

other, and they never rose above petty questions of the price of such articles. I venture to say that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) made capital for his party in just about that way.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You are guessing now.

Mr. CLANCY. Though it is only guessing, it is not hard to guess what hon. gentlemen opposite will do under such circumstances. I regret that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is not in his place. But I can tell you that that was the cry he raised. He made a personal canvass in the houses, and on the platforms he talked of nothing else than the villainy of the Government in Ottawa that imposed an enormous tax on coal oil and robbed the people on their rice. Is rice cheaper to-day? They have dealt with the matter, and, as a matter of fact, there is far greater tax on it than before.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) must have a strange way of calculating duties. I thought that rice came in before at 3-10ths cent per pound, and that now it comes in at $\frac{3}{4}$ cent. If I am wrong in thinking that the present duty is higher than the old, perhaps the hon. gentleman will enlighten me.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I shall be glad to enlighten the hon. gentleman. Uncleaned rice came in formerly at 3-10ths of a cent per pound, and it comes in now at $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent per pound. But the manufacturer gets no more for the cleaned rice than he got before, for the duty on cleaned rice remains as before, $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound. The increased duty on uncleaned rice comes out of the manufacturer.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that the House is now enlightened. The hon. gentleman has told us what we knew before—that 3-10ths cent was paid formerly on the uncleaned rice, while the duty now is $\frac{3}{4}$ cent. But he seems able to convince himself—but I believe not an hon. gentleman on that side, and I am sure not an hon. gentleman on this side is convinced—that this increase does not come out of the pockets of the people. It is a perfect absurdity. But I do not wish to speak in harsh terms. It would be curious to know where the hon. gentleman would land in arguing about duties in such a manner as he does. But he has been distressed for fear that a rice mill would live in Canada. That is what has exercised the hon. gentleman and his friends more than anything else. But now he is in peace. He has discovered in his mind, and only in his mind, that this duty can be raised and still the people pay no greater tax.

These are the small cries raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. But the questions that the people expect to find raised at the assembling of Parliament are questions of

Mr. CLANCY.

greater magnitude. On these questions hon. gentlemen opposite gave no specific pledges, but only stated in broad terms that they were going to make reforms. One of these was the reduction in taxes. Has there been a reduction in taxes? The effect of this tariff is the very opposite. We were told, also, that there would be a reduction of expenditure and no further increase of public debt. These were the great questions before the country, and not these small points upon which hon. gentlemen opposite compliment themselves for having redeemed their pledges. On these greater questions, how have hon. gentlemen opposite redeemed their pledges?

As I stated a moment ago, taxation has been materially increased, but it has been increased in such a way that the burdens are heavier upon the people than they were before. The policy of the Conservative party was never to impose taxation without some compensating advantages, where it was possible to do so. What were the compensating advantages? Where duty was imposed as a protective duty in order that we might foster the interests of this country, it meant that if the people were taxed, they would have a day's labour for it; it meant that if the people were taxed, they traded with each other; it meant that if they were taxed, it was for the purpose of giving them the first right of a day's work, the first right of selling their own commodities, the first right of keeping their own country for themselves, so far as enjoying its fruits was concerned. Now, those were the compensating advantages for the taxation imposed under the National Policy. But now we have what is called a new National Policy. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) last night adopted the phrase of the new Liberal National Policy; I do not know whether his friends will be disposed to adopt it also. They have had their knife in the National Policy so long that I am afraid that if they adopt that name, it will not be received very well by the country. The National Policy, either upon the tongues or in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, is a thing that is very ill-fitting. Their National Policy has been one of tearing down, the National Policy of the Conservative party has been one of building up; and if the hon. gentleman and his friends can get the country to accept the proposition laid down by him last evening, then we are willing to accept that, and let it be the dividing line between the two parties in this country. Now, in the matter of additional taxation how much have these hon. gentlemen built up? I candidly admit that it is not very easy to build up, but we have the assurance that there would be no disturbing results from the reformation of the tariff. But I wish to say while upon that point that the whole revision of the tariff, so far as it has gone, has been not only a dangerous one, but it