

cents net, free on board, at Seaforth. He tells me that he was speaking to a Montreal buyer who sent several lots of eggs to the English market this year, and he netted on the first lot 9 cents a dozen and for the second lot 11 cents a dozen, free on board in Montreal, and the western buyer realized 12 and 12½ cents free on board in the town of Seaforth, 500 miles further west than Montreal. He tells me that if the McKinley Bill was not in operation, instead of 10 cents, the average price paid this year, he could pay from 12 to 15 cents. Three cents a dozen on 1,550,000 dozen would be \$46,500 that egg buyers would be able to pay into the pockets of the Canadian farmers more than they are now paying for their eggs. And does any hon. gentleman tell me that in face of these substantial and experimental facts, reported by men who have been engaged in that business, that the English market is as profitable to us as the American market at the present time? And what is the reason? Why, we are told that the English market affords a very large demand, and we can find a sale for eggs in the English market at any time. But we cannot find a sale in the English market at as high a price as we can in New York at any time, and that is the essence of the argument. It is estimated by the egg exporters that it takes from five to six weeks from the time the eggs are laid until they are laid down in the English markets. When these eggs go into the English market they are looked upon as stale by consumers, and only second class prices are obtained. Eggs from France, Portugal, and Germany, are taken over to England in two or three days, and being considered as fresh, they realize the highest prices, while, I repeat, the Canadian eggs are only reckoned as second class. Eggs, however, can reach New York in a few days at most, and sell there as fresh eggs and bring the highest price. This is the condition of the egg business, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to dispute these facts, because I have taken the trouble to gather them from parties who are thoroughly posted. Then there is the question of horses. It is very well known that England is not the proper market for our horses. We import horses of a certain class from England, but she imports very few from this country. Several attempts have been made to ship horses profitably to England, but they have proved a failure. The truth is, that the class of horses we raise here is not the class used there, and unless we change our breed we cannot obtain a market for them. Instead of sending a large number to England, only 125 were shipped last year, while about 17,000 went to the United States, showing that, notwithstanding the high tariff against our horses, the adjoining Republic is our natural market. The previous tariff had proved prejudicial to the trade, but the McKinley tariff has nearly destroyed it. I am not a horse buyer or a horse dealer, and I do not come before this House to express my own opinion on this matter, but the opinions of practical men who understand their business and know which market is the best. I desire now to quote the opinions of some of our horse dealers. Mr. Isaac Rattenbury, of Clinton, says:

"There has been a drop in prices of \$25 a head at least, and this during the last month or six weeks since the McKinley Bill menaced the trade."

Let me give the opinion of another large horse buyer in the County of Huron, A. M. Polley, who says:

"The McKinley Bill has knocked the horse trade higher than a Gilderoy kite. The new duty has put a dead stop to the trade. I have been doing, and I can do, nothing until the farmers can be brought to see that they must sell for \$20 or so less than in previous years."

Let me now give the opinion of a very respectable Conservative, an experienced horse buyer, John McMann, who says:

"Each year there has probably gone out of this section 1,300 horses, which would average \$150 to \$160 each. Now those horses would not bring more than \$125 to \$130 each. Or instead of those 1,300 horses at the old price putting into the pockets of the farmers say, \$195,000, at present prices they would only bring \$162,500, or \$32,500 less."

Can hon. gentlemen, in the face of that fact, stated by a man who understands the subject, declare that the National Policy has brought prosperity to the farmers and filled their pockets with sufficient money to enable them to maintain their families in comfort? Do not these facts prove that the National Policy has largely injured the farmers in respect to horses? Take next the article of wool. The hon. member for Albert, I think, said that he remembered the time when our farmers sheared sheep in New Brunswick, which was equivalent to saying that it was not worth while to shear sheep there now. Before the National Policy came into force it was worth while doing so, because the farmers got 34 cents to 40 cents for wool, whereas last year they only received from 20 to 22 cents. It will be remembered how eloquent were the Conservatives in 1877-78 in telling the farmers: You are fools to support the Liberal party, for you are only getting 34 cents per pound for your wool, whereas under a national policy, which we propose to introduce, all your wool will be manufactured at your own doors, adding one-third at least to present prices. The farmers, always anxious to get money into their own pockets, believed these assertions, and they are now sorry they did so. At the present time, instead of the farmers receiving increased prices under the National Policy, their wool realizes only one-half what it did at that time. Hon. gentlemen will judge from what I say that the National Policy is a two-edged sword. It cuts into the farmer by preventing him obtaining as much for his products as he otherwise would do, and it cuts into him also by preventing him buying goods in the cheapest market.

Mr. AMYOT. Then they go to the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Why should they stay in Canada? Another objection to the National Policy is that it has been one of the chief causes of the depression in values in this country. I suppose I am touching on another subject in regard to which it may be declared I am decrying the country. I have facts on this subject, gathered from my personal knowledge, not merely guesswork. I know that the sum for which certain farms were sold several years ago, and the prices they have realized during the last one or two years, and as I will give both prices, hon. members will obtain an idea of the depreciation in farm property in my neighbourhood. When I say my neighbourhood, I refer to it with pride. I believe the county I represent is one of the finest in Canada, I believe it is the garden of the Dominion; and when I find that the farmers even in the very best portion of this country are failing to make both ends meet, and have not five cents in their pockets as a surplus at the close of each year, there is something wrong in the policy of the Government. When the indus-