

will say: That makes no difference, you would have got your binders from the other side anyhow. Had we done so, where would our money have gone? Where would our people have been employed? Where would the money have gone that those people got for their labour? It would have been in the United States instead of being in our banks, which are sending it to that country and lending it at 7 per cent. There is not one of the western states where money can be procured as cheaply as it can be in Manitoba for any legitimate business. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat spoke of the low price of wheat. Well, I do not think that the National Policy has anything to do with the price of wheat in Canada, and if the hon. gentleman knows anything at all about the matter, he must know that the price of wheat was never, in the history of the world, so low as it is to-day. There are 105,000,000 bushels visible in the market. The like was never known before, and that is the cause of the low price of grain, and not the National Policy or the Conservative or any other government. I am very much surprised to see an hon. gentleman using that kind of argument. Senator Boulton has said, according to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that wheat sells at 30 cents a bushel in Manitoba. It must have been frozen wheat. The price of wheat in Manitoba has been undoubtedly low, but the present price is 48 to 56 cents, and the price is governed by the Liverpool market and not by the rates in any other part of Canada. The Liverpool market controls the price, and not the Conservative party or the Liberal party or any other party. So far as I am concerned, I am not like the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin). I am not going to support that amendment. Why should I support it? Why should I support those people (the Opposition)? What did they do when in power? They said we were a sink hole and many other things I would not like to repeat. What railway did they ever build for us? Did they open up the country or make any preparation to open it up? According to the policy of our opponents, the people would never be able to get there, and those who were in would never be able to get out, and we would not have 14,000,000 bushels of wheat for export to-day. If I might be permitted to give those gentlemen advice, I would say to them: admit that the policy you have enunciated is wrong, admit that we have outstripped your expectations, admit that ours is a greater country than you thought, and that you made a mistake about that railroad, and promise to build another railroad. If you would talk like that, you would not have solid Conservative ranks from that country facing you to-day, but would have some support. Apparently, however, you have no faith in your country. I do not know why you should not have faith in it. Where is the place on the face of the

Mr. Boyd

earth to-day where the people are better off than in Canada? Name the place. Is it England, with 250,000 people in the city of London alone starving, and with dock labourers working for \$2.88 a week, and only half of them able to get labour at that rate? You talk about our people, where can you find the people on the face of the earth happier and more prosperous than the people of Canada to-day? Travel from Halifax to British Columbia, as I have done, and where will you find beggars and paupers? I have been in all the large cities in the United States from California back to Minneapolis, and have never been in any city where I have not met beggars seeking alms, and I have yet to meet the man in Manitoba or British Columbia who has ever asked me for a cent. I do not think I will take up any more of the time of the House. I may say that I will support the motion of the Government. I intend to support the hon. Finance Minister, who has promised us that the tariff shall be revised in such a way as will suit the whole Dominion of Canada and be in the best interests of the country. We stood by the Conservative party and the National Policy when probably we might have done better, but the people of eastern Canada built a railroad into our country for us. They opened up the country, and if it had not been for the Conservative party I would not have gone there and would not be here to-day, nor would my friend the hon. Minister of the Interior. Manitoba is willing and ready to pay her share of the taxation of the country, as she has always done, and show her gratitude to the party which has done so much for her. I thank you, Sir, and the House for your kind indulgence and patience in listening to these few remarks.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. leader of the Opposition has called attention to the fact that the papers in the Manitoba School question have not been printed. I understand that the papers which are material are those I now move:

That the return to the Address of the House of Commons, laid on the Table on the 10th instant, containing a copy of the report of the Committee of the Privy Council to His Excellency the Governor-General, on the 9th September, 1892, on the Manitoba School Act, be printed forthwith, and that Rule No. 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. LAURIER. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman had moved for the printing of the papers. However, there has been some misunderstanding as to that, and I agree very willingly to his motion. These papers are not all that should be brought down, but in my judgment they are quite sufficient for the purpose of the discussion which will take place on this matter. I apprehend that they contain the report of