

number of pounds of home-made butter, pounds of home-made cheese, pounds of grapes, bushels of other fruits, pounds of maple sugar, pounds of hops, and a variety of items of the same kind. Now, if accurate information on these points could have been obtained, the hon. Minister might have been justified in asking for it, and in loading down the census tables with all these details; but I put it to the common sense of every hon. gentleman in this House whether one farmer in a hundred, or in five hundred, is able to give the census enumerators the number of pounds of home-made butter or cheese he has produced, much less the number of pounds of grapes or of maple sugar. Any one who has paid any attention to the way in which such information is obtained knows that farmers scarcely ever dream of keeping accurate accounts of these various matters. The fact is, that all these details are simply guesses, and nothing more; not one of them can be depended on. They are approximations, more or less accurate, generally less accurate than more. I dare say the information would be valuable if it could be relied on; but the hon. Minister, who is a man of practical experience, knows that very few farmers keep accurate accounts, even of the quantity of grain they raise, much less of these details with which the census is encumbered."

In contrast with this implied depreciation of the intelligence of the farmers of our country, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture responded in this wise:

"He says these people are guessing. It is he who is guessing. He says the quantity cannot be obtained. Why, there is not a man who makes sugar who does not know almost to the very pound how much he makes. Is there a man who raises hops who cannot tell how many pounds he sells? Is it not ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to say that this information cannot be got directly? It is the very information you can get directly."

And further:

"It shows what an impracticable man the hon. gentleman is. Let the hon. gentleman condescend once in a while to dine with a farmer, or go to a farmer's house and look at him, and the farmer will tell him at once that what the hon. gentleman has said is perfectly ridiculous."

I am informed that that hon. gentleman's constituents are in a very large degree farmers. I simply ask the question—I will not answer it—whether, according to his estimate of the intelligence of that portion of his constituents, that does not account for the presence of the hon. gentleman here in Parliament. I am reminded that his predecessor was a farmer, but arrangements were made by which the farmers of his county should not be represented here. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the further indulgence of the House, I will refer to some of the statements made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom I am sorry to see is not in his place. That hon. gentleman, during this debate, said:

"Sir, the hon. gentleman has reduced the price of every bushel of wheat the Canadian farmer has to sell, of every bushel of farm produce he has to sell—he has reduced it by the operation of this policy, which has placed us at variance with our natural customers, and driven from the markets of Canada the people who are the consumers of our surplus food products."

Now, is it reasonable, or is it in accordance with common sense, to make those remarks about a country whose exports of agricultural products in 1884 were \$619,269,449, and of manufactures, \$111,330,242. The hon. gentleman went on further to say:

"This has been the operation of the National Policy, a policy which has not only imposed direct taxes on the people of this country in the shape of Customs"—

It is something new, probably, to this House, to hear that Customs duties are direct taxation—

"but has imposed indirect duties, in the shape of an enhanced cost of the ordinary articles of consumption of the people of this country, and impose this additional taxation in the shape of a reduction in the price of farm produce. Not for one hundred years has wheat been lower in England than it is to-day, because she has reached countries where that article can be produced cheaply. Not for many years has the price of wheat been lower than it is in Canada to-day, notwithstanding the vaunts and boasts of hon. gentlemen, that they would afford agricultural protection to the farmers of Canada. They offered them benefits and blessings. They have conferred on them curses instead."

I will now point out the contradictions, and these are very evident. Here is another palpable self-contradiction, but that is not unusual with the hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House. He says, first, that the National Policy

has lowered the prices for the farmer. Second—and that is (heir stock argument—he says it is well known that England regulate the prices. Next, he says that for 100 years wheat has not been lower in England than it is to-day. Therefore, his argument is contradictory, for it opposes his own contention that prices are reduced by the effect of the National Policy, whereas by his own showing low prices are produced by a fall in the English market. Then that hon. gentleman went on to say:

"Sir, we cannot conceal our position from the United States or from any other intelligent men. It is not necessary to tell them; they know it. But we can inform ourselves, and it is necessary that the people of Canada should know the truth. It is necessary that the people of Canada should know the affairs of this country, and it is nothing short of criminal to conceal from the people of Canada the actual condition of the public affairs of this Dominion. I do not intend to conceal them. And gentlemen may prate about unpatriotic conduct and injuring the country if they choose. We have heard enough of that stuff."

An hon. gentleman who, with the responsibility resting upon him as a representative of the people and a member of this House, stigmatises any pretension to patriotic conduct that he does not agree with, as "stuff," I think, Mr. Speaker, will hardly be appreciated by this House or the country. Has that hon. gentleman come to his conclusion on the same principle that a certain nameless personage who has a perpetual contempt for and sneers at the existence of virtue of any kind? Next, we have a choice specimen of his asserted truth-telling, where he refers to the present position of the sawed lumber interest in this Ottawa section. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must solicit the indulgence of the House whilst I refer to the following statements of the hon. gentleman, and I cannot imagine where or from what source he obtained the information that he gave to the House and to the country, when he stated in his place:

"I may remind the people of the country that they are growing poorer every year through the reduction in value of the various properties. Farms can be bought in any part of Ontario cheaper than they could be purchased six years ago."

Now, whatever the experience in this respect may be of the members from the western part of Ontario, the contrary, I can assure this House and the country, is the experience of the representatives from the Ottawa valley and central Canada. There is a difference of opinion even among the hon. gentlemen opposite on that point. I will read an extract from a speech of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who said:

"The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who spoke the other day, quoted the statistics of the Ontario Bureau of Industries to show that the price of farm land had gone up in Ontario. I believe he quoted them correctly, and I believe, from my knowledge of the gentleman who collects those statistics, that they are as correct as they can be made. I believe that the value of farm property in Ontario has gone up."

But the most astounding and incorrect statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk is in respect to the present condition of the sawed lumber interest in this section particularly:

"What is the state of the lumber interest? Are the lumbermen of Ottawa and of the West, and of the East working double time, making sales far ahead? There is a vast accumulation of lumber in the yards at Ottawa, and none of it is sold. Gloom and despondency prevail in the lumber markets; the shipping interest is low, not a single prediction made by the hon. gentleman in regard to any industry in the country has been realised."

Now, I deny that the sawed lumber interest of the Ottawa valley is in a deplorable condition, but to the contrary, is in a most satisfactory state. Allow me to state, Mr. Speaker, that a very carefully compiled statistical account appeared in the *Citizen* last November, of the season's cut on the Ottawa, and it gives an approximate estimate of the amount of lumber cut in the different mills during the season of 1884. The gross amount is 495,500,000 feet. That amount, taken with what is cut up the river, makes the gross cut for the Ottawa Valley 625,000,000 feet, or