's statement. I observe in schedule C that the French products enjoying the benefit of a special tariff includes 'Champagnes and all other sparkling wines in bottles.'

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend; but, as he has asked the question, I would say that these items are put there simply because they were in the treaty of 1893, and they are carried on in the same condition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say that on none of these articles to which I have alluded is there any reduction?

Mr. FIELDING. Only on light wines.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the workingman will have to content himself with laying in a supply of light wines instead of angostura bitters and champagne, and I have no doubt that will be a very important plank in the platform of the Minister of Finance, and especially the Minister of Agriculture, when they come to lay the policy of the Liberal party with regard to prohibition before the electors of this country at the next general election.

The speech from the Throne refers to the Quebec bridge. It is undoubtedly a most regrettable incident that the Quebec bridge should have fallen in the midst of its construction, and that so many lives should have been lost. It has always seemed a marvel to the members of parliament and the people of this country that the government of Canada, dealing with that bridge as a great national work, should have seen fit to commit its construction to a company which at the time of the passage of the Act of 1893 had put less than \$66,000 of its own money into the enterprise. In 1903 the government of this country practically declared that the Quebec bridge should be a part of the great system of railways known as the National Transcontinental Railway. There was no doubt about it—both political parties were committed to the construction of that bridge; and yet the government of Canada saw fit to commit its construction to this company, which was interested in it at that time to no greater extent than \$66,000, so far as its own money was concerned; the rest of the money was to come from the province of Quebec and from the city of Quebec, but principally from the Dominion of Canada, which had provided a subsidy of \$1,000,000. By the Act of 1903 it was provided that the capital of the company should be brought up to \$200,000, and that \$184,000 of that sum should be devoted to wiping out the deficit in the sale of the company's bonds. It provided further that a bond issue to the extent of nearly \$7,000,000 should be guaranteed by the government of this country; and it was provided especially in that Act, chapter 54 of 1903, that this