

should be more unanimously condemned by those hon. gentlemen who at one time or other had themselves been responsible for the providing of ways and means. He did not know what line might be pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, but he would take the opportunity of referring to the course pursued by his hon. friend beside him (Mr. Mackenzie) on similar occasions, when propositions were started by friends of his to reduce the duty on tobacco. Although the hon. member for Lambton was, doubtless, anxious to embarrass the Government of the day in a fair and honourable way, his name had always been recorded beside that of the hon. member for Kingston and his colleagues in opposing the reduction of the duty, because he felt it was essential to the proper conducting of the Government of this country, that the revenue should be maintained, and that it would be easier to forego any other duty than the duty on tobacco. He would fain express the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, who were men of experience and ability, and who must know that it would be utterly impossible to replace this tax without a very heavy direct taxation, and knowing, also, the enormous and extraordinary indulgences which had been already conceded to parties supposed to be interested in the production of tobacco, would imitate the example set by the hon. the First Minister, and allow their votes to be recorded in support of the existing mode of collecting a revenue—a revenue which was always looked upon as one of the fairest modes of raising taxes which prevailed in any civilized country. He had no hesitation in saying that it would be a most unfortunate thing if the motion of his hon. friend from Beauce was allowed to prevail. He had no doubt whatever, if the House were ill-advised, they would entangle themselves in infinitely worse difficulties than those which they were likely to meet with if the proposal was rejected.

Mr. PLUMB said a touching appeal had just been made by the Finance Minister to hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side. He had given as a reason why the resolution should be

rejected, that it would largely reduce the public revenue when the country could least afford any experimental legislation which tended to the reduction of the revenue. But the hon. Minister was not in accord with the Minister of Justice who represented, in a certain way, the interests of the Province of Quebec. That gentleman had told the House that tobacco would ripen in the Province of Quebec, and there could be no harm in making an experiment. When the hon. gentlemen in the Ministry, who were responsible for the affairs of their own Provinces, made such representations on the floor of the House, their utterances must be accepted rather than the merely financial view of the question given by the Finance Minister on this occasion. It was a very serious question, certainly, for the House to entertain, whether the public revenue should be endangered in any way at this critical moment—at a moment when the Finance Minister of the country had declined to deal with deficits which had accrued, and which were still likely to accrue, by providing a means of taxation to bring up the revenue to something like the expenditure. There would have been no necessity for such an appeal being made by the Minister of Finance, had he provided for the deficits, which were staring us in the face. He ventured to say, further, that the House would be perfectly justified in permitting agriculturists to make an experiment in the direction indicated by the resolution of the hon. member for Beauce. The resolution had been brought forward in the interest of the agricultural community. The growth of tobacco in this country had been entirely tentative. It had not been grown on a large scale, and the carrying of this resolution might have the effect of fostering what would probably prove a great industry. There was a case in point. Everyone knew what the growing of beet-root had done for France, although the proposition was not at first approved of.

Mr. STEPHENSON said that in the western portion of Canada the production of tobacco had been greater than at present. Returns showed that in 1851