

very cheap rates in the mother country, and at whose cost? For that reason, from every labor district in Canada, I believe, and from every Province representatives are to be found sitting on this side of the House; the labor interests are totally adverse to the hon. gentleman's financial doctrine; the labor organisations, whether in Great Britain, the United States, or this country, are protective, every one of them, and the policy of this country is essentially framed in the interests of labor. That is one reason of its success, and it is for this reason that hon. gentlemen opposite have a slim chance and little opportunity of ousting this Government from power. The hon. gentleman contended that the Finance Minister had denied that the farmers paid any taxes, and that they paid taxes upon machinery, or that in any respect they were affected by the tariff. The Finance Minister made no such statement. An hon. member who is always interjecting, apparently for the purpose of interjecting, and nothing else, called out "Nails" when my hon. friend was discussing the farmer's purchases and the articles which the farmer chiefly used. My hon. friend spoke not of machinery; as to whether the articles are dearer on that account or not, I am not now going to discuss. Time after time this question has been fully discussed in this House, and it has been shown that, even if the people do pay a little more for their goods, it is something to have a tariff policy that enables them to obtain money wherewith to buy them. Make the goods as cheap as you like, they say, let them be slaughtered in this country! We have had that experience, and our experience is this, that when these goods become so cheap, the inability of the intending consumer is often absolutely taken away, so that the people understand that. Take, for instance, the question of coal, upon which hon. gentlemen from the west now and then excite themselves. The cry was all through Ontario that the price of coal was increased to the consumers in consequence of the tax of 60 cents per ton. The hon. gentlemen know that experience has illustrated the entire fallacy of that argument in this respect, that since that tariff was removed the price of coal has increased, and that the hard coal supply of Ontario is now practically in the hands of an American monopoly. That has been the experience in that regard—and so it is not true in most of the cases, though in some it may be—that the price of an article is slightly increased by a moderate protective tariff such as ours. Then, another point is sought to be made in regard to the farmers of Ontario. I was surprised to hear from the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), notwithstanding his fondness for extravagant remarks and extravagant speeches,—I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman endeavor to show before an intelligent audience in this House, that the value of farm lands was decreasing, especially in Ontario, and that the decrease was a result of the policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman ought to have admitted, and, admitting it, then pointed his argument to some other direction, that whether it be in free trade England, or in the United States with the high protective tariff, or in Canada with a lower protective tariff, the value of farming property, all the world over, has decreased during the last few years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen say "no." I tell them that an eminent English authority, Mr. J. S. Jeans, has made a calculation of this, in a very interesting work which he has written lately. Mr. Jeans is a gentleman who has on many occasions lectured before some of the most intelligent audiences in England. He has made the calculation that both in America and in England the value of farming property has decreased in the last few years by something like 100 per cent. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when speaking in regard to the farms of Ontario, was not one-half or one-tenth so

Mr. TUPPER.

bad as that. I hesitate to give the House the statement, but since the hon. member for South Oxford challenged it, I will read it, as it is not long:

"In America, as in England, and indeed all over Europe, there has been a great fall in prices within the last two or three years, affecting nearly all agricultural products; in some cases those have been reduced in value 100 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would be left after taking off 100 per cent.? You would wipe it out altogether.

Mr. TUPPER. The statement is 100 per cent., and I do not intend to argue the question out as to whether the arithmetic is good or not, but I will refer the hon. member to the member for South Oxford, who said that the Canadian laboring men, or poorer classes, pay 600 per cent. more taxes than the corresponding class in England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know so little of arithmetic as not to know that you may multiply ten thousand per cent., but that you cannot deduct it?

Mr. TUPPER. I think I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is ashamed of his own calculation, and cannot justify it. Now, as to the condition of the farmers; and I will call the attention of the House to a very valuable authority, the statement of a Reform journal in the Province of Nova Scotia. Let us see as to whether our farmers are to be in so much better a position when we are part and parcel of the American Union, as under the terms of this resolution we will be. In July last, after Unrestricted Reciprocity had been fully aired before the country, the *Morning Chronicle* stated: "That the farmers of the States, in every way favorably situated, had been declining in prosperity, farms had been mortgaged, and profits were vanishing away." Hon. gentlemen well know that the Province of Ontario, especially with its position to the Western States and the neighboring States of the American Union was magnificently portrayed to the credit of Ontario, last Session, by hon. gentlemen who are much better prepared to deal minutely with the question than I am, and those statements, up to this day, have not been answered. Now, if the condition of the farmers in the States be as described by this Reform journal, where is the advantage of this market of sixty millions of people to Canada? The American farmers enjoy that market, they are within the sacred confines of the American limits, and, notwithstanding those wonderful pictures drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite of what would follow if the customs lines were taken down, we find that the American farms are being heavily mortgaged, and that all their property is vanishing away. The hon. gentleman was not in good fighting trim the other night, for he candidly confessed that he could not attack the success of the late loan, yet, although he admitted that it was a good loan and that it was placed at the right time, he could not leave the subject without the sneering remark that money was very cheap all the world over, and that no credit was due to the Government for the success of the loan. I will not weary the House on that, further than to refer hon. members to a very able article in the *Globe* newspaper which gives a comparative statement, and which, in that comparative statement, supports the able and unanswerable arguments of the Minister of Finance, showing that not only was it a successful loan, made when money was cheap, but that, comparatively, it was the best loan ever negotiated by a colony, and its comparison with the credit of other countries, including the colonies, was such as to show that in itself it was a most extraordinarily successful financial transaction. However, we will take, though it was given ungracefully, his testimony to the acts of the Minister of Finance, though some, I fear, will feel a little dubious as to the loan being a success, because the hon. gentleman himself admitted it. The member for South Oxford could not resume his seat without, as he has often times done before, and without much success, showing his