

country to live in, and he said he was reading about a poor little child whose mother had covered it over, and then put a door or a board upon it to keep it warm. I have reason to believe that that case occurred when the Grit Government was in power, and not since this National Policy came into effect, because we now find that these girls can earn blankets to keep themselves warm. Before 1879 42 cents per pound was the price of the blankets, but since that time, since these establishments were started at Weston, they are selling at 27 cents per pound, or little more than half the price they were when hon. gentlemen were in power. Still, because farmers are only getting 2 cents per pound less for their wool, and are getting their cloth 25 cents a yard cheaper, they are finding fault. Why are they getting their cloth cheaper? Because there are more manufacturers, and the competition of the manufacturers brings the price down. When I hear hon. gentlemen making statements like these in this House, I look upon their statements with suspicion. The other night one hon. gentleman was hunting in London for an oil cloth factory which was in Kingston, and because he did not find it in London, when it was in Kingston, he found fault with the policy and said that the Blue Book could not be depended upon. I have no doubt he gets most of his facts 300 or 400 miles from where they are. That is all I have to say on this question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I judge that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle) is somewhat at variance with hon. gentlemen opposite, sitting on the front benches, with reference to placing rags on the free list. I infer that he considers a shoddy blanket at 27 cents a pound better value than a good all-wool blanket at 45 cents a pound, and that he considers that the country will suffer a serious loss if the policy of admitting rags free of duty is not persevered in. I rose, however, to say a few words with regard to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He gravely informed us, and in doing so he took a position directly at issue with the position of his leaders some years ago—he informed us that common sense taught us that Governments could do nothing to affect the price of grain, or produce, or the condition of trade in the country. Now, we have an explicit declaration on the part of the leaders of the party now in power, in the elections of 1878, that the Government could affect the prosperity of the country, that the Government could affect prices. The farmers were assured that the duty on grain would result in enhancing the price of grain; the Government assured them that they would have a home market as the result of this policy; they assured them that the prices they were receiving for the various productions of the soil were to be largely increased, in consequence of the adoption of this policy. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1878, stated:

"Hon. gentlemen ought to know that if Governments are good for anything they are good to increase the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament, and to meet the difficulties in which the country may be placed by legislative interference."

That was a declaration made in 1878, and the same gentleman declared that it was possible that the taxation of the country could be so arranged as to increase the prosperity of the country to an extent sufficient to give the people the funds necessary to pay the taxation, by arranging the taxation drawn from their pockets.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him. I was not speaking of the prices of grain generally, or the prices of agricultural products generally, but of the price of wheat alone, and the price of wool alone—two very different things.

Mr. CHARLTON. He asserted that the tariff had been instrumental in increasing the price of wheat, and I infer from his remarks that he considers that at the present moment wheat is higher in Canada in consequence of the
Mr. WIGLE.

duty than it would be without it. I turn to the market reports of yesterday, and I venture to say the story they tell will be told by the market reports of any day since 1879, when the tariff went into operation. What do the market reports show with regard to wheat? They show that yesterday No. 1 spring wheat was worth 92 cents in Buffalo, the corresponding market to Toronto, while it was worth 83 cents in Toronto, 9 cents less than in Buffalo; and they show that No. 2 spring wheat was worth 84 cents upon call in Chicago, 1 cent higher than in Toronto, although Chicago is hundreds of miles farther west. That is the story the market quotations to-day tell with regard to the price of wheat, and that is the story they will tell for any day in the last four or five years—that the National Policy has had no effect whatever on the price of wheat, which has been relatively lower in Canada than in the corresponding markets of the United States, during the time that policy has been in operation. We find that yesterday oats sold for 36 cents for 34 pounds in Toronto, and for 35 cents for 32 pounds in Buffalo, or 1 cent a bushel higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. No. 2 barley was 67 cents in Toronto and 87 cents in Oswego, or 20 cents higher immediately across the lake. Yet the hon. gentleman promised that the duty of 15 cents a bushel on barley would make it 15 cents a bushel dearer in Canada than in the United States. If the duty was not imposed in order that the price the Canadian farmer was to receive for his barley should be increased by the extent of the duty, why was it imposed? If the duty is useless and absurd, as every one of the grain duties is, except that on corn, why put it there, as a false promise, a delusive light to the farmer, to persuade him that he is to receive some advantage from this policy of humbug?

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has just repeated the statement to-night that he made some time before. The hon. gentleman states that to-day in Chicago No. 1 spring wheat is quoted at 84 cents. Well, I hold in my hand the *Mail* of to-day, which has the following:—

"Chicago, March 26.—Wheat opened at 76½, closed at 77½; the highest price, 77¾.

And yet the hon. gentleman has the effrontery to get up in this House and quote the price at 84 cents. What does he do? He takes the quotation of wheat in Chicago for next June, and he tells us that is the price in Chicago, and then compares the June price in Chicago with the Toronto price to-day in order to mislead this House. If that is not a specimen of political dishonesty I do not know what is. He tells us, further, that this policy is a fraud and a delusion to the farmers, and that the farmers have never received any benefit from the duty. Well, Sir, we know that large quantities of flour have been brought into this country during the last year, a larger quantity than I would like to say; but what does that prove? It proves that American flour has been selling at a lower figure in the Lower Provinces. When Ontario millers want to sell flour to the dealers in the Province of Quebec they tell us: We can buy American flour cheaper than yours. If that duty was not on flour, we would have to sell our flour 50 cents per barrel cheaper, which amounts to 11 cents a bushel on wheat; so that the farmers received at least an advantage of 11 cents a bushel from this policy. Now, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen) told us, that, from his experience, the price of wool was lower to-day than it was during the time the Mackenzie Government was in power. There is a difference, but very little. South Down wool will sell to-day at from 27 to 28 cents a pound; Cotswold wool and other coarser wools are somewhat cheaper. These hon. gentlemen tell us that during the time the Mackenzie Government was in power these wools were very much higher in price, but they do not tell the reason they have gone down in price. The