

temporizing measure to satisfy the grumblings from a certain portion of the Dominion. If there was to be a duty at all on stock, perhaps it might not be desirable to exempt all animals imported for the improvement of stock. Private parties importing such animals did so with a view to profit, but where agricultural societies imported animals for the improvement of stock, he thought that they should have the benefit of exemption.

Sir John A. Macdonald said the reason why a duty was put on breadstuffs two years ago, was to show the United States when they withdrew reciprocity that we would assert our freedom as an independent country by putting a moderate duty on their products, although we could not follow their bad example by entering upon the absurd system of retaliation. In the first part of this session, the Government laid down the principle that whatever the tariff should be, we ought to have the same tariff all over the Dominion. This duty on breadstuffs was therefore made uniform throughout the Provinces. He knew that his honourable friend from Lambton objected to the principle of any tax on breadstuffs, but a number of the members of this House and a large class of the people entertained a different feeling. The members for Glengarry, Leeds, South Ontario, etc., had urged there should be a protective duty on breadstuffs, and no doubt the view they put was a plausible one with farmers. He believed a large portion of the people of Western Canada were in favour of protective duties, so long as the Americans retained protective duties against our products. There was a clear difference of opinion therefore as to the abstract policy of the tax; but when they learned that it had operated a peculiar hardship locally on the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that it had brought home the alleged inconvenience and oppressiveness of the Union to every poor man's door in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, he thought it was a wise, judicious, and liberal policy, an act of kindness and statemanship on the part of the Government to come down and remove that tax.

Mr. Mackenzie—That is all right. What I complain of is that you do not go far enough. The people of these Provinces use pork largely. Why then not admit swine free?

Sir J. A. Macdonald said the member for Chateauguay had also asked if you free breadstuffs why not free beef. The first item here was horses. He did not suppose it was

meant that horses furnished beef. (Laughter). Why not go further and say that in a climate like ours clothing is just as necessary as food, and that we must admit free beef and materials for clothes as well as bread; but the line must be drawn somewhere. We must have a duty on something. We must raise a revenue. This substitution, however, of a specific for an *ad valorem* duty was a step in the direction contended for by the member for Lambton, and when the Government had agreed to take this step in order to avoid too oppressive a duty on superior articles, he thought the House should have accepted it at once, instead of objecting that the duty was not removed altogether. As to the amendment of the member for Oxford, there was this difficulty; that with regard to every animal imported, the importer would say it was for the improvement of stock. Even Barnum would introduce his woolly horse on the principle. (Laughter). It had been suggested that, at least, blood stock introduced by agricultural societies might be exempted, but the result of this would be that any one who became a member of an agricultural society by paying a dollar subscription, might manage to get his bull or horse or ram imported under the auspices of the society.

Hon. Mr. Holton said the honourable gentleman had admitted that a wrong policy had been initiated in 1866, with regard to the duties on breadstuffs and other foods. Now he found himself compelled to do away with the half of this injurious policy. Why not do away with the whole?

Mr. D. A. McDonald said American corn would certainly come into direct competition with the coarser grains raised in Canada, and therefore to admit it duty free would be a real and serious injury to Canadian farmers. The result of such a policy, favouring the American cultivator at the expense of our own people, would be to give certain States additional attractions for agriculturists, and to draw an emigration of the very best bone and sinew of our agricultural community away from Canada to those States. He hoped that time would not be wasted in long discussion. If the yeas and nays were to be taken on every point, it would be better to go back into Committee and have the discussion there.

Mr. Mackenzie said he must protest against the idea that discussion was to be cut short because members were desirous now to have a speedy close of the session. He claimed the