

discussed at length in Committee, and an hon. member (Mr. Godin) proposed in amendment that the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the whole House, with instructions to amend the same, as follows:

"1. By striking out section 3, which read as follows:

3. All tobacco grown in Canada and prepared for sale, shall, when it passes out of the possession of the occupant of the farm or premises upon which it was grown, be carried directly to and deposited either in a licensed tobacco manufactory, and entered in a licensed tobacco manufactory, and entered in the stock-book of the manufactory, or it shall be bonded in a tobacco warehouse in the same manner and under the same conditions as are herein provided with respect to raw tobacco imported from abroad.

2. By striking out sub-section 2 of section 9, which reads as follows:

And all raw or leaf tobacco grown in Canada, not bonded as herein required and removed from the farm or premises whereon it was grown, and in the possession of any person other than a licensed tobacco manufactory, except only for the purpose of carrying it directly to some licensed tobacco manufactory or to a tobacco warehouse, the proof whereof shall be upon the person having possession thereof; and also the amendment to sub-section 3:

3. By striking out of section 10 of the said Bill, the words, 'or grown in Canada' which occur in line 4 and 5 of the said section inserted instead thereof.

These amendments had certainly been made with a view to protect the cultivator and to enable him to bring his tobacco to the manufacturer without any restriction, yet they were negatived, and among the "nays" was the name of the hon. member for Charlevoix. A second proposition was made the same day at a latter stage of the Bill, by Mr. Godin, seconded by Mr. Pâquet:—

"That all the words after 'the' to the end of the question be left out, and the words 'Bill be re-committed to the Committee of the whole House, with instructions so to amend the same as to exempt from payment of all duties, leaf tobacco grown in Canada' inserted instead thereof."

A division was taken on this amendment and the hon. member for Charlevoix, as the seconder for the hon. member for Beauce, the hon. member for Bellechasse, voted against it. Consequently the hon. member for Charle-

voix believed it was necessary to impose this restriction on the Free-trade, and free production of Canadian tobacco of 4c. per lb. He (Mr. Laflamme) did not blame him, for the result proved that the tax on tobacco produced a revenue of \$1,600,000 which went to relieve the agricultural class who did not pay this tax. It was the consumer who paid it. The agricultural class were allowed to produce the tobacco which they consumed free of tax, consequently no portion of this \$1,600,000 was paid by them. What was the object of the present motion? It was to shift this tax of \$1,600,000 from those who now paid it, and place it on the agricultural classes, because this tax must be raised, and if not imposed on tobacco it would have to be imposed on some of the prime necessities of life. He defied hon. members to point out the means of imposing another tax which would raise a similar amount and be as lightly felt as this tobacco tax. The hon. members for Charlevoix and Joliette had pretended that this tax was prejudicial to the production of tobacco. Any man who examined the question fairly would see that it was a tax in favour of indigenous, and against the importation of foreign tobacco. The duty was not imposed so long as the tobacco was in the possession of the cultivator, and not manufactured. The proposition of the hon. member was most illogical. At present an *ad valorem* duty of 12½ per cent. was imposed on foreign tobacco, and a specific duty of 24c. per lb., and an excise duty of 20c. per lb. The only duty imposed on Canadian tobacco was an excise duty on the manufactured article of 10c. per lb., so that there was a protection to it of 25c. per lb. specific duty, 12½ per cent *ad valorem*, and 10 cents per lb. excise. If the law were rigidly enforced, the Canadian producer would be obliged to bring his article to the licensed manufacturer, and obtain, in the end, a higher price for it than he now received through illegal traffic. If his tobacco only sold to-day for five cents per lb., it was because he sought to evade the law. The hon. member for Charlevoix argued that our climate was as favourable as