

was, according to his view, true. Freedom of trade would endanger the fate of the aristocracy. At the time of the discussion of the corn laws the rental of land was \$12 per acre; but the price of rental has been reduced until, after forty years of free trade, it is \$6 or thereabouts; and this condition of things will go on. The price of land will continue to decline until it has reached its normal standard, just as in this country and in the United States, if we had freedom of trade, the price of land would increase to its normal standard, because in land as in everything else there is a normal standard which can be moved up or down by artificial causes for the benefit of a privileged class; but so soon as these obstacles are removed the price will reach its normal standard, its own level, and its level is and always must be based on the relative profit that can be obtained by those who till the soil, and that is the only standard. I may remind the House of this, that when the National Policy was introduced in Parliament a mighty attempt was made to capture the farmers. It was represented to the farmers that they would be greatly benefited if such a policy were adopted. Of course the National Policy must increase the taxation of the farmers; but it was represented to them that they must submit to the increased taxation, because the higher duties would be the means of establishing in this country manufacturing industries which would afford a home market and increase prices for their products. Let me quote here a speech delivered by Sir John A. Macdonald, which was the text-book at that time of his party. Addressing a meeting of farmers at Bury, he said:

I tell the manufacturer unless he gives protection to the farmer, the farmer will not give protection to him. I say the same thing to the farmer. You must not grumble, if perhaps you have to pay a few cents more for anything we can produce in this country. You must not be hungering for strange markets to get goods at bankrupt, sacrifice prices. No; you must encourage manufactures at our own doors. Who are those artisans and skilled labourers to whom you must pay perhaps a few cents more for the produce of their lands? They are your brothers and sons, bone of your bone, flesh of your flesh, and in return for your giving only, perhaps, the real value to these men of their products, you have at home—at the next village—your reward, because you have purchasers for everything you can raise, not only for the larger crops, but for the egg that the hen drops, and the hen herself, God bless her.

How false this language sounds in view of actual facts? Where is the home market to-day? Where is the nearest village to which the farmer can take his eggs? Whether he takes his eggs to the nearest village or the nearest city he will be glad to get 10 cents a dozen for them, and he will not always be sure of getting that. The home market is a delusion which has long vanished into thin air; but what is not a delusion is the hard fact that remains to the farmer to-day, that though he has not a home market, though he cannot take his eggs to the next village, yet he has to pay a heavy tax on everything

he buys; a tax upon his clothing, a tax on his cottons, a tax on his woollens, a tax on the iron he uses, a tax upon the sugar he eats, for though the farmer and the consumer no longer pays a tax into the treasury on sugar he still continues to pay a tax for the benefit of the sugar refineries of Canada. But I will undoubtedly be told: Granted that the National Policy has not benefited the farmers, surely you will not deny that it has developed several industries. I am free to admit that the National Policy has developed a few industries into monopolies, into suckers which extort inordinate profits from the people of Canada; but I question very much whether the National Policy has benefited the great body of manufacturers, the smaller manufacturers and those who have invested a small amount of capital in their own business, because it is obvious that the moment an article is taxed for the benefit of one special manufacture that manufacturer is of course protected and benefited; but while one manufacturer may be so protected and benefited, two, five or ten manufacturers may be hampered by the tariff, because the articles produced by that one manufacturer may be the raw material of the two, five or ten others who have to use it and are hampered thereby. Take the iron duties. Everybody remembers the great flourish of trumpets with which Sir Charles Tupper introduced his policy with respect to pig iron, in 1887. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) a few days ago alluded to this subject, and I need not go over the same ground; but let me simply remark this: that at the time Sir Charles Tupper introduced his policy respecting pig iron, it was already protected by a duty of \$2 per ton and a bounty of \$1.50, and by his policy the bounty was increased after three years to \$2, and the duty was increased from that moment to \$4 per ton. So at that time we gave the producer in pig iron a bounty of \$2 per ton and a duty of \$4, and Sir Charles Tupper used—I believe my hon. friend quoted his language, but I will quote it again because these facts are instructive—these words:

Now, Sir, the result is that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity. I say, Sir, that if there is anything in the National Policy, if we have not been all wrong from the very start, if the history of Canada shows that this National Policy has achieved for Canada what we said it would achieve,—and I have given the most abundant and irrefragable evidence on that point,—if there is any question on which there ought not to be any doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman, it is that the application of the same sound policy which we have found so admirable and successful in relation to all other industries, will have the same result in regard to the great iron industry of this country.

Well, Sir, this language is simply ludicrous in the face of what followed afterwards—ludicrous is the word. I show to what extent a man of ability can go when he undertakes