1666

gentleman (Mr. Laurier) declared for "free trade as they have it in England." If that is not the policy of the Liberal party, then what was the meaning of half the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Davies)? He devoted half his time to showing, that things are in a very prosperous condition in England. Well, there was no necessity to do that, if the Liberals are not going to give us free trade as it is in England. Again he says: Although that is not our policy, we are going to aim at it, and the great principles that underlie free trade as it is in England, are the Well, Sir, it rather principles we go by. struck me as if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) denied that the Liberals wanted free trade as it is in England, and then felt uneasy lest the people were convinced that that was exactly what they wanted, and so he went on to prove that it would be a very good What else was the signifithing indeed. cance of all which he read out of that little red book? He told us of falls in values, but we all knew about that. He told us that wages had risen comparatively, because the purchasing power of money was greater; or in other words, he told us that the price of labour had not fallen with the same rapidity as the price of commodities. Well. Sir, we all knew that, and we all knew further that the very same thing has happened in Canada, and that the value of commodities in this country have decreased in greater ratio than has that of labour. The hon. gentleman described his chief as "having spoken with a wealth of argument and profusion of illustration rarely equalled." Well, Sir, I have heard the hon. mem-ber for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) frequently. I have heard him in and out of this House, and all I can say is this : that the only way in which during this debate he varied from his past, was in being more verbose (and I was astonished to find that was possible) more flatulent, more reckless in assertion, more careless of his facts, and altogether weaker than I have ever known him to be for many a year. Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in an ex-cited strain tells us "that there was a wealth of argument and a profussion of illustration that was utterly astonishing" in the speech of his leader (Sir Richard Cartwright). The wealth of argument consisted in giving us two long speeches in which he raised one question after another that had no bearing whatever on the issue before the House, and then leaving the actual issue undiscussed. He told us, in defiance of all statistics prepared even by Reformers, that real estate was reduced in value, and left the subject without an attempt at proof. What, however, has that to do with the tariff? During the course of his two long speeches, he never discussed with any illumination nor with any care the changes made in the tariff, and he utterly failed to grapple with the speech of the Finance Minister. Then, imispeech of the Finance Minister. Then, imi-tating the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard is about as follows :--Gray cottons, 35 per 53

Cartwright) my hon, friend (Mr. Davies) brought forward an illustration about cotton. He told us that year after year, England exported large quantities of cotton than ever before and at lower prices. That we did not need to be told, for every one with any knowledge of contemporary or past history, knows it. Although he was in the House at the time, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) might have known that when parties were on different sides of this House, when steel rails were higher by a vast percentage than they are now, and higher by a vast percentage than when the Reform party went out of power; the hon. gentleman might have known that in a falling market, with scandalous want of prudence, if not scandalous corruption, the Reform party went on buying steel rails. The hon. gentleman said that Canada was deprived of buying these cheap cottons because of the tariff. Well, strange it is, that Canada buys cottons and buys them to a very great extent, giving a large and handsome revenue to the treasury because of the amount she buys. If the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in that respect has any significance at all, it would be in the inference from it, that the prices of cotton had remained the same in Canada as they were some years ago. But let me read the prices in Canada. In 1878, gray cotton sold at 7¹/₈ cents per yard; in 1885, at 4³/₄ cents per yard, and in April 1895, at 4¹/₄ cents per yard. So on with the various grades. Cotton at 7³/₄ cents per yard in 1878 April, 1895; cot-1878 fell to 5½ April, 1895; cotton fell to 5 cents in at 8¼ cents in ton yard in cents per yard in April. 1895; cotton at 9% cents per yard fell to 6¼ cents in April 1895; cotton sold at 9% cents in 1878, sold for 6% cents in April 1895; cotton sold at 11¼ cents in 1878, sold for 7½ cents in 1895. White sheeting which sold for 25¹/₂ cents in 1878, sold for 161/2 cents in 1895. Canton flannels which sold for 10½ cents in 1878, sold for 8 cents in 1895 ; what cost 11½ cents in 1878, fell to 8¼ cents in 1895 ; what cost 12 cents in 1878. cost only 9 cents in 1895; what cost 14 cents in 1878, fell to 10½ cents in 1895; and what cost 17 cents in 1878 cost only 121/4 cents in 1895. The prices of cotton bags fell in the same way; what cost \$24.50 in 1878 fell to \$18 in 1895; what cost \$22.50 in 1878 fell to \$14.75 in 1895. Cotton yarns, whites, fell from 23½ cents per pound to 12 cents per pound; and cotton yarns, coloured, fell from 33½ cents per pound to 22 cents per pound. Bleached shirtings fell from 63/4 cents to 5 cents; from $7\frac{3}{4}$ cents to $6\frac{1}{4}$ cents ; from $9\frac{1}{5}$ cents to $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents ; from $9\frac{1}{4}$ cents to $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents ; from $10\frac{3}{4}$ cents to $8\frac{1}{4}$ cents ; from $12\frac{1}{4}$ cents to 91/4 cents; and so on. Denims. tickings, and ginghams fell in the same ratio; cheese cloth, apron checks and bleached sheeting in about the same ratio. The