

Mr. COWAN. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will remember that I stated that for the three years 1894, 1895 and 1896, prices were, on the average, higher than they were for 1897, 1898 and 1899, and the hon. gentleman need not hinge his argument on a single year.

Mr. COWAN. That makes it all the worse for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), and all the worse for his argument. Every man in this House, and every man, woman and child outside of it, knows that if ever there were hard times in Canada, they were in the years the hon. gentleman first mentioned. And, if the prices were good and still the times were hard, I would like to know where the argument leads the hon. gentleman. In 1899, as the hon. gentleman knows, there were hundreds and hundreds of cattle throughout the western peninsula of Ontario purchased and shipped to the United States that could not possibly have been exported at all in 1896, on account of the quarantine regulations. And I am within the judgment of the House and of every man who raises and sells a bullock in Canada, that the lower grade of cattle are worth \$5 per bullock more than they were prior to 1896, by reason of the abolition of the quarantine regulations permitting the Canadian bullock to go to the nearest market, that of the United States. This has not affected animals actually exported to the United States alone, but it means that every bullock slaughtered in Canada is worth \$5 more.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) knows that the average price was only \$13, and yet he adds \$5.

Mr. COWAN. I say that the average steer that would have sold for \$30 in 1899, could have been purchased for less than \$25 in 1896.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the average price was \$13, and yet he talks of steers being worth \$30.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) poses as a farmer. If he does not raise a steer worth \$30 I am sorry for him as an agricultural authority. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not rise for the purpose of going into a general discussion of the tariff. If there has been anything discussed in this House *ad nauseam*, it is the British preference and the general tariff. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken on that side has delivered himself of the argument that the exports of Canada to the British market should have a preference in that market. Though those exports represent less than 5 per cent of the import trade of Great Britain, the people of the mother country, it is said, should tax themselves on the 95 per cent from other countries for the benefit of the 5 per cent that comes from Canada. It seems

to me that that is an argument that needs no answer. It is an argument no hon. gentleman in this House in his serious moments would dare to make, but for the purpose of attempting to make some political party capital by impressing the people of Canada with the idea that there is a possibility of a British preference. Were it not for this, the time of this House would not be taken up with this discussion. Sir, that brings me to consider a statement that was made by the hon. member for York, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), as found in *Hansard* at page 2800 :

These gentlemen allow the alien labour law of Canada to remain a blank on the statute-book, while the alien labour law of the United States is rigidly enforced against every labouring man and woman who enters the United States. We are opposed, as a party, to that kind of preference.

That brings me back, Mr. Speaker, to consider the whole history of alien labour legislation in Canada, and the attitude of the Conservative party with reference to it. I want to find out just what kind of an alien labour preference the ex-Finance Minister and his associates were in favour of. It is well-known to every member of this House that the newspapers at the time were teeming with accounts of those who had been turned back from the American border, during the years from 1887 down to 1896. The records of parliament, and the pages of *Hansard* show that at different times this matter was brought to the attention of the ex-Minister of Finance, and his colleagues in the government, and we learn from the records the course which they took in reference to alien labour legislation. Now, I find that in 1890, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), introduced an Alien Labour Bill. Sir John Thompson, then leader of the government, on February 27, 1890, said, as recorded in *Hansard*, at page 1335 :

Two members of his government had interviewed the Secretary-Treasurer of the United States on alien labour.

In 1890, mark you, Mr. Speaker, matters had come to such a pass in Canada, that two members of the Conservative government felt constrained, without anything having been said on the floor of parliament, to interview the United States government, and the answer which they received was, that :

Congress had deliberately adopted legislation of that kind with the view of enforcing a policy which was thought necessary in the interests of the people of the United States.

At page 1238, Sir John Thompson says :

It would be unwise for parliament to pass an Act extending to the whole of Canada such a measure, because these grievances have arisen in certain localities.

So that although in 1890, the matter was brought up in parliament, while from 1887, outrages of the grossest kind had been per-