

Hon. Mr. Holton thought when the duties on breadstuffs had been removed those on animals should follow. Why make a distinction between bread and meat?

Mr. Gibbs said the taxes on cheese and butter were also continued. If there was to be a uniform principle adopted, he would prefer leaving the duty on flour at the old rate.

Mr. D. A. McDonald asked if we were to allow American products to come in free when the Americans shut out ours. When would we get Reciprocity? He would put the same duties on the products of the United States, as they imposed on the products of Canada.

Mr. Jones (Leeds) could not imagine that anything could be more detrimental to the interests of a large and influential class of our community than the policy now adopted of admitting free the coarse grains of the United States to come into competition with the products of our own farmers. There would be a feeling aroused, particularly in Ontario, such as had not been witnessed for many years. In former years our farmers depended on the United States for a market for their wheat. We were now excluded by the high duties. The only home market for farmers had been for coarse grain, and that was now to be destroyed. One inducement to Confederation in the West was that we would have a market for our wheat and flour in the Lower Provinces. This also was to be destroyed. He protested against this class legislation for the benefit of a few individuals and companies.

Mr. Oliver said Canada was more a producing than a consuming country, and there was no reason for protection to agricultural production. As to the question now before the Chair, Government had recognized the principle that agricultural implements imported by agricultural societies for the improvement of agriculture, should be admitted free of duty. He thought they should also admit free valuable horses, cattle and sheep, introduced for the improvement of stock.

Hon. Mr. Dunkin disagreed from the doctrine of the member for Glengarry that we should impose on American products the same duties as the United States imposed on Canadian products. Let the United States impose what duties they pleased, and we should impose not the same, but just such duties as we pleased—such as we found best suited to our own circumstances.

Mr. Young agreed with the last speaker that we should not impose high duties because the Americans did so. At the same time, we should be careful not to run to the opposite extreme. It would be an advantage to us to get reciprocity; but if we admitted American products free we would have nothing left to offer in order to secure reciprocity.

Mr. Oliver moved in amendment that horses, cattle, swine and sheep imported for the improvement of stock, be admitted free.

Hon. Mr. Holton suggested that this might be moved better as an amendment to the Bill.

Sir J. A. Macdonald said there was a general anxiety that the prorogation should not be needlessly delayed. He hoped there would be an understanding that all amendments should be moved and disposed of now, so that the discussion might not be renewed on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Rose said there was scarcely an animal imported that would not, in some way, be brought within the description given in the amendment, and nearly all animals would thus be admitted free.

Hon. Mr. Holton—And why not? He would like the Government to state why they enfranchised breadstuffs and continued the tax on beef?

Hon. Mr. Rose—It was stated the other night.

Hon. Mr. Holton denied that it had been stated. It was monstrous that the House should be asked to revise part of the policy initiated two years ago, and retain part without any explanation of the reason why.

Hon. Mr. Rose said the Government desired to make as few changes as possible in the existing tariff. With reference to the duty on breadstuffs and grain entering into consumption in the Lower Provinces, it had been thought desirable to take it off for the reasons stated the other evening.

Mr. Mackenzie—Then the reduction of duty on one class of articles is merely to please one section of the Dominion? That might be a reason, but he did not think it a good reason. He supported last session the amendment to remove that tax, because he thought it was wrong to tax breadstuffs, not because he wished to favour one section of the Dominion rather than another. But it appeared that the Government removed this tax not because they had any policy on the subject, but as a