

Do you advise legislation with a view to establishing and promoting in Canada, the cultivation of sugar beet, and the manufacture of sugar therefrom; also cultivation of tobacco and flax? And what legislation would best conduce to the end in view?

A.—The House of Commons in 1873 expressed itself in favour of exemption from duties for a certain number of years of the beet-root sugar manufactured in Canada. I think nothing could be more efficacious for promoting that industry. True that, so far, it has not taken root in the country, but strenuous efforts are made to introduce it. The difficulties are great, greater even than in France, Belgium and Germany, but I trust they will be overcome, and rely especially on that exemption from duties as the greatest encouragement that can be given. As regards tobacco the tax on Canadian grown tobacco yields but a very small revenue while it hinders the cultivation. It ought to be abolished and the tax on imported tobacco increased. We can produce very good tobacco in Canada. I see no reason why ours should be inferior to the Connecticut or Kentucky. All we want is experience, which can only be acquired by practice, and no one will grow tobacco on a large scale with the present tax.

As for flax its cultivation will never be profitable without linen factories, and those who have a practical knowledge of the subject know how difficult it is to work profitably a linen factory in Canada under present circumstances.

Do many of the sons and daughters of farmers in your locality, whose taste or physical capacity lead them to desire other employment than farming, seek employment in the United States? If so, what remedy would you advise?

A.—A great number of people leave our part of the country every year for the factories in the States, and will continue to do so as long as we cannot give them work. Of course our market is too limited to employ them all; but, limited as it is, we could employ a good many more than we do if we kept our market to ourselves, which we ought to do, since the United States refuse to open their market to us.

Does the free importation of American flour, with ut reciprocity, put you at a disadvantage as compared with American competitors? And if so, state reasons.

A.—I think those who have grain for sale must feel it seriously.

Have you found grinding in bond convenient and practicable and fair to all parties concerned, and would you recommend it in case of the imposition of a duty on foreign wheat?

A.—No.

As an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. imposed in the United States on flour against the fixed specific duty of 20 per cent. per bushel on wheat, generally operates as a discriminatory tariff against the Canadian miller, would the establishment of discriminatory duties by the Parliament of Canada, in your opinion, be advisable?

Mr. ORTON.

A.—Yes.

Do you think the admission of American hord cattle, horses and sheep into Canadian markets at a 10 per cent. duty, while the United States impose a 20 per cent. duty on similar animals sent from Canada, acts injuriously on Canadian farmers? And would you recommend a similar duty to that imposed by the United States?

A.—Yes.

Can the Canadian farmer raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock, or will it pay him better to buy Indian corn?

A.—With a good system of farming we ought to produce enough to fatten our cattle.

What articles produced on the farm require a home market for their sale?

A.—All bulky articles.

What changes, if any, are required in legislation to make agriculture a more desirable and profitable occupation for the people?

A.—Give up all abstract notions and study the real interest of the farmer and manufacturer; they ought to go together.

Mr. ORTON, having read this statement, withdrew his motion.

THE BOURGOIN-LAMONTAGNE CONTRACT.

The House then resumed consideration of item 11, in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DESJARDINS observed that the prices were so nearly alike that it was difficult at first sight to say whether Mr. Martin or Messrs. Bourgoin and Lamontagne should have had the contract; but, nevertheless, to the former should have been confided the construction of the building. If we were to admit the principles laid down by the Hon. Premier that such works as the foundation of a building must be considered as an extra work, it would lead to many abuses, because it would always be easy for a man abiding by his political feelings to deprive a tenderer of his rights in a contract. In this particular case the Hon. Premier admitted that Bourgoin and Lamontagne had at first refused to accept the contract; that Martin was called for; that he accepted the undertaking according to tender, and yet we find that not only are Bourgoin and Lamontagne intrusted with the contract, but that they are even admitted to modify their tender so as to put themselves in a like position as Martin.

The item was passed.