

Why, if the dignity of Parliament would be offended by publishing a plain statement of the terms made, surely that dignity was hurt by the partial statements from time to time. I do not think the position taken by the leader of the Government with regard to this matter will meet with the approval of the people of the country; nor do I think it will satisfy the people that they have not been unfairly dealt with. I merely wish to join in the protest against the manner in which the public have been treated in this respect, and against our treatment in being compelled to come here without having been afforded the slightest opportunity of consulting with those whose opinions we are bound to respect. There would be no objection to the passing of this address immediately but that there is much in it apparently introduced to provoke discussion, and for the purpose of placing this side of the House in a false position before the country. I remember well, some years ago, what a desperate opposition was made to the passing of the Address by the present Minister of Railways, because the Address was not perfectly colorless. The Premier of that day, the member for Lambton, assured the hon. gentleman he had done all in his power to avoid giving cause for the slightest opposition to the Address. But that did not satisfy the hon. gentleman, who insisted that there were words offensive to him and those acting with him, and he stated that unless they were expunged, he would insist on discussing all the questions mentioned in the Address at full length. The late Premier replied in effect, "we have no intention of protracting the discussion on the Address. A general discussion of public affairs on occasions of this kind has fallen into disuse, and if there is now any real objection to certain expressions, I have no objection to strike them out,"—and he did strike out some words, substituting others for them. I think it would not be too much to ask the right hon. gentleman to confer with the leaders on this side with regard to some very objectionable passages in this Address, that it may pass without further discussion. We have no desire on this side to occupy time unnecessarily; no disposition to discuss questions at improper times, or under improper circumstances. But so much has been done by the Government to provoke discussion, and the circumstances under which we were called together are so peculiar, that it was absolutely necessary to say all that has been said on this side. I think we can claim from the House and the country, and that the people will accord us, entire credit for the most extraordinary moderation in allowing the Address to pass under the circumstances. I, therefore, propose that hon. gentlemen on the other side consent that the words to which we object may be struck out, or altered, so that the Address may be as colorless as an Address ought to be, if we are to act on the principle that on the Address there should be no protracted discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman asked that the Address be read clause by clause. Let that be done, and if any objections made by hon. gentlemen opposite be reasonable, we will try to meet their views.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not rise to impede the passage of the Resolutions. The First Minister in his speech, deprecated the discussion of specific propositions on occasions of this kind. I feel called upon, however, to answer one specific proposition advanced by the hon. gentleman who moved the Address. In the course of his admirable maiden speech, he told the House that the National Policy did not injure the farmer; that in consequence of it, his barley, oats and other cereals bore a higher price. I wish to take issue on that assertion—to assert that, on the contrary, the National Policy has had no effect whatever on the price of cereals, with the exception, perhaps, of Indian corn, and to say that, in my opinion, it is time that that well-worn humbug by which the farmers of the Dominion were deceived in 1878 was disposed of in the discussion of this question before the House and

country. I wish to adduce some facts that may effectually dispose of that assertion to-night. On turning to the market quotations of the day, for Canada and the United States, I find they refute that assertion most effectually. Yesterday No. 2 wheat in Toronto was quoted at \$1.14 and in Oswego, at \$1.22 to \$1.24. The hon. member for West Toronto asserted that the duty of 15 cents is necessary to prevent the importation of wheat from a market where it costs \$1.24 to where it would be sold at \$1.14, a loss of 10 cents in addition to the freight. These two quotations show the preposterousness of the assertion that a duty is necessary to keep American wheat from the Canadian market. The price of wheat in Canada and the United States is regulated by the common markets of the world; these productions seek markets in Europe, where the prices received regulate the prices paid in this country and the United States. I find that the quotation of oats in Toronto is 34 cents a bushel of 34 lbs., the price in Chicago being 32½ cents for 32 lbs.; oats in Chicago are therefore worth half a cent per bushel of 34 lbs. more than in Toronto. Will the hon. gentleman tell the farmers of the Dominion that a duty of 10 cents a bushel is necessary to prevent the importation of oats from Chicago under those circumstances. The market quotation of oats in New York is 46½ cents a bushel, or 12½ cents more than in Toronto; that is a much larger sum than the cost of carriage between those points. These figures cannot but demonstrate the utter absurdity of the position taken by the hon. gentleman in asserting that cereals are higher here in consequence of the N. P. At present, I find, Sir, that the quotations of rye are, in the city of Toronto, 58 cents; in Chicago, 87 cents; and in Oswego, 95 cents. Does the hon. gentleman wish the verdant farmers of this Dominion to believe that a duty of ten cents on rye is necessary to keep out 95 cent rye from a market where it would have to be sold at 88 cents. The price of barley is in Toronto 97 cents for No. 1, and 93 cents for No. 2; in Oswego, \$1.25 for No. 1, and \$1.20 for No. 2; or 28 cents for No. 1, and 27 cents for No. 2, higher in Oswego than in Toronto. Does the hon. gentleman wish the country to believe that a duty of 15 cents a bushel is necessary to keep Oswego barley out of our market. These are the absurd propositions made by the hon. gentleman when he stands before the House and country, and gravely gives utterance to the assertion that the National Policy has raised the price of barley, oats, peas and other cereals. I find also that the price of peas in Toronto is from 68 to 70 cents, in New York 87 cents in bond, to which must be added the duty when the consumer takes it out of bond; and are we to be told it is necessary to impose a duty of 10 cents to keep out American peas from our market when they can be sold at a higher rate on their own market. I find that butter is worth in New-York, common to choice, 19 to 36 cents, and the same grades in Montreal 14 to 27 cents. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that a duty of four cents per pound has any influence on the market for butter in Canada. Cheese in New York of the best grade is worth 12½ cents, and in Montreal, same quality, the same price. The prices of cheese in both markets are regulated by the Liverpool market. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that a duty of 3 cents per pound on American cheese has any effect on the market quotations provided that the prices are regulated by the common market of the world. The farmers of this Dominion are beginning to thoroughly understand that the promises made to them, in order to induce them to consent to taxation, intended to swell largely the profits of rings who wish to charge enhanced prices for their own benefit, cannot be carried out because they were fallacious in their nature. I do not wish to enter into any lengthy discussion on this question. I took occasion, last session, to make a lengthy comparison of the prices at different periods both before and after the adoption of the National Policy, and I shall probably during the course of this session go more fully into the ques-