

timber demanded, he thought, their immediate attention. (Applause).

Mr. BISHOP said that as a farmer he could not sit there and hear the statements made by the members for North and East Grey respecting the benefits to the farmers from the National Policy. (Hear, hear.) It reminded him of the old lady who told the same story so often that she at length believed it true. (Laughter.) The member for West Toronto had said that the N. P. gave better prices to the farmers. He as a farmer took issue with the hon. member on that point. He had taken great care to look into the matter, and took the prices as quoted in the *Mail* for the 20th of October in each year since 1874, or during the five years of the Mackenzie regime, as follows:—

	20th October					Average.
	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	
Fall wheat.....	\$1 00	\$1 10	\$1 11	\$1 25	\$0 92	\$1 07
Oats.....	43	39	40	35	32	38
Barley.....	97	92	86	65	1 00	83
Hay.....	23 00	20 00	14 00	18 25	13 50	17 97
Straw.....	16 00	14 00	11 00	15 00	12 00	13 75
Wool.....	..	..	..	30	24	27
Dressed Hogs.....	8 50	8 00	6 50	5 25	5 50	6 75
Eggs.....	24	21	22	20	15 20	2-5c

Making a total average of.....\$41 28  
For the same date in the three years of the National Policy the prices were quoted in the *Mail* as follows:—

	20th October			Average.
	1879.	1880.	1881.	
Wheat.....	\$ 1 34	\$ 1 35	\$ 1 36	\$ 1 25
Oats.....	36	34	43	38
Barley.....	72	73	95	80
Hay.....	11 00	11 50	16 00	12 75
Straw.....	7 00	8 50	12 00	9 00
Wool.....	20	27	24	23½
Dressed hogs.....	6 00	7 00	8 50	7 16½
Eggs.....	18	20	25	21

Making an average total of.....\$31 79½  
so that a farmer taking a bushel or a pound of each of these articles to market now would only receive \$31 79, as against \$41 28 before the introduction of the N. P. (Applause.) This showed that the National Policy had not benefited the farmers, nor made prices for their produce better. They saw that the average price of barley during the five years prior to the accession of the present Government was 88 cents per bushel and during the last three years only 80 cents, or lower than before the N. P. was introduced. The market reports taken from the same paper for June 20 in the first five years showed the prices to be:—

	1874	'75	'76	'77	'78	Average.
Wheat \$	1 32	\$ 1 01	\$ 1 14	\$ 1 60	\$ 1 01	\$ 1 21
Oats.....	53	49	34	56	32	45 4-5
Barley..	70	60	57	70	55	62 2-5
Hay.....	20 00	18 00	15 50	16 00	17 00	17 30
Straw...	15 00	8 00	12 00	10 00	12 00	11 40
Wool....	40	35	38	29½	20	30 2-5

Average total for the five years \$31 28 3-5  
For the period of three years following the imposition of the duties, the prices were on the same date in each year:—

	1879.	1880.	1881.	Average.
Wheat.....	\$ 1 01	\$ 1 12	\$ 1 16	\$ 1 09½
Oats.....	41	39	41	40½
Barley.....	60	70	57	62½
Hay.....	14 00	13 00	11 00	12 65
Straw.....	7 00	7 00	7 00	7 00
Wool.....	22	38	22	24

Total average price for the three years \$22 02½  
He admitted that the farmers were better off, but why? Because they got more bushels to

the acre. (Opposition applause.) Did hon. gentlemen mean to tell him that the N. P. did it. When a lad he learned that Paul planted, and Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. Did they mean to say that Paul planted and Apollos watered, but that the N. P. gave the increase? (Cheers and laughter.) He paid more to-day for his coat than ever, and yet the farmers were asked to say, when they received less for what they sold and paid more for what they bought, that the N. P. was good for them, or that their improved circumstances was due to such a policy. (Loud applause.) Before resuming his seat he wished to speak of the inability of the farmer to drain his land under a railway track without the permission of the railway authorities, who invariably withheld that permission. He thought a law was needed to remedy that evil.

Mr. NEELON said he had been a protectionist for twenty years, and he believed that every man in this country had derived benefit from the National Policy. (Opposition applause.) Wherever there was a manufacturing establishment they had derived benefit from the tariff. During the seasons of 1876-77-78-79 mechanics had to seek employment in the United States, and delegation after delegation had gone to Ottawa and tried to get the tariff increased. After the present tariff had been imposed the mechanics who had formerly left the country through lack of employment returned, as they were glad to do, when they found that they could get employment at home. It might be said that higher prices had to be paid for goods, but his answer was that

higher wages were being paid to workmen than two years ago. Another reason of higher prices was that raw material was somewhat higher. This was not because of the increased tariff, but because of the increased value of raw material and the increased value of labour. He held that the N. P. benefited the farmer because, wherever there was a manufacturing establishment located, the agriculturist had a ready market for the products of his farm, and received fifteen per cent. more for his products than if he had to export them, and that thus the N. P. was not a hardship upon him. He held that when the imports exceeded the exports the country was getting poorer, and accumulating debt, the interest upon which he had to pay every year. The exports, if the country was to be in a proper position, should exceed the imports, and that was the true principle of the country's success. The Minister of Finance, in his opinion, deserved a great deal of credit for the part he had acted in inaugurating the National Policy. This question should not have come up in this House, but when it did come up he wanted his constituents to know where he stood. If this policy, which had been carried out for so many years, was a benefit to other countries, then why should it not be a benefit to this country. Speaking of the boundary question, he said that when the interests of Ontario were at stake the House should be a unit. There was \$150,000,000 worth of timber in that country, and that showed the necessity of every member of the House standing up for the rights of Ontario. (Hear, hear.) If the members of the Dominion Parliament from Ontario had demanded the ratification of the award, and they should have done so, the award would have been carried out. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that the members of the Dominion House from Ontario would make a demand of that kind. Regarding market fees many places had prepared market grounds at much expense, and he hoped that if the Government was going to introduce a Bill on the subject it would not be of such a nature that it would give the farmer the use of the markets without his paying some consideration for them. The Streams Bill met all the requirements of the case. To have an individual owning a slide and being in a position to say that no one else could use that slide but himself, virtually gave him the ownership of all the timber from the slide up to the head of a stream, because there being no other outlet, he could buy that timber for comparatively little or nothing. The Government deserved a great deal of credit for the way in which they had dealt with that question. (Applause.)

Mr. HAWLEY, as a farmer, and representing a purely agricultural constituency, disclaimed that protection had been of any benefit to the agricultural population, but rather an injury. Why did the manufacturers want protection but in order that they might limit competition and compel consumers to purchase from them alone. This principle was the opposite to that which was observed in private transactions, and was clearly opposed to the best interests of the people. Referring to the Boundary Award, he could not but feel that the Dominion Government, in not ratifying the award had committed a gross act of injustice to this Province. (Cheers.) The Opposition had made a change of base on this question, and had proved themselves untrue to their Province, and they would be taken to account for their action in this matter by the people at the next election. The Streams Bill was a measure clearly within the province of this Legislature to enact, and the action of the Dominion Government in vetoing that bill was in no way justifiable. The labours of the Agricultural Commission were acceptable to all classes of the farming population. It was to be hoped that the Government would issue a further supply of reports. He favoured the abolition of market fees altogether, and concluded with the hope that the Speech from the Throne and such other matters as may form the subject of legislation would receive the earnest consideration of the House.

Mr. HAY referred to the charge that in moving the Address he had introduced matter foreign to the Speech when he touched on the National Policy. He was not aware that the mover and seconder of the Address were to be strictly confined to the subject matter of the Speech in their remarks. He proposed on the present occasion to review some of the questions which had been referred to in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER hoped that the hon. gentleman, having already discussed these matters fully, would confine himself to the third paragraph in the speech.

Mr. HAY said that other hon. members while speaking to this paragraph had referred to other subjects having no connection with it.

Mr. MEREDITH said the Opposition had no desire to prevent the member for Perth from having the fullest latitude, and he suggested that the hon. gentleman be permitted