

plus to export, the prices of which must necessarily be regulated by the prices in the markets to which we send our surplus of these articles. Where do we get the increased price? The Minister of Finance told us that circumstances may arise which would lead to an enhancement of the price of Canadian wheat and flour in the Canadian market. Either we may have a short crop, or what is more likely to be the case, we may have shipped at a particular season of the year so much that what is left will be insufficient for the needs of the people; and when we reach that point he admits that the price will go up, perhaps as much as the equivalent to the duty. He admits that, although the increase will be confined to a particular season in the whole year it will amount to ten cents a barrel on all the flour used in Canada during the year. Now, that is a considerable tax, it means a large sum of money in the year on all the flour used in Canada. But he says this increased price goes into the pockets of the farmers. Does that hon. gentleman know so little of the course of trade in this country and all other countries as not to be aware that by the time that state of things comes to pass in any year nearly all the grain is out of the hands of the farmers? Do the farmers of Ontario hold their wheat on speculation until the next spring? I think not. So far as my enquiries have gone the farmers sell nearly all their wheat within a few months, as fast indeed as they can thresh it. There is another point the force of which will be perceived by any man acquainted with the course of trade. If any considerable quantity of grain remains in the hands of the farmers, the price will not advance. But it is not the farmers who receive the benefit of any such advance as that. In the Maritime Provinces the people have to pay an enhanced price for their food, but that enhanced price does not accrue to the profit of the farmer but to the profit of the trader and the speculator, who are of the class of men particularly favored by the present Tory Administration. Now, what else? He says there is more demand for rye, as distillers now use it more largely. He does not say they pay a higher price for the rye. He does not pretend to say that they absorb all the rye of the country, which would be the case if the Tariff had added to its value; but can any man in his senses imagine that it is of the slightest moment to a farmer whether he sells his rye to a man who distills whiskey in Toronto or elsewhere, or to a man who intends to export it if the price be the same. Where is the benefit of the home market in that case? Did not the Minister in making such a statement attempt to cajole and deceive the people, whom to-day the Minister of Railways described as the intelligent and independent farmers of Canada? Does he suppose that the intelligent and independent farmers of Canada are to be misled by such sophistries and fallacies as have been propounded to them by hon. gentlemen opposite? It is true that some of them were deceived once and misled by men whom they had never trusted before, by men in whom they had no confidence when they voted for them. They said, we will try what will be the results of a change; we cannot be much worse. They made the trial very much in the same way that a sick person, who has been told by his physician that he will recover, but that his recovery will be slow, tries a quack, in whom he has no confidence even when he tries him. Some of the people in the country tried hon. gentlemen opposite whom I have no idea of insulting when I call them quacks—I mean that they are political quacks—charlatans of the worst description—but they will never trust them again as they never trusted them before. Farmers as a class are intelligent and sensible men. They never trusted in the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the man who has been fooled once and knows it is not likely to be fooled again. The Minister of Railways, as well as the Minister of Finance, says: "We

Mr. ANGLIN.

have not only imported a larger quantity of foreign wool, but the exportation of Canadian wool has been reduced by over 1,000,000 lbs.—just see what a large home market we are creating." But the farmers suffer if they are only getting half the price for wool that they got before, while the prices of sugar, woollen and cotton cloth, and many other articles are higher than they were before. If the National Policy regulates the price of these articles and makes them higher, why does it not give the farmers a higher price for their wool? Men do not go on producing any article which they find it unprofitable to produce; and although wool may be profitable at 40 cents a pound, it may be a losing business to grow it at 20 cents a pound. If these hon. gentlemen had the interest of the farmers so deeply at heart, why did they not put a duty on wool? Why did they leave it on the free list the first year, and last year, when they found it necessary to please or to delude the farmers a little, impose a duty on the wool we do not use in the country, and put no duty on the wool we import? The wool used by the manufacturers comes in free. They are not bound by any provision of this National Policy—they are not forced to use the wool produced by the people of Canada. We were told, when that objection was first taken to the Tariff, that the farmers would have their home market, and the price would be kept up, so that they would have no need of any protection. Duties are imposed on wheat, barley, rye, and other things which are not imported at all. Hides come in in large quantities, and why are hides not taxed? Forty or fifty per cent. on hides would add very materially to the value of every hoof on a farm in this country. But that would not do; the farmers are to be humbugged and cajoled, but the farmers are not to be protected. Cheese sells very well now, but since the National Policy went into operation the best cheese could be bought at five or six cents per pound; for a whole season it was a drug in the market.

Mr. BOWELL. This year?

Mr. ANGLIN. No, I did not say this year, I said since the National Policy came into operation.

Mr. BOWELL. What year?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In 1879.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In 1850.

Mr. ANGLIN. I say that since the National Policy came into operation it was a drug in the market. The National Policy did nothing for cheese, it left the duty where it was before. I do not know that it could do anything for cheese, but hon. gentlemen might have tried to do something. The omnipotent National Policy they say can do anything. Talk of asking for bread and getting a stone; it can convert the stone into bread. The limits of the power of the National Policy are inconceivable and incalculable. It extends beyond space, it controls the heavens. The dew that falls from heaven falls as the National Policy directs; the rain drops as the National Policy directs; the sun shines as the National Policy directs, and what the fields yield the National Policy controls and directs. Why, then, should it not control the cheese market and give farmers a good price for their cheese? Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell us seriously that in regard to a single article the farmers of this country get a cent more than they would have received if the National Policy had never been heard of: got more even for their cabbages, their turnips, their poultry, their lambs and their veal as the Finance Minister asserts? Now, Sir, we say that the National Policy, instead of being a benefit to the people of this country as a whole, or to any large class of the people, is the greatest curse that could befall them. Look through the whole country, and find if you can, what industry is benefitted by it. They say our anticipations have been falsified; that our calculations all failed. We