

and represent them. member for Lambton, on sing singularly practi- with him I fail to see y will do the farmers. ow that these changes ade, and make more ment of our comm- leration I further en- system which the Fi- the European was in- , under circumstances from those in which we point out that when stem, it was after the the observance of the n regard to the differ- affected thereby ; , proves that the com- ance Minister was in seriously the foreign that while it would mers either in Upper very much impede rade by the St. Law- ur policy to build up d that it was not the r specially to pro- and over again the and I have stated nt planks in our po- arrangement of foreign [Cheers.] and I pretend that from that policy. I

part of my observa- y that the argument these changes made Lower Provinces, d in reference to g 20, 25 and 30 per e 5 per cent,---reduc- gard to existing in- l policy adopted at tirely approve of, ects, and that there em of the Maritime duties upon many argely to the reve ars as commodities ould not have been reference to sugar e bad; that having most unjust to the nsumer, and that e principle of the e a certain number each grade should e saccharine value consider that the

question, whether it is to result in evil or good, depends entirely on its working out and upon the class of standards adopted, and when in England it has been declared to be faulty, we ought to pause before we now introduce a theory whose effect we cannot tell until we see the results of those experiments now going on in England. I shall now repeat the question on which the whole working of the scheme as regards sugars will depend. What arrangements have the Government made with reference to the standards applicable to the new tariff?

Hon. J. A. MAODONALD was understood to reply that they would make the necessary arrangements, or that they had been made by the Finance Minister.

Hon. Mr. ROSE, continuing, said that a great part of the objections I have to this scheme springs from the fact that it is not final [cheers]. While at this moment the Canadian duties on tea and sugar are higher than those of the Lower Provinces, you are going still further to increase them. Then, as regards an article kindred to sugar, and which enters more largely into the consumption of the people of the Lower Provinces than almost any other---I mean molasses---the Hon. Finance Minister says he adopts Mr. Gladstone's rate of duty. In order that there may be no mistake in reference to the impression of my hon friend I will quote his own words. He says: "But in altering the sugar duties, it becomes necessary also to alter the duties on molasses; and with regard to this article, it is the intention of the Government to recommend that the duties shall be made, as in England, proportionate to the duties on sugar. We have followed the English scale in everything. There is the same amount of duty per pound and per hundred weight, and the tariff is, in fact, the English tariff." Well; he proposes on molasses to increase the duty from five cents per gallon and ten per cent ad valorem, which is equal to about six and a half cents per gallon or forty cents ad valorem, and to make the duty about eleven cents per gallon, equal to about 70 per cent ad valorem, or a hundred cents per one hundred pounds. But Mr Gladstone's tariff places not eleven cents per gallon on molasses, but only eight and a half cents---not five shillings per one hundred pounds as is here proposed, but only three shillings and sixpence sterling per 112 lbs. (Hear, hear.) So we have here a very considerable difference between the proposal of Mr Gladstone and that of the Finance Minister in regard to this article. Let us next compare his rate with the duty on molasses in the Lower Provinces, and I am informed that any one who would propose to raise the duty on this commodity which enters so largely into consumption with their population, would never be able to carry it in Parliament! Well then, in New

Brunswick the duty is only two cents per gallon and three per cent ad valorem; in Nova Scotia five cents per gallon; in Newfoundland five cents and Prince Edward Island five cents and a half. (Hear, hear.) Thus the Finance Minister makes the duty in this important article, which is intimately connected with the question of sugar double what it is in New Brunswick, and the other Provinces. Again, if you look at other articles, which enter largely into consumption, or use, such as brandy, rum, wine, iron, leather and agricultural implements, you will find the divergence from the Lower Province tariffs is equally great. I will not annoy the House by going over the variances in detail, but will do so as they come up in Committee, contenting myself with saying that it is a transparent fallacy to assert that the proposed changes, except in certain imported articles, are an approximation to the tariff of the Lower Provinces. With respect to wine and brandy, I entirely acquiesce in the policy of lowering the duty on direct importation from France; but here again the policy of the Lower Provinces has been adverse, for Nova Scotia charges 100 per cent and Newfoundland 120 cents per gallon, while we charge only 70 cents on brandy. Now their high duties are opposed to the principle which the Finance Minister said he was going to adopt---namely, lowering the duty on French products of this kind to encourage a direct trade between us and France. (Hear, hear.) While I do not propose to follow up the present scheme in all its details, let me ask in this connection, is the proposed mode of levying the duty on wines, etc., a wise one? The necessity of testing these liquors to ascertain their strength, in order to the collection of the different duties, will, I fear, lead to extreme inconvenience and practical difficulty in this country. The Finance Minister does not pretend he is going to get any more revenue by this new system; and with regard to the trade, when was there any change from the ad valorem mode of fixing the duties asked for?

Hon. Mr. CARTIER---You do not know of it.

Hon. Mr. ROSE---If there had been any demand of the trade for this change I think I should have heard of it.

In answer to the Hon. Attorney-General West,

Hon. Mr. ROSE remarked---What I say is that the Finance Minister stated that he did not contemplate there would be any great increase of duty by the change in the mode of collection, and unless there was some demand for a change---unless the revenue was suffering---I think both importers and consumers would say it is better to let things alone. If there is no great evil, why put the trade to great inconvenience by changes in matters where there is absolutely no necessity for them? (Cheers.) I see further that it is proposed that agricultural