

crop in that country; the frost last year killed the wheat. In the next place, that country depends mostly on the corn crop, more especially in Kent and Essex, and the early frost killed the corn, the first time in 60 years, and the result was that we did not have corn to fatten hogs, and that is the reason why times were hard there. When corn is killed, that touches the farmer, and as the farmer is the man who buys these waggons, you now have the reason why that factory closed down. We all know that we are in a depressed state at the present time, but we all know this: that we will get out of it with the National Policy a great deal sooner than we would without it.

“THE RING OF MANUFACTURERS.”

Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have said that the manufacturers of this country had formed a ring, that the manufacturers of cotton had formed a ring, and that after the surplus that they had on hand was worked off, they would run up the price, and we would have to pay whatever they charged. Well, would not that apply to any other country? Would it not apply to this country, if we had Free Trade? Do they not form rings in the United States, and could they not form rings in Free Trade England, where there are more factories in any industry than are needed? That is no argument at all. We find that the cheap goods are those that the poor man uses. Why has the poor man been able to increase his earnings in the savings bank? It is because, instead of having to pay $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on his cloth, he gets it without paying any duty; instead of paying $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on his boots and his shoes, he gets them here at home without paying any duty, and so with everything else. He gets his tea free of duty, his coffee free of duty, and the result is that he saves more money and puts more into the savings bank than he did before. (Applause.) Now, if these hon. gentlemen say that the National Policy has not cheapened goods, that the poor man has to pay as high as 50 and 75 per cent. for many of the goods he buys, why do not they propose their remedy? Why do they not stand up and say: “Here is a piece of cloth, and we intend to reduce the duty on it. Here is a piece of grey cotton, here is a blanket, and we want the duty taken off.” They are not ready to do so. Why do they not bring these things up and then we can discuss them? The hon gentleman, in talking about blankets, said the poor man paid 70 per cent. on his blankets. I have a letter here from a manufacturer where he says that he will make blankets, 60 by 80; with a pound of good, pure wool in them, and sell them for 50 cents a pound and a grey blanket for 45 cents a pound. Now here is a pound of good, pure wool in that blanket, 20 cents for the wool and 30 for the manufacturer. Now let the hon. gentleman say where the poor man pays 70 per cent. on that blanket. It applies to everything else in the same way. Of course, I admit, if we sent to the United States and bought blankets, we would have to pay 70 per cent. on them, but we don't do that. We first find out the price of the article in the foreign.