

I suppose he took this idea from what the prophet of old saw after three years of drought. He goes on :

“That may not afford our hon. friends opposite as much pleasure as it does us, but it excites in some of us the hope that, before we are many years older, we may, by means of new political adjustments, find in the old country, for the products of our farms, a larger market than we have hitherto found. A very small difference of duty, a duty of 5 or 7 per cent. in the English market in favour of our wheat, and our barley, and our beef, and our mutton, and our poultry, and our eggs, and our lumber, would guarantee the very rapid building up of this country.”

Sir, he believes that the English people are going to come to the rescue of Canada, because Canada, under its own fiscal policy, has failed to extend its trade. But, Sir, do you believe that such an event will ever transpire in Britain? Does the hon. member believe for a moment that from that cloud will come a party actuated by the protective spirit of fossil Tories of fifty years ago, and roll back the wheels of British progress fifty years? No, Sir, rain will come from that cloud that will drown out every one of those protectionists, and the English free trade sky will be clear again, and a rainbow will appear which will indicate that no such fossil Tories will ever appear again. And what does that policy mean? Supposing that England adopted a policy giving a preference to colonial goods in the British market. It would mean an addition of £40,000,000 sterling to the price of the food supply of the English people, or \$200,000,000, \$5 for every man, woman and child in England, \$25 additional expenditure every year for each family in England. Sir, what would be the consequence? They say the English farmers would be benefited by an increased price of farm products, and if there were an increased price in England the colonies sending in their products would receive the same price in the English markets, and an increased price in the colonies means an increased price to every man, woman and child who consumes food in Great Britain. Sir, what would be the consequence if the English farmers were more prosperous than they are now? The landlords would raise the rents, the farm labourers would ask for additional wages. The labourers, mechanics and factory hands of England, on account of this additional expense of living, would demand from their employers additional wages, and the manufacturers would have to put on an increased price upon manufactured goods throughout England, and then that would handicap the manufacturers of England in the foreign markets in competition with the other nations of the world. Do you suppose that England would ever consent for a moment to consider a policy that, from first to last, would injure every class of the people, and not only injure the classes of people living in the country, but would injure to a great extent that renowned position which England occupies in the various markets of the world. But, Sir, that policy of Imperial federation is not entertained in England by the leading statesmen of that country. A few days ago a deputation from the Federation League called upon the Premier of England, Lord Salisbury, in reference to this policy, and he answered them in the following words:—

“The league, however, said the Premier, must work hard to convert their countrymen to the league's way of thinking, for it was impossible for England to give preferential treatment to the colonies at the expense of the rest of the world. The league must first ascertain how

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

far the country would support the policy of which, he imagined, a prominent feature was a preferential tax on grain, wool and meat. Englishmen, in his opinion, would never consent to legislation of a vague or indefinite kind, especially where their dearest daily interests were concerned.”

Still further, he says :

“The difficulties have been often stated, but I will just refer to them again. If you give preferential treatment to your colonies it must be, of course, as Sir John Macdonald said, that you tax the similar goods of the rest of the world. If you give a preferential treatment—that is, a better price—to your colonies, it must be a better price than that which, with unrestricted competition, is obtaining now. A better price to the producer means a more disagreeable price to the consumer.”

Sir, I do not see much hope for the hon. gentleman in the cloud, and if he puts his hope and his aspirations in a cloud that is rising over Britain, as a means of improving the prosperity of the people of this country, it is time that the party he is supporting on the Government benches should be placed on the Opposition side of the House, and allow abler and better men who can grasp the necessities of the country, to formulate a policy better calculated to further the interests and the prosperity and advantage of this great country. Now, I think I have demonstrated that the National Policy has not been successful in establishing a foreign trade, and I will next consider it from another standpoint. The question may be asked, why the Liberal party is opposed to the National Policy. Well, the first reason is the one I gave, namely, that the National Policy has not been successful in establishing a foreign trade; in the next place the National Policy has been a failure because it has not given to the farmers of this country what was promised them in 1878. The National Policy, it was promised, would benefit and foster the agricultural industries of this country. Now, I ask, in presence of facts and figures which cannot be disputed, if it has accomplished the ends which it had in view? Mr. Speaker, there are only three ways in which the agricultural interests of this country can be benefited. The first, if the fertility of the soil can be increased, the farmers of the country will be benefited, and I do not suppose the most ardent supporter of the National Policy will say that it has ever increased the fertility of the Canadian soil. The second way in which the farming industries will be benefited and fostered, is by giving the agriculturists a better price for what they produce. Now, has the National Policy given a better price for what they have produced?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend from West Assiniboia says “yes.” Now, I think I can prove in a very few moments, from facts and figures which cannot be disputed, that the prices given to the farmers since the National Policy was adopted have been far less than the prices they have obtained under the tariff of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I have gone to considerable trouble in getting figures upon this matter; I have examined files of the papers for the last fifteen years; and I have taken the same date, namely, the 5th day of March each year. I have examined files of the *Globe*, I have examined files of the *Mail*, I have examined files of the *Monetary Times*, so that I might have correct statements from the farmers' markets in the city of Toronto on the 5th of March of each of these