

sured them that while it was true their products had fallen in value, the purchasing power of such as they had to sell was as great as ever it was. They said the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat, then worth 60 cents, was as great as it was in the period from 1871 to 1881, when it was worth 90 cents per bushel. According to this argument, then, 60 cents in money in 1894 was worth as much as 90 cents in 1881, and, I suppose, still more in 1878. If 60 cents to-day has a purchasing power equal to 90 cents in 1878, then it puts us face to face with a very curious problem in finance.

It takes 37½ millions to govern this country now; if what they say is true, then 37½ million dollars to-day will go as far as 56½ millions in 1878. What a tribute this is to the skill of the hon. member for South Oxford and the Government of which he was a member, who, in that year, governed the country for ten million dollars less than one-half this amount.

Will 60 cents to-day go as far as 90 cents in 1879? Will it go as far as 90 cents in the farmer's payment on his mortgage, or on his land, or his interest, or on his taxes, or on any other debt? Then, there is another thing that must be remembered, the farmer's crop is not all his to spend. There is a lien upon it for seed, for rent, for interest, for the cost of production. He must first set aside a sufficient sum to meet these charges, and the balance only is his to spend.

Hon gentlemen are fond of quoting Mr. Blue. Mr. Blue says that he has ascertained that the cost of producing an acre of wheat is \$14; the average price of wheat was 90 cents per bushel, the crop 20 bushels an acre. At 90 cents per bushel, this would be \$18 as the value of the crop of each acre of wheat. The difference between the value and the cost of production would leave in the farmer's hands \$4 on each acre for him to spend. But the price of wheat last year was only 60 cents per bushel, that is the price received by the farmers of this country. The cost of production may have been a little less, let us say \$13 per acre. Now, 20 bushels of wheat at 60 cents yields \$12 per acre; so that if the unhappy farmer had to pay the cost of production in cash, if he did none of the work himself, he would be producing his wheat at a dead loss of \$1 per acre.

It is well known to the farmers themselves that it is only by incessant labour that they have been able for some time past to escape the hands of the sheriff, that constant toil, day after day, yields them the necessaries of life and little else.

But while the Government has done nothing for our miners, our fishermen, our lumbermen or our farmers, they have done much for the manufacturers. They have forced all the rest of the community for sixteen years past to pay a heavy tribute to this favoured class. For sixteen years they have

been fed on the pap of protection, and by this time should have attained a lusty growth which would cause us to feel proud of the manufacturers of our country. By this time, after sixteen years of protection, they ought to cut some figure, surely, in the export of our country. Let us see what the exports are. I find that we exported last year, manufactured goods to the value of seven and three quarters million dollars. But of this I find that one million is put down for household effects of the people leaving the country, reducing the export of manufactured goods to 6¼ million dollars.

The Year-Book for 1893, informs me that protection was of no benefit at all to the tanners of this country, that apparently it has paralyzed that industry. It tells me that there were 1,012 tanneries in 1881, against 802 in 1891; that the output had fallen from \$15,000,000 in 1881, to \$11,000,000 in 1891. But the tanners last year exported a million and a half dollars worth of sole and upper leather. Wood manufacturers, who, surely, do not owe their existence to the fostering care of the tariff of protection, exported ¾ of a million dollars' worth, and we exported half a million dollars' worth of wood pulp; so we will have to write off a million dollars for household goods, and 2¼ million dollars for manufactures that were not aided by protection, and that leaves four million dollars as the contribution of the protected manufacturers of all Canada to the exports of the country. Even these four millions include some manufactures which I cannot see are the result of protection. I find they include jewellers' sweepings, gypsum, lime, brick, building stone, grindstones, ice and rags. Rags alone, of the whole list might fairly be called a product of protection.

But among the most curious features is the effect of the tariff on our trade with England. Hon. gentlemen have become somewhat famous for their loud declarations of loyalty. I have little faith in the man who is for ever proclaiming as to what an honest man he is. So soon as he informs me in unctuous language of his honesty, a cold distrust of the man grows up within me, and my respect, faith and belief in the loyalty of the man is not increased by his constant declarations. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite are treating the country with loud and oft repeated assurances of their unflinching loyalty to the old flag and their great devotion to the mother country, and that they are ready to follow the lead of the motherland. But, while professing loyalty, those hon. gentlemen have been, I cannot but think deliberately taxing the goods which we import from Great Britain more heavily than they do the goods imported from the United States. Their own Trade and Navigation Returns reveal the fact beyond all question.

If hon. gentlemen will turn up the returns, they will find that they took \$8,245,845 in duty on goods of the value