

Mr. A. G. Jones replied, contending that the Minister of Finance had not met the argument he had advanced. The honourable gentlemen had represented that it was only the selfish importers who oppose the Government scheme. He (Mr. Jones) no doubt looked to his own interests as well as others, but he claimed to stand in the position of the great majority of the people of this country who desired the legislation which would bring in the largest amount of sugar from the quarters where it could be most cheaply produced, and which would create as wholesome competition, so that consumers might have it at the lowest possible rate. He had yet to learn that the refiners who were specially taken under the protecting wing of the Government had any more disinterestedness than the importing class whom the Minister of Finance wished to guard against. The honourable gentleman thought if we could get cheap sugars in the East Indies it would be for the advantage of the country to get them. He seemed to forget that if we were to have the benefits of direct trade with the West Indies, it could only be by reciprocal legislation. The honourable gentleman, in the ground he has taken on that point, swept away the whole argument which he so eloquently presented to the House the other night on the subject of encouraging trade with the West Indies.

Hon. Mr. Tilley asked if Mr. Jones did not state to him, some days ago, that if the Government imposed 25 per cent *ad valorem* on molasses it would be satisfactory.

Mr. A. G. Jones—Without casks.

Hon. Mr. Tilley—That was not mentioned, and the cask did not make much difference. He proceeded to give figures as to the value of molasses imported into Canada, the average of which was 22 cents. The Government had therefore come to the conclusion that the proposed duty would be about 5 cents per gallon, which was a reduction that would diminish the revenue by about \$20,000. He then gave a series of the calculations as to the difference of the rates per hundred pounds on sugar between the old and the proposed tariff and the tariff proposed by some of the Board of Trade of 20 per cent, and 1 cent a pound. The last proposition, he concluded from the figures presented, would have closed every refinery in the country, and put the whole business in the hands of the importers. The present proposed tariff would be also alike fair to the importers and consumers.

Mr. A. G. Jones replied to the Minister of Customs. He disputed his proposition that the scheme of the Board of Trade would have closed the refineries. These refineries were established, and had been living and making money under a protection afforded them of 10 per cent *ad valorem*, and it was trifling with the House to say they could not live under a 20 per cent *ad valorem* protection.

Hon. Mr. Anglin thanked the Government for their concession to the people of the Maritime Provinces in taking the duty off breadstuff. Coming to the sugar and molasses question he said he did not pretend to comprehend the calculations read by the Minister of Customs. He questioned if the honourable gentleman understood them himself, for in drawing his comparisons he had read for some time from the wrong column before discovering his mistake. (Laughter). He then proceeded at some length to contend that the true principle of levying duties on sugar was to have the same *ad valorem* and specific rates on all grades.

Mr. Bolton said he was in the molasses trade, and he doubted very much if the new rates were a reduction of duty. He did not look on the remission of the duties on breadstuffs as a concession so far as New Brunswick was concerned, for there were no such duties there previous to the Union—(Cries of "question, question").

Hon. Mr. Holtton asked that the debate be adjourned as other members desired to speak and it was useless to do so when the House was so impatient.

Hon. Mr. Cartier said the debate on the sugar duties might be made the first order to-morrow, after which he would proceed with the resolutions on the fortifications.

After some further conversation it was agreed to divide on Mr. Jones' amendment, which was negatived—yeas, 32; nays, 85.

YEAS—Messrs. Anglin, Bolton, Bourassa, Burpee, Cameron (Inverness), Coffin, Connell, Coupal, Dorion, Ferris, Fisher, Forbes, Fortier, Godin, Jones (Halifax), McDonald (Antigonish), Mackenzie, Magill, McLellan, Mills, Oliver, Paquet, Parker, Pozer, Ray, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N.B.), Savary, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Wallace, Workman—32.

NAYS—Messrs. Beaty, Bechard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burton, Campbell, Carling,