

through with the hon. gentleman yet. We will now take chewing tobacco. I hold in my hand the 'Prince of Wales,' manufactured by McDonald, sixteen plugs to the pound, at five cents a plug, or eighty cents a pound. I hold here the Empire Tobacco Company's 'Currency,' one-tenth of a pound, costing five cents, or fifty cents per pound. So that, you can buy more than one and one-half pounds for the same price that you pay for a pound of the other. I have here the Empire Tobacco Company's chewing tobacco, ten plugs to the pound, or fifty cents per pound. While McDonald's tobacco cost eighty cents a pound, the Canadian tobacco costs fifty cents a pound, and I ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) if the cheaper kind of tobacco I have produced here is not the kind of tobacco—chewing and smoking—that is used by the labouring men and masses of Canada?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman asks me a very fair question, and I am going to answer it. He has made a correct statement as to the present; but he should have stated to the House that he is quoting the price of a tobacco that forms less than one-tenth of all the tobacco used in Canada. The hon. gentleman knows that. I stated that there is \$1,050,000 on tobacco over 1896, and I appeal to the Finance Minister whether that is not correct.

Mr. COWAN. As usual, when the hon. member for Bothwell opens his mouth, he puts his foot in it; and I will show the hon. gentleman how deep down it has sunk. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that Canadian tobacco forms less than one-tenth of the tobacco consumed in Canada. Well, fortunately we are able to get at the exact amount of Canadian leaf that has been consumed in Canada, and although it is a little out of the line of the argument I intended to pursue, I am going to deal with this at once. The Canadian tobacco produced in the year ending the 30th of June, 1896, according to the Inland Revenue Returns, was 474,205 pounds; in the year ending June, 30, 1898, it was 1,989,429 pounds; and in the year ending June 30, 1899, it had increased to 2,575,955 pounds. Taking the last year of the old regulations, ending June 30, 1896, and comparing that with the year ending June 30 last, there is an increase of 540 per cent, or there is 5½ pounds consumed now to what was consumed prior to the tariff changes. I will go further, and figure it more closely for the hon. gentleman. In the year 1894-5, the percentage of Canadian leaf compared with the total product was only 5·8 per cent, whereas in 1898-9 it increased to 26·2 per cent. For the six months ending the 31st December, 1899, it had further increased to 36·2 per cent, and for the month of January last it had increased to 45·2 per cent. And yet the hon. member for Bothwell knows so little

of the staple product which he himself produces, and which is produced in his own constituency, that he makes the lamentable exhibition and the erroneous statement that less than one-tenth of the tobacco used in Canada is of Canadian growth. Surely, if we can produce tobacco of as good a quality made from Canadian leaf, and it can be purchased in Canada to-day at less than two-thirds of the price of tobacco made from foreign leaf prior to the tariff of 1897, it does not operate as an additional tax on the masses, but as an absolute saving to the people of Canada by giving them 50 per cent more tobacco than they could formerly obtain for the same money. I think that is a proposition that even the hon. member for Bothwell with his fertile imagination and lack of information will hardly contradict. Now, it was stated by the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), who had apparently as little knowledge of the matter as the hon. member for Bothwell, that there had been a falling off in the consumption of tobacco in Canada, and that the cause of this was that we had raised prices and caused increased smuggling into Canada; and, strange though it may seem, that hon. gentleman holding a responsible position in this House, and an ex-minister of the Crown, carried the matter one step further and said that we had imposed those tobacco duties in order that increased smuggling would take place along the borders of Canada, for the sole purpose of giving jobs to our political friends as preventive officers. Now, I want to take this matter up, and while I do so I want the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell, because there is no man who demands the attention of every minister of the Crown when he speaks so much as that hon. member. I have noted it since I came into the House in 1896. If a minister of the Crown attempts to engage in conversation with his neighbour while the hon. member for Bothwell is speaking, that hon. gentleman stops and says, 'When the minister of so-and-so gets through, I will proceed.' Surely, if the hon. member for Bothwell is entitled to ask ministers of the Crown to give their undivided attention to him when he is speaking, the hon. member, a private member, should at all events give me his attention when I am discussing an article grown in his own constituency. I will go back ten years. On June 30, 1889, the consumption of tobacco in Canada was 2·153 pounds per head. On June 30, 1896, twenty-three days before the hon. gentlemen were defeated, it had shrunk to 2·129 pounds per head, or, ·024 pounds per head less under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then, if the statement is correct that greater smuggling went on, would it not follow as a natural sequence that the consumption would have fallen to a still lower point? But I turn to the population of Canada, as figured out by the statistician, Mr. Johnson, and I find