

failure to find a solution of it, no proposition was ever made by a member of the government to remove that embargo? The hon. Minister of Finance tells me that I must go to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for an answer to that question. I am willing that the farmers of Canada should accept his answer, and that they should ask the Minister of Agriculture. I can tell the hon. Minister of Agriculture that all the sentiment he has spoken of in this House has counted for nothing. If he made an effort and failed, or if he failed to make an effort to remove the restriction, I tell him that in either case he has sinned and in both cases he has failed. If giving a special preference to England has failed to induce them to extend bare justice to Canada, then hon. gentlemen opposite had better think again, where is our preference in England? What has happened recently? Canadian cattle were allowed twenty days in the English market before being slaughtered, but recently owing to disease being found among Argentine cattle the order has gone forth that Canadian cattle as well as all foreign cattle must be slaughtered five days after arrival in England. Surely this is a suitable time for that statesman to go over to England to try and get the ear of the British government and to have this injustice to Canada stopped. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) seems to know nothing about it; the matter is so unimportant that he has passed it over with a light heart, and he appears to have handed it over to the charge of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. COCHRANE. Tarte is in London.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, but that is not the kind of business the Minister of Public Works attends to. He is engaged in something more sensational just now. There is just another point, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to refer to. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and other gentlemen opposite taking the cue from their leaders have repeated over and over again, that as a result of their preference the price of goods coming from England would be reduced; the price of goods coming from foreign countries would be correspondingly reduced to the consumer, and all manufactured goods of the same kind produced in Canada would as a result be reduced in price.

Mr. COCHRANE. A long bow.

Mr. CLANCY. It is a pretty long bow, but it was none too long for gentlemen opposite to draw. On the face of it that statement has a sort of gloss that might make it commendable to the people of the country, but let us see how it works out. The hon. gentleman gave a list of articles that would be affected in this way, among others, cuffs, collars, blueing, soap, Paris green, carpets, jams and jellies, mustard ground, pickles, starch, cotton white or bleached and

prints. Now, let us take the prices of these articles. Collars and cuffs sold for 85 cents a dozen when they came from England and 97 cents when they came from the United States. Blueing 9·8 from England and 21·7 from the United States; soap, 5·2 from England, and 4·00 from the United States; Paris green, 11·6 from Great Britain, and 26·6 from the United States; carpets, 64 cents per yard from Great Britain, and 51 cents per yard from the United States; jams and jellies, 7·2 from Great Britain, and 12·8 from the United States; mustard, ground, 21 cents from Great Britain, and 3·2 from the United States; pickles, \$1·09 a gallon from Great Britain, and 79 cents from the United States; starch, 5·8 from Great Britain, and 3·3 from the United States; cottons, white or bleached, 7·6 from Great Britain, and 6·5 from the United States; printed cottons, 8·3 cents from Great Britain, and 6·4 cents from the United States. This proves that the argument of the hon. gentleman has no application whatever. It proves that the class of goods coming in were of a different kind, and did not come in contact with each other so far as prices were concerned, and therefore the preferential tariff had no bearing upon them. We were told by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) that the general tariff would have no substantial reductions. I wish to keep that statement before the eye of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). He told us in explicit terms that the general tariff would have no substantial reductions, that if any reductions were to follow, or if there were to be any modifications of the evils of the national policy it was to be all embodied in what is now called the preferential tariff. Let me point out to the Minister of Finance that last year we imported \$98,000,000 worth of dutiable goods, and of that, just \$26,000,000 or less than 30 per cent came in under the preferential tariff. I point out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that although the preferential tariff was to correct everything that was wrong in the general tariff, yet as a matter of fact only 30 per cent of the dutiable goods imported into Canada came under the preferential tariff, while more than 70 per cent came under the general tariff which the Finance Minister declared was not altered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is not quoting me as stating that there were no reductions in the general tariff.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister (Mr. Fielding) stated that there were no substantial reductions in the general tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said there were scores of reductions in the general tariff and the records will show it.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not intend to read the hon. gentleman's speech, but now that he has raised the question, I will read the