

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I shall not have an opportunity to speak at all unless I do so now. I deprecate the practice which has prevailed in the past of treating this body as a kind of debating society. It seems to be considered a rule that when a member speaks on one side he must be followed by one on the opposite side. I do not think it should be so at all. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on Fridays we always have a thin House. All the members who can, go home for the week end merely registering their names here and then hastening to the railway depot. There are here this afternoon only two or three who could possibly have got away.

I wish to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. member from Halifax, and one by the leader of the Opposition. I regret to hear the statement made continually that those who opposed the reciprocity pact were influenced by a desire to have no trade with the Yankees. That was an invention on the part of those who supported the reciprocity treaty, and is not based on the utterances of those who took any leading part in opposing the reciprocity pact. A year and a half ago I had the honour of addressing the Canadian Club in Chicago. A large number of the members of that club were from the city where I live. On one side of me sat the Governor of Illinois who is a Republican, and on the other side of me a leading Democrat. I took occasion then to deny in the most positive terms that the people of Canada had been influenced in their rejection of the reciprocity agreement by any feeling of hostility to the people of the United States. I told them that, on the contrary, the Canadian people had done exactly what the people of the United States do when dealing with public questions affecting their interests. The majority of our people, I said, were opposed to the scheme submitted to them by the party in power, believing that it was not in the interest of Canada that it should be adopted. I went further and said that if I were a citizen of the United States I should be a Republican because I was in principle a protectionist. The Governor of the state applauded that remark. Then I said that if the Democratic party would adhere to the principles which they professed, and not follow the course usually pursued by the Liberal party in Canada, that is professing one thing in opposition, and taking the opposite course after obtaining power, they would, when returned to office, reduce the tariff. The

Democrats were successful, and they lowered the tariff. The result was what was anticipated by both parties, that it has opened up a market for the agricultural products of this country. Why do we hear a continual condemnation of the exporting of our own farm products? That is what we have been seeking, and that is why we have been looking for a lowering of the United States tariff. Moreover it has been done without impairing any of the protection which agriculture enjoys in this country. We are told that the effect of the lowering of the United States tariff has been to raise the price of food in this country; but that has done no injury to any of our people, except those who have a fixed income. It has not injured the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant or the manufacturer. I have had some experience in this direction, more probably than most of those who are listening to me, and I have found that the country is more prosperous when the farmers get good prices for their products. What do we find to-day? Beef is 18 to 25 cents a pound, an increase of from ten to fifteen cents over a few years ago, but the mechanic gets \$3 to \$3.50 a day, where he formerly got \$1.50 to \$2.50, and so he is able to pay the higher price. My experience has been, the better the prices that farmers get for their products, the better off the whole country is.

I am sorry that the hon. gentleman from Halifax is not present because I wish to refer to one expression which he used, to which I take particular objection, that is the drawing of a distinction between the interests of Canada and the interests of the empire. He says that if a question affects Canada very seriously, it should be first in our consideration. I have always been living under the impression that Canada is an integral portion of the empire, and that what is in Canada's interest must be in the interest of the empire. Whatever is in the interest of the empire is in the interest of every outlying portion of the empire. Anything which injures the empire must injure us.

The hon. leader of the Opposition paid a very great compliment to the Senate when he told us that, after investigation, he found that during the period when the Conservative party were in the majority in the Senate, they had rejected or amended fewer Bills sent up by the Liberal Government than had been rejected or amended when the Liberals were in a majority in this Chamber. From that he argued that the

Hon. Mr. DAVIS.