

the law stood, every inhabitant of Canada and particularly every inhabitant of Lower Canada, was permitted to grow for the use of himself and his family, all the tobacco that they could possibly consume; in addition to this, he was not required, as in most other countries, to pay an excise duty at all in proportion to the amount which was levied on tobacco imported into this country. Hon. gentlemen who by voting for this motion favoured a reduction in the revenue from this source of from \$500,000 to \$800,000 a year, should be prepared to inform their constituents how they proposed to make good that deficiency. As matters stood at present, he did not see how the loss to the revenue could possibly be made good, unless by very considerable direct taxation—a step which he thought few of the constituencies of this country would welcome in exchange for the loss of duty on tobacco. He would say nothing as to the injury to our credit, which would inevitably ensue if we showed to the world, and particularly to individuals with whom we might have financial relations, that we were prepared to allow such perilous experiments to be made with one of the main sources of our revenue. For his own part he had always said that he would be very glad to see not only this, but other duties reduced, if the revenue permitted. There were, however, few things on which a duty could be more properly levied than on tobacco. He would also remind the House that, although the present duty on tobacco might appear considerable compared with the duty formerly levied in this country, it was utterly insignificant compared with the duties levied in other countries, particularly with the duty levied in England, which was at present in excess of 4s. sterling. He believed that, under the recent proposition of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it would amount to something like 4s. 8d. or 4s. 10d. sterling per lb., being nearly five-fold the duty levied in Canada. He need not remind hon. members of the House that the growth of tobacco in Great Britain was prohibited altogether under very severe penalties, vastly more severe than we had ever thought of adopting. He particularly

Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

desired to call the attention of hon. members whose constituents might be interested in the matter, to the simple fact that, under the scale of duties as adjusted by the present Government, those constituents were not injured thereby, but gained a very considerable advantage. Under the duties imposed by the late Government, in 1868, which were 10c. per lb. on imported tobacco, and 5c. on tobacco grown in this country, the native producer had an advantage over the foreign producer of 5c. per lb. only. Under the present scale of duties of 20c. on imported tobacco, and 10c. on that grown by the native producer, there was a clear advantage to the latter of 10c.; in other words, he had, by the duties of 1874, gained an additional advantage of 5c. over the foreign producer. Now, when it was remembered that the foreign tobacco imported into this country, amounting to nearly 10,000,000 lbs., it would be seen that the Canadian producer had at the present moment an enormous advantage, if he could produce an article which would enter into competition with the foreign product. He had called attention to these few points, because he thought it was very desirable not only that hon. members of the House, but also their constituents throughout the country, should understand distinctly what was aimed at by a motion of this kind. There could be no doubt whatever that if this rate was passed, if the duty now imposed on tobacco grown in this country was abolished or curtailed, a very considerable production of native tobacco would take place—though he was inclined to think this production would take place more largely in certain localities in Ontario than in Quebec. But, in any case, the inevitable result would be, first, an enormous reduction in the duty now obtained from that source, and, in the next place, a very heavy direct taxation would be levied in some form on the whole people of this country. He could conceive no proposition, under present circumstances, more mischievous; no proposition more likely to injure our credit, or which ought to be more unani- mously condemned by the House. No proposition, he might venture to say,