

based on the following estimated calculation: the present value of American tobacco reckoned at 6 cents a pound, carriage from the United States and Customs' dues, $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound; packing, 2 cents a pound; manufacturing and manipulating, 2 cents a pound; wholesale manufacturer's profit, 2 cents a pound; retailer's profit, 5 cents a pound, and Government duty, 20 cents a pound. Now, with regard to Canadian tobacco, if one adds together 14 cents Government duty, 2 cents for carriage, 2 cents for manufacturing, cutting and manipulating, 2 cents for packing, $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for the manufacturer's profit, 5 cents for that of the retailer, one gets $34\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. What remains then as profit for the grower? About 3 cents a pound. Hence it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that there is actually no protection for Canadian tobacco. Now, if I am to believe the reports for 1880, all these duties which are levied on Canadian tobacco by means of stamps, licenses, &c., have brought the Government about \$7,600 for the past year. It is evident that the Government cannot, under such circumstances, derive any profit from the duty on Canadian tobacco, for \$7,600 do not represent an amount sufficient to cover the expenses incurred in collecting this duty. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, as well as I am myself, that it necessitates a whole host of officials to collect this duty, the establishing of offices, the engraving of stamps and other expenses as a natural sequence. Thus it is that the Government does not derive any revenue from this tax, but that it meets on the contrary with a deficit. Who, then, Mr. Speaker, is interested in such a system? Is it the grower? I have just shown, I think, that he does not get any protection, and whilst receiving no protection he finds himself constantly face to face with difficulties; he is, for instance, compelled to shape the tobacco, an operation for which there is no reason, and which causes considerable loss of time to the grower. Ere a pound of tobacco can leave his premises, he must have license, without which he cannot dispose of his tobacco. The law remains a dead letter, for no one takes out a license or submits to all the formalities. According to the present law the grower must roll his tobacco before it leaves his premises; then go to town, to reach which he has sometimes to travel a long distance, in order to procure the stamps; he then has to return, and if he has not a sufficiency of stamps the whole of his tobacco is immediately confiscated. The following case occurred lately:—A grower came to Quebec and purchased stamps for 350 pounds of tobacco; on returning to Lévis he stamped his tobacco, but it had so happened that his tobacco had dried, and that each pound did not represent what it did previously; thus he had a certain number of rolls of tobacco which were not stamped; he declined to sell these; nevertheless a revenue officer impelled by a motive which it might not be opportune to mention in this House, went to the grower's house, seized all his tobacco, as well as his horse and cart, and removed the whole; whilst the grower, who had honestly endeavored to fulfil the obligations of the law, was compelled to pay a considerable sum to recover his horse and cart, besides losing all his tobacco. On other occasions revenue officers and their subordinates, animated with a zeal hard to explain, have of a sudden entered respectable houses, where there might or not be people in bad health, broken open chests and cupboards, made confiscations or threatened to do so, and then left with that air of triumph which has the effect of causing the law to be laughed at, when enforced in such style. The present law is, therefore, not only unjust, but unreasonable, and imposes on growers formalities that have no cause to exist; a remedy is required, and I have no doubt that the Government will find one. I know that it is favorably inclined towards making all classes enjoy the advantages of that protection which has done the country so much good, and which has so powerfully contributed

towards recalling prosperity; and I feel certain that when all this is proved to the Government, it will be the first—if the statement which I ask confirms my statements—to bring to this House a measure that will do justice to the growers,—by granting them the protection that they ask for,—which will remove the obstacles which impede this culture, by which the revenue of the Government will be considerably increased. It will be objected that if Canadian tobacco is grown on so large a scale, that the importation of foreign tobacco will thereby be diminished. Not so, Mr. Speaker, for three-fourths of the population who actually buy foreign tobacco, will continue to smoke it, as they have acquired a taste for it. There was a time when Canadian tobacco was not taxed; just as large a quantity of foreign tobacco was consumed nevertheless, and it will be the same in the future. With regard to the revenue collected by means of a duty on Canadian tobacco, it will increase considerably, and for this reason: the duty of 14 cents levied, actually is so excessive, that no one pays it, and that every one defrauds the revenue. Now, were the duty fixed at 6 cents, or at a reasonable figure, every one would pay it, and the revenue would be considerably increased. Let us encourage and protect this culture and thus both increase the revenue and meet the unanimous wishes of the people. That is my reason, Mr. Speaker, for presenting the foregoing motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member cannot meet with any difficulty, and the statement which he asks for will be brought before the House. I seize the opportunity of congratulating the hon. member upon his maiden speech before this House. I feel convinced that he will be a valuable acquisition to members following and taking part in the debates; and I am certain, from the practical manner with which he has handled his subject, that he will be of assistance to us upon other questions than that of Canadian tobacco. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will excuse me, if I do not agree with him upon his argument concerning the duty on tobacco and the seizures that have occurred. The question will assuredly receive the attention of the Government, if it has not already done so; and if the Government is able to do anything in the matter, I am certain that the hon. member will have the pleasure of hearing the hon. Minister of Finance refer to the subject, when his Budget is brought down.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the House adjourns, I desire to make the customary explanations respecting the changes in the Government. The only change in the *personnel* has been by the elevation of the late Minister of Justice, Mr. McDonald, to the Chief Justiceship of Nova Scotia, and the appointment of Mr. McLelan as a Minister in his place. The Department of Justice becoming vacant by the elevation of Mr. McDonald, Sir Alexander Campbell was transferred from the Post Office Department and appointed in his stead. The Secretary of State, Mr. O'Connor, was transferred to the Post Office Department, and the President of the Council, Mr. Mousseau, was appointed Secretary of State. Mr. McLelan, the new Minister, taking the position of President of the Council.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's explanation partakes rather of the character of a statement. He has stated to us certain facts which the *Official Gazette*, and the other sources of public information, have rendered us familiar with some time since; but he has not given us any information which the House would have been glad to know. I had the good fortune last Session to be able to agree very cordially with the hon. gentleman in one of the transfers he then announced, and it is my misfortune