

and all other grains for a less price in England than we can sell them for at home.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have been getting more for the flour I export than I get at home.

Mr. CLANCY. That may be, but I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell), told us a rather funny story to the effect that since Sir Wilfrid Laurier had given the English people a preference for nothing, the English people were begging for his flour. The hon. gentleman said he had a letter to that effect, but he never read it, and it occurred to me that sometimes people write letters to themselves. The fact remains that the Canadian producer sells his grain of all kinds at a lower price for export than he would get for it at home. If the argument of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has anything in it, it is that they want Yankee corn to feed their cattle, and they do not use the grain grown in Canada, and so our farmers have to take whatever price they can get for it. According to the logic of gentlemen opposite the object of lowering the duty on an article is to lower the price. Then if that be so, when corn was admitted free, the price of Canadian grain was lower. There never was a more unwise policy, and one less in the best interests of the farming community, than to allow corn in free. True there may be a few benefited by it who are engaged in what might be called manufacturing, and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is one of these. They buy cattle when they are cheap, but they do not buy Canadian grain to feed them. No, they buy Yankee corn to the exclusion of Canadian grown grain. I challenge the fact that there is not more than one farmer in fifty who buys American corn, and if only one farmer in fifty uses American corn for feeding purposes, then the admission of corn free of duty simply benefits one farmer to the detriment of the other forty-nine. There never was a greater blunder than this policy of the government corn, in view of the fact that we have to send our own grain products out of the country to find a market for them in foreign lands. Common sense and experience show the folly of the government in this. I see the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) is now in his place, and I will point out to him the fallacy of his argument about free corn. The principal argument in its favour advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) was that we would have to meet that corn in Great Britain any way, and we might as well meet it at home. Does the hon. gentleman adhere to that statement yet? Has he the hardihood to hold himself up as an exponent of the farmers of this country and to use such an argument as that. I leave that argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan), to the intelligent people of this country to pronounce upon it. The hon.

gentleman told us also that we imported something like seven million bushels of corn, and that if we sold pease to the same extent, we would make \$1,000,000 profit. But the hon. gentleman did not know, or he did not take the trouble to inform himself, that we do not export much more than one-third of that quantity of pease, and so the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) and his \$1,000,000 profit disappear at the same time. I say, Sir, that it was a stupid policy of this government to admit American corn free of duty into this country.

The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) stated that the farmers of this country were prosperous, because since the Liberal party came into power they sold their products at a higher price than before, and bought their goods cheaper. I do not think that any well informed man who has any reputation at stake will seriously assert that the farmers buy their goods cheaper now than they did before. I deny that there has been a general period of prosperity so far as it affects the farmers of Canada. We have had without doubt a wonderful expansion, but we have had no corresponding period of prosperity amongst the farmers. There may be great expansion of trade in a country, but it does not always follow that there is going to be corresponding advantages to every class in the community. Let us see how far the statement of the Minister of Customs is borne out by the facts. I will take the export prices of the principal articles which the farmers have to sell. I will take these prices for the last three years which the Liberals have been in power, and compare them with the average prices for the eighteen years previously when the Conservatives were in power. Here is the result:

AVERAGE EXPORT PRICES.

	3 years, 1897-9.	3 years, 1894-6.	10 years, 1887-96.	18 years, 1879-96.
Horses	\$90 71	\$98 00	\$112 90	\$112 74
Cattle	41 84	73 08	68 45	62 51
Swine	5 48	7 63	6 06	5 35
Sheep	3 54	4 21	3 89	3 90
Butter	0 18.1	0 18.9	0 18.1	0 18.3
Cheese	0 08.8	0 09.4	0 09.7	0 09.9
Eggs	0 12.7	0 12.8	0 13.7	0 14
Bacon	0 08.9	0 09.2	0 09.1	0 08.8
Beef	0 05.7	0 06.4	0 05.7	0 05.9
Hams	0 08.8	0 09.8	0 09.8	0 09.4
Pork	0 03.1	0 05.3	0 06.1	0 06.3
Wool	0 17	0 20	0 21	0 22
Bran	0 68	0 75	0 77	0 75
Barley	0 38	0 41	0 51	0 60
Beans	0 75	1 14	1 31	1 29
Oats	0 29	0 34	0 36	0 32
Pease	0 60	0 74	0 72	0 76
Wheat	0 79	0 61	0 77	0 89
Rye	0 52	0 55	0 61	0 65
Flour	3 98	3 85	4 36	4 64
Apples, green..	2 30	2 51	2 38	2 42
Hay	8 34	8 78	9 28	9 26

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where are these prices?