

gleaned, some from essays on political economy, some from newspapers, and some from my own thoughts; and before commencing my speech, I will read them:

"It is as much a law of our nature to exchange with one another those things we have to sell for those things we have to buy as it is to breathe. It was clearly the design of our Creator for the benefit of the race. Notice the different articles in a household which we cannot produce or sell, but can produce something else and purchase them. Society is one vast hive of buyers and sellers, every man carrying something to the market and bringing something away. Everybody exchanges. You do something for me, and I will do something for you. The farmer brings the fruits of the field; the mechanic brings his skilled labor; the laboring man brings his strong arm; the fisherman brings the various products of the sea; the school teacher brings his knowledge; the merchant, the physician, the lawyer, the clergyman, all exchange their abilities and skill for something that other men have to give them. It is impossible to divest ourselves of the fact that this desire to exchange is a universal law of our nature and of society, and any system which interferes with the fullest freedom of exchange is wrong. Freedom of exchange is as much a natural right as the right to think or breathe. Every man has a natural, self-evident right to put forth efforts for his own well-being; and whenever two men find that by exchanging efforts with each other they can add to their own happiness, they have an indisputable right to do so; and it is a high-handed infringement of natural rights when any authority interferes to restrict or prohibit the freedom of exchange, except that act is justified by solid proof that other private or public rights are infringed which are as well founded as the right of exchange. All the restrictive laws which have ever been made overlook entirely the mutual benefit to the parties of every act of exchange, without which benefit the exchange clearly would not take place at all."

These are words of wisdom; these are like apples of gold set in pictures of silver; these are principles which the National Policy controverts; these are the rights which the National Policy seeks to deprive the inhabitants of this Dominion of; these are the fundamental principles of political economy. Now, I always listen to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) with a great deal of interest. He is, evidently, an able man, and I listen to him with great pleasure for the ability he displays and the eloquence he possesses. We are never disappointed in a speech from the hon. gentleman. It is always well prepared and well delivered, but there is no man I have ever listened to who understands how to make error appear interesting any better than does the hon. member for Cardwell. Of course, that is not exactly the word or the phrase that I would prefer to use, but I have not the command of language sufficient to find any term to express my opinion of his speech better than that. In that speech he said:

"We have been enjoying for some time past the free traders' paradise—a cheap country to live in. The real trouble has been that articles have been too cheap, and that very thing which hon. gentlemen opposite have been arguing we should endeavor to bring about is the very thing which has produced the difficulty from which, to some extent, we have been suffering during the last twelve months. Go to a merchant and ask on what his hopes rest for a revival of business. He will tell you, in the fact that prices are beginning to stiffen, as he expresses it, and there are likely, therefore, to be better times."

I accept the paragraph in so far as the free trader's paradise is concerned. I know that this is not the best world of which we have any knowledge, but it is next to the best, and to be able to procure what we need to make life pleasant, adds much to make our journey through it agreeable. The desire to live in a cheap country and to have a cheap market is universal, and that sentiment marks the difference between the Government and their opponents. They believe in having a dear country to live in; we believe in having a cheap country to live in; they believe in high prices for the necessaries of life, and all we require; we believe in low prices. I am always happy when in an open, free market—I can get what I want at the lowest possible price, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite think the same way. Despite their professions they themselves have the same feeling, for it is a universal feeling. Nobody goes out to find where he can buy at the highest price; everybody wants to buy at the lowest price; but of course it makes greater difference to the poor man than to the rich, whether they can buy at the lowest price or at a higher price. I know how

much a dollar is worth; I am a workingman myself; I have earned my bread by my toil; I know what it is to earn a dollar in the woods, in the mill, with the spade and the shovel and the hoe, and when I have so earned a dollar I ought to have the right to spend it in the cheapest market, and the Government has no right to enact laws to make that market dear when it would otherwise be cheap. Another expression I have heard in this debate is "cheap and nasty." I believe the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, has the credit for that saying. I do not agree with him; I do not consider that anything nasty can be cheap. Everything nasty must be dear, and we ought not to have it at all. With regard to the Ministers, I tell you, Sir, those who are in Government employ, those who rule the country, do not know the value of a dollar. They get their dollars quite differently from those who toil for their livelihood, and those who toil are the great mass of the people, for whom these hon. gentlemen ought to legislate. They out to legislate so that the people may get as much as possible out of their earnings. Of course the hon. member for Cardwell does not know what it is to be poor, and I am not anxious that he should ever know it; it does not make much difference to him whether a barrel of flour costs \$5 or \$10, but it makes a great difference to the mass of the population. It is very important for the poor man who has earned \$5, whether he can get a barrel of flour or only half a barrel of flour for it, and many a time have I seen a poor man struggling to sustain his family, after he had accumulated sufficient to get a barrel of flour, express the wish, over and over again, that he had enough money to get a bag of meal as well, so as to stretch out the flour until he could earn enough to get another barrel. Of course I will be told this is mere sentiment; that I am only trying to curry favor with the poor. But, Sir, I do not want to curry favor with the poor or the rich; all I want is to express my sentiments here fully and freely, and I only wish I had more ability, more power, with which to urge the claims of the people. However, I do the best I can, and that is all any one can expect. With regard to purchasing in a cheap market, I have never been a Minister of the Crown, I have never been on a mission to England, but I venture to say that the very best apparel in the wardrobes of hon. gentlemen opposite have been purchased in England at the people's expense. I venture to say that the West of England broadcloth and everything else they wear, and they have the best, was bought when they were on the other side. There was nothing wrong in that; they were in a country where goods are cheap and where it is cheap to live; they found cheap goods and purchased them; they arrayed themselves in purple and fine linen at cheap rates and brought them home. There was nothing wrong in that, but if any one of these hon. gentlemen forgot to open his trunk on his way back, and let the Custom house officer examine it, that would be rather nasty. I do not know whether any one of them did forget or not, but if he did it would be a nasty matter. Of course, in this country, there are not many people who are very poor, and for them there are fortunately institutions of benevolence where their wants can be supplied. This idea of a dear country being a good country for any body to live in is a mistake; and it is now re-acting. Dear coal means less coal, and less coal means want, and cold, and suffering. Dear bread means less bread, and it means hunger for a great many when it is dear, and want and suffering. Dear clothes means less clothes for the poor, and in some cases it means rags. And dear blankets means less blankets and suffering to be endured by the poor in consequence of the high price of blankets. I remember reading a little story in some book, of a poor woman with a large family, who was in very destitute circumstances. She got her little ones ready for bed at night, and had very little to keep them warm. It was a cold night, and she piled over them some