

had altogether overstated what the effect of this resolution upon the revenue would be. The cultivation of tobacco in Canada was only an experiment, and it would be years before it would compete with the tobacco of warmer climes. He should vote for the resolution.

MR. PATERSON said that although the question was one which largely affected the Province of Quebec, it was one of very considerable importance to the people of other Provinces. The resolution was one which meant that those in the other Provinces who consumed tobacco, and who were willing to pay a fair share of the tax, should be burdened with the whole of it, while their friends in Quebec should escape clear of the duty. He was glad that the hon. member for Charlevoix had publicly called the attention of the Government to the fact that the growers of tobacco in Quebec were evading the payment of the duty. He believed the same was true of those counties in Ontario which were the only counties that raised tobacco at all, for he found by the Inland Revenue returns that these counties only accounted for four pounds as having been raised by them. The tariff of 1874, introduced by the present Financial Minister, had given a far greater amount of protection to the Canadian farmer in the growth of Canadian tobacco, than the tariff of the late Government. In 1867-8, the tariff introduced by the then Government, imposed a Customs duty of 15c. per lb. specific, and 5 per cent. *ad valorem* on imported tobacco. Estimating the value at 50c. per lb., that would give 2½c. per lb. on the *ad valorem*, which added to the Customs duty, gave a protection of 17½c. per lb. The tariff of 1874 was 25c. per lb., and 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*. Taking the *ad valorem* duty on the same value of 50c. per lb., they had 6c. which made the whole Customs duty 31c. per lb. in 1874, as against 17½c. in 1867. Then, in 1877, there was also an excise duty of 5c. per lb. on the Canadian common twist; that left a protection to the Canadian farmer of 12½c. per lb. Under the present Government the excise duty was 10c. per lb., which, deducted from

the 31c. per lb., left a protection of 21c., as against 12½c. under the previous Government. Hon. gentlemen would admit that in taking 50c. as the value he was under the mark, but that gave 8½c. per lb. more protection than was given by the previous Government in 1867. When the tariff was amended in 1870, according to the same mode of calculation, the Protection was 19c. per lb., while under the present tariff, it was 21c. per lb. He held that it was desirable that a certain amount of Protection should be given to the growers of tobacco, but he believed, under the present tariff, the Protection had been increased to such an extent that if the growth of tobacco was capable of being developed it would be under this tariff. If it was not being developed it was on account of causes which the abolition of the entire Excise duties would not at all countervail. It did not follow, as the hon. member for Charlevoix seemed to imagine, that because an hon. gentleman had stated that Lower Canada had not a climate suitable to the growth of tobacco, he was therefore decrying that country. Certain products could be cultivated successfully in particular climates, and it was a geographical and established fact, that tobacco of a market value could not be grown in any part of Canada. In the counties of Essex and Kent, where they grew finer tobacco than was grown in Lower Canada, he had bought samples for 7c. per pound which had been grown from precisely the same seed as tobacco grown in the State of Connecticut, which cost 40c. per pound. They could not hope to make the growth of tobacco in this country a national industry. There was no such revenue as the hon. gentleman had mentioned derived from the growth of pure Canadian tobacco; but if the duty on one class of tobacco was repealed the revenue would be defrayed by the manufacturers declaring other leaves to be the Canadian leaf. In that way a loss would be caused to the revenue. He considered it was the duty of everyone who desired fair play, and an equitable distribution of the taxes, to vote down this resolution, which was sectional in its nature, and which could not give protection to farmers.