

does the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite not prove of any advantage to Canada, but it also prevents their ever obtaining any reciprocity with the United States, which at one time they were so anxious to obtain. The fact that they have given a preference to England, at first of one-eighth, and then of one-quarter, and now of one-third of the duties imposed on the goods of foreign countries will effectually prevent any chance of their obtaining reciprocity with our neighbours to the south.

These hon. gentlemen have violated the pledge they made to the people of Canada in the speech of the Prime Minister at London, England. Their tariff, as applied to the whole world, was a failure, and then when they came down with their subsequent tariff, giving a preference to England, that preference did not touch a fringe of the evils of taxation which they said were oppressing the people of Canada. In fact there is not one redeeming feature in their tariff, and its only effect is to delay, so long as it continues in force, what would have taken place long ago, if these hon. gentlemen have followed out the course we advocated. It has the effect of delaying a preference which the mother country would otherwise inevitably give us.

I do not propose to detain the House longer. I say that Canada's interests are inseparably linked with those of the mother country, but Canada has also a destiny in the future of her own. While she has no interests hostile to those of Great Britain she has still conditions of her own which must not be lost sight of. We must have a fiscal policy of our own which must not be hampered by any restrictive conditions, and the greatest gift we can give Canada and at the same time bestow upon Great Britain, in the interests of the enlargement of the British Empire, is to make Canada great and prosperous.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (Essex). At this hour, Mr. Speaker, and at this stage of the debate, it is not my intention for one moment to follow the various arguments which have been advanced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who has just spoken. But there are one or two statements he made, to which I propose devoting some small attention before branching into the two points on which I purpose dwelling before I resume my seat. The hon. member for Bothwell laboured for one solid hour to show—and apparently he argued it satisfactorily to his own mind—that farm produce in Canada to-day was cheaper than it was prior to 1896. He then went on to show that the articles which the farmer had to buy were dearer to-day than they were prior to 1896, and then he made the startling admission that the farmer was prosperous to-day, and that the whole country was prosperous.

Mr. CLANCY. I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) that I made the very opposite statement.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman's words are not yet cold, and I venture to say that there was not a man who listened to him who will not remember that he quoted the list of cattle, hogs and other articles that are the produce of the farm to show that they were cheaper than they were prior to 1896. I rose in my place and asked him if he thought it was fair to compare the prices of cattle in 1899 with the prices prior to 1896, and he said it was. In reply to an hon. member on this side, I think the hon. gentleman from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost), as to the prices of certain agricultural implements the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) went on to show that the articles which the farmer had to buy had increased in price as compared with 1896, and he wound up with the startling admission that this country was in a state of prosperity. The whole result of the hon. gentleman's argument was what the farmer had to sell was cheaper, and what he had to buy was dearer, and then—and I see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) nods in assent—he declared that the country was prosperous. If he has argued that satisfactorily to his own mind, he is very far from having argued it to the satisfaction of any other hon. gentleman who heard it. Fortunately, we do not have to take the statement of the hon. gentleman in that regard. I listened, and listened with interest, to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and if the hon. member for Bothwell will turn to *Hansard* of March 27, page 2699, he will find that the hon. member for York makes this statement:

Suppose we apply that rule to 1895, and then compare with 1899. In 1899 the prices were 17 per cent higher, according to the index, than in 1895, so that if you would make a fair comparison, you would have to add 17 per cent to the trade figures of 1895, which would give an addition of \$34,700,000.

There is the admission of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). If the hon. member for Bothwell had figured it out, he would have found that in animals and their products alone, the farmer in 1899 received \$1,173,000 more than they would have received for the same sales in 1895. And yet, at this stage of the debate, an hon. gentleman occupying the position that the hon. member for Bothwell occupies or pretends to occupy in this House, makes such a statement as that to which we have just listened. Living near a border county, the hon. gentleman knows—no one knows better—that there never was a more unfair comparison attempted than that which he attempted in the prices of cattle in 1899 and 1896. The hon. gentleman was careful to take the export price. The hon. gentleman knows that in 1899 we exported from Canada, cattle that we could not have exported in 1896 at all.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) permit me to ask him a question?