DECLINE IN THE OATMEAL TRADE.

The duty upon oats has been injurious to our oatmeal trade. Before the N.P. came into force, American oats were imported for our oatmeal mills, and the export trade in meal was large. Since the N.P. the export trade has largely fallen off. In the year ending June 30th, 1878, we exported 174,511 barrels; in 1881, only 53,825 barrels; and for the six months ending December 31st, 1881, only 24,435 barrels. This indicates a serious loss of trade, and, while the miller has been injured, no one has been benefitted.

THE BARLEY DUTY ABSURD.

It is surprising that a single Canadian farmer should ever have been deceived by the allegation that a duty upon barley could confer any benefit upon him. The price of barley is uniformly higher in the American markets than in Canada, as an examination of the market reports at any time will show. If we compare Toronto and Oswego quotations for the third Wednesday of September, October, November and December, which covers the shipping season for barley, we will find the following average for the last six years.

Average market quotations for barley from 1876 to 1881:

	Oswego.	Toronto.
1876	1.08¾	81
1877	88¼	66¾
1878	1.22½	1.01¼
1879	84¼	70
1880	1.00	84½
1881	1.07½	91½

THE RICE OF RYE

If we compare the price of rye in Toronto and Chicago on the third Wednesday in September, October, November and December of each year since 1876 we shall find the average price for each year as follows:

	Chicago.	Toronto.
1876	64½	60½
1877	53¼	60¾
1878	46½	53¼
1879	66⅓	67⅔
1880	85½	83¾
1881	1.03¾	91

THE PRICE OF PEAS.

Peas are also uniformly higher in the United States than in Canada to the extent of the freight and the American duty.

From all the information contained in the foregoing tables it is evident that the price of grain is not higher in the Canadian market as compared with the American market since the N. P. that it was before, and the statement that grain duties cannot benefit the Canadian farmer in the case of any grain of which we raise a surplus for export will in every case hold good.

The farmer has been subjected to heavier duties and increased taxation under the N. P., and the promise that he should be compensated by a home market, and higher prices for his productions has not been kept. Our agricultural exports are steadily increasing, and there is no inducement to import American grain for consumption except under exceptional circumstances, as it is higher in that country than in our own. In short, the farmer, the lumberer and the laborer have been injured by the increase of duties above the rates imposed by the last tariff, and very few men comparatively have been benefitted.

WERE INCREASED DUTIES REQUIRED FOR REVENUE?

It was asserted by Sir Charles Tupper during the session of 1882 that in 1879 there was no choice between adopting the National Policy and resorting to direct taxation. Such was not the case. The difficulty under which we labored was temporary, and was sure to disappear with the return of better times. An increase of $2,225,000 in the Customs over 1878 would provide for the deficit of that year and an increase of $1,100,000 in the expenditures, which would have been ample to cover all necessary increase under an economical Government. This would have been an increase of 18 per cent. During the period from 1878 to 1881 the revenues of the United States rose from $130,000,000 to $198,000,000, without any change of tariff, equal to 52 per cent.