

bly the Committee might find in their report that the imposition of duties on articles that the farmer produced would be an injury to him instead of a benefit, in which case no person would advocate the imposition of those duties or the carrying of them into effect. It was my wish, however, to ascertain what influence the imposition of such duties would have on the farmers; it was not an argument, as the hon. member for Lincoln tried to make out, for placing duties upon breadstuffs, but it was the expression of a desire to ascertain what effect such duties would have.

Mr. RYKERT. I read your exact words.

Mr. PATERSON. No; my exact words were, Committee, not concession. Do you say that that is not correct?

Mr. RYKERT. I do not.

Mr. PATERSON. Then I accept the statement. The hon. gentleman will also admit that he did not read what I subsequently said, which explains the whole matter, and that I wish the appointment of the Committee in order to ascertain the effect of the imposition of duties. A Committee was granted. Did the Committee ever report in favor of the imposition of the duties on grain? The Committee never so reported, but it submitted the evidence to the House, and left every man at liberty to determine the question for himself. To-day it is a problematical question whether the imposition of those duties has been productive of good. A Committee was appointed the other day on the subject, showing that there is a dim suspicion that those duties, after all, have failed in doing what they were expected to do in benefitting the agriculturists of this country. If there might be anything said in favor of the imposition of those duties, it is what I said in that same speech, that with the imposition of those duties, we might be able to say, in the event of the Americans desiring a renewal of reciprocity, that we have duties on grain. I say now, that if there is any value in having those duties, that is the value; but it will be a very little value, because the Americans would say it would be no advantage to them to get this market for their grain. If there was any argument in it, it was that; but what did hon. gentlemen opposite tell the farmers? They told them they would get better prices as the result of the imposition of this duty on grain, and whether designedly or not, in that, the Government of this country have deceived the farmers and they are attempting to deceive them to-day. But farmers have been undeceived with reference to it, and many of them who cast their votes in favor of hon. gentlemen opposite, under the delusive promises broken by them since they have been in power, will withhold their votes from them at the next election. Let us bring a little common sense to bear upon this question. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to follow me for a few moments. He admitted my proposition, made a little while ago, with reference to manufactured goods, viz.: that when you produce more manufactured goods in a country than it wants, that then the imposition of a duty could not benefit the manufacturers, except they wanted to enter into a combination.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say anything of the kind. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to put a construction upon a remark I made across the House, that it did not bear. The hon. gentleman said that when in a community, or any section of a country, the people produced more than the country required, and they had to seek a market abroad, then it was not necessarily the consequence that it should increase the price to the consumer, and, under those circumstances, I said hear, hear, to it.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps in words a little more plain, my hon. friend that sits beside me says that he used

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the same words that I did, and now the Minister of Finance has endorsed that hon. gentleman's position. I knew he would, because it is common sense, and the view which a business man would take of a business question. But, Sir, the farmer had reached the second stage of protection before the National Policy was put in force at all, and therefore the imposition of duties on grain is a force, a delusion and a snare, and they know it. If they do not they show no more intelligence on this question than the gentleman who addressed us this afternoon. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that when you have a surplus of any article in this country, and are obliged to send to foreign markets to find their prices, the imposition of duties upon that article is harmless to increase its price. Now, as admitted by the Minister of Finance, you cannot protect the agricultural products of this country except in the one article of Indian corn. I say here, as I have said on every platform, on this article you can enhance the price. And why? Because we do not grow as much of it as the country wants, and therefore the imposition of a duty on corn raises its price to the Canadian farmer some  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel. The Minister of Finance agrees with that in his speech, but the hon. the Minister of Railways said that the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal did not raise the price of that article, because Yankee coal came into the country and met coal produced here, and consequently the Yankee paid the duty. Corn comes into the country and meets corn grown here; how is it that the Yankee does not pay the duty? The hon. the Minister of Finance says that the duties on corn did not raise the price to our farmer, and I say so too. He is logical and I am with him, but as a consequence the hon. the Minister of Railways is illogical and inconsequential with reference to his coal duties. With reference to duties on corn the farmer has had his prices enhanced, and that cannot be prevented; but is that in the interest of the farmer? It is in the interest of the farmer who has corn to sell, but while one farmer has one hundred have not. An hon. gentleman says that it gives the farmer a better price for his oats. It is a very strange thing, if that be the case, that oats should be higher in the Chicago market than they are in Toronto, as I think the hon. member for North Norfolk pointed out the other day. If the farmers are content with it I have no reason to complain of the duty, but I argue simply on business principles, and the hon. gentlemen know for a fact that the farmers, having reached the second stage of protection, before the new policy was introduced, it is impossible to protect them; that being the case a Tariff that makes them pay enhanced prices for what they have to buy is an imposition upon them, and they have a right to resent it. Trace the hon. gentlemen opposite in their action in this matter; they put a duty of 15 cents per bushel on wheat and 50 cents per barrel on flour. The duty on wheat is greater in proportion than the duty on flour, and that shows that the hon. gentlemen knew that the impost of a duty on wheat would not raise its price at all. What did they do further? They went through the farce of putting a duty on wheat, and then they passed an Order in Council permitting the millers of this country to go to the United States, where they could buy 2,000 to 10,000,000 bushels of American wheat, and bring it into Canada, and not pay one cent of duty on it, but simply give their bond, grind that wheat into flour, sell that flour in Canadian markets, within a period specified, and if the millers had sold and realized their prices within one year after, they could export a like quantity of flour and wheat, and the exportation cancelled the bond they gave for the duty, and thus they never had paid one cent of duty upon it. That was the treatment the hon. gentlemen opposite gave the farmers, and that would have been the fact still, if the attention of the country had not been called