

government. We who come from the west know well that the clarion-toned and trumpet-tongued member for Bothwell goes up and down the counties of Essex, Kent, Bothwell and Elgin saying: Look at the tall chimneys that the national policy, the protective policy, has stimulated and brought into life. And yet, the hon. member for Bothwell cannot rise in his place and show where the protective policy, in eighteen long years, ever stimulated twenty-five factories in other lines of trades or industry in the four western counties. We can point to twenty-five new factories existing in Canada in the short space of three years in tobacco alone, and to the fact that the greater portion of the benefits resulting from these industries goes to the masses, to the farmers who produce the tobacco, to the laboring men who earn their money by the sweat of their brow in the Canadian tobacco fields and the tobacco factories of Canada, and that the money goes into the pockets of the consumers of the common grades of tobacco. In the face of this the hon. gentleman rises in his place and says that \$1,050,000 was taken out of the poorer people of Canada in taxes. Then, when asked to state why and how, he said "because one-tenth of the tobacco consumed in Canada is made from Canadian leaf," while in point of fact, over 45 per cent. was manufactured from it in January last. The hon. gentleman actually did not know the difference, although he spoke with all the assurance of a man who could leak wisdom on the subject. Earlier in this debate, and earlier in the night I gave the hon. member for Bothwell the figures of the consumption of Canadian tobacco in Canada from 1896 down. I also gave him the percentage that Canadian tobacco bore to the total consumption, and therefore I need not now weary the House by going into that any farther. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the Empire Tobacco Company distributed \$300,000 last year in wages to their workmen, that they spent \$150,000 in increasing their plant, to say nothing about the twenty-four other factories. Does any hon. gentleman think that these gentlemen, tobacco experts, would invest such large sums of money in the industries for the manufacture of Canadian tobacco were they not thoroughly satisfied that it was a product that would strike the palate of the Canadian consumer, and that it was equal in texture, aroma, flavor and general character to the foreign article. Now, the crop of 1898 was put on the market in 1899. I have already referred to the fact that the growers lacked the facilities for curing it, but they went to work in 1898 and got the facilities, and the result is that the tobacco crop grown last year is only being purchased now, and will not go to the consumer until next year. When it does go to the consumer it will be found that the crop is 50 per cent. finer than that grown in 1898. As has been stated by Mr. Gregory, these men have come to a point in Canada that it took the United States years and years to reach. Some hon. gentlemen may ask in view of the fact that under the excise regulations which imposed twenty-five cents per pound excise on foreign leaf and five cents per pound excise on Canadian leaf, giving a protection of twenty cents a pound upon the home grown article, or an advantage of twenty cents per pound, under the regime of the hon. gentlemen opposite, how it was that Canadian tobacco only amounted to a little over 5 per cent. of the total consumption. Hon. gentlemen opposite sat on the treasury benches for eighteen long

years,
in this
opposit
grades
consum
grow it
you ma
acres c
none,
Fieldin
will te
Canadi
Turkish
tobacco
that sta
bring th
any wr
of Cana
well (M
the bac
can put
cover u
Clancy)
has a w
in any c
not gro
ment w
tobacco
We hav
can gro
or Kent
wrapper
governm
was, and
ment ha
the hon
asks in t
let him p
plug of C
will dem
thing wh
this coun
governm
blend to
could ha
and this
ing as a s
that the