

and states that the poor man is taxed \$1,150,000 a year on his tobacco, and the funny part of it is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) still needs his head in confirmation of the erroneous assertions he made to the House. I am not 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 costs 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 laboring 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 30th, 1898, it was 1,989,429 pounds; and in the year ending June 30th, 1899, it had increased to 2,575,955 pounds. Taking the last year of the old regulations, ending June 30th, 1896, and comparing that with the year ending June 30th last, there is an increase of 540 per cent., or there is 54 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 23.2 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
mor
that
ferti
was
entl
that
and
incre
hon.
mini
had i
take
to o
matt
Both
minis
have
Crow
memb
'Whe
the h
give
memb
I am c
ten ye
2,153 p
gentle
.024 po
Then,
not fol
a still
by the
sumpti
the reg
and yet
statem
An
and the
no care
class of
into Can
of that
these h
support
Wh
ing class
he woul