

tinued—Take the article of Indian corn, for instance, a large quantity of which goes into the production of spirits. I contend there should be a duty on it, and if this would increase the price of spirits to a great extent, we should reduce the excise duty on it. Our grain went into the same mash tub with a duty of 73 cents paid to the Government, while the American corn goes in free. Is that a fair way of treating the produce of our soil? I contend it is unfair. I will go further and say, that spirits can be made just as reasonably out of the produce of our own soil as that of any other. Barley will make spirits—rye will make spirits. Now, if a fair duty is placed on the American corn that goes into the production of spirits, the distilleries of the country would be looking for our rye, buckwheat, barley, oats, &c., and it would increase the price of our own soil. We fill ourselves up with American corn when freights are cheapest, and are then able to say to farmers who are "carrying" these products. "We will pay you whatever we like, we are full of American corn," and we make our own prices. But when the duty of 10 cents was placed on American corn we began to see what corn to buy to make spirits the cheapest. The consumption of grain by distilling is large, one establishment in the city uses, I have no doubt, 2,500 bushels per day. Yet how far we should go in the direction of a protective tariff I am not prepared to say. I am pleased to see such a resolution as this entertained by the Association. I am firmly convinced that it should be the great aim of the farmers of this country to encourage the establishment among themselves of manufacturing industries, because they consume the articles that are now exported. I ask would any reasonable man take up a farm in a country where the farmers supply a population of 40,000,000 of their own and 4,000,000 of ours, or would he buy a farm where there is only the 4,000,000 to supply.

Mr. Howland—The farmer has not even the 4,000,000 to supply.

Mr. Reed—Where would a man grow barley? Throwing a stone across the St. Lawrence, could there be such a difference between the soils of the two countries that you can afford to pay 15 per cent. to come into that country. In the State of New York they grow more barley but it is not quite so valuable. I met a gentleman named Mr. Ferris going to the States to buy land. I asked him why he was going there and he said, "If I grow barley here and send it there, I have to pay 15 cents per bushel duty to ship it to the States. If I raise cattle here and send them over there I have to pay 20

per cent; while, if I ship them to Canada I have to pay only 10 per cent. Also, if I ship wheat to the other side I have to pay 20 cents per bushel, while to ship from there to Canada costs nothing." I am quite prepared to support the resolution and I hope the meeting will favourably receive it. (Applause.)

Mr. Wm. Lukes, Toronto, said—I have great pleasure in having the opportunity of seconding the resolution, especially in relation to the important subject of the milling interests, which, I am pleased to see, have been included in the resolution, and had these not been taken up I should have left the meeting. It had been said by some that the manufacturers were opposed to agricultural protection, but I believe they are prepared to carry out the pledges they have made to the agriculturalists of this country, and I have to vindicate the Secretary, Mr. Frazer, against a misconception that has been going through the country, viz.: that it was not the desire of this Association to have agricultural interests protected, but I contend that both the agricultural and milling interests are entitled to receive some consideration at the hands of the Government. I have been a Reformer all my life, and attended a Reform picnic at Newmarket this summer, and I put the question to the Premier, "Why the Agricultural and Milling interests were not receiving the attention they demanded?" The reply was, "He did not know they wanted protection; if they did they could not get it, and if they had it, it would do them no good." I asked to be allowed five minutes to reply to this, but was refused, and of course had to keep my mouth shut. I did not, however, believe what the Premier had said, and had I been allowed the opportunity, I was prepared to prove that a change from *free trade* to *protection* would be an advantage not only to the farmer and miller, but also to the country as a whole. In exporting our wheat we have to pay one per cent. to one and a quarter for freight per bushel; if ground into flour, nine cents, therefore showing as conclusively as possible that there is 8 or 9 cents per bushel or 50 cents per barrel to be expended among the labourers and artisans, which reverts into the farmers' hands, and if you calculate how much benefit the country would receive, considering the enormous amount of wheat shipped—were it ground into flour—I say the benefits would be immense. I ask why it is that wheat or cattle are worth more on American soil than on ours. It has been said that England fixed the price of our wheat, &c., but this I do not believe, as I think the States a better market. I do not know anything liberal

enough in the
would induce
that he could
beef that he
a farmer has
buyer, the b
own price; b
farmer will
other case.
that the exp
other that th
ator Reed ha
who paid the
over to Ro
horses to sel
which amoun
erican Gover
the duty? th
er or the pro
into the Unit
they have a
being able
over here, b
manufacture
and underse
ably through
could learn
milling inte
the Americ
recently as
Millers' Ass
trade there
they are det
make flour
they are fir
four million
the English
tered into t
attention o
ject, but th
take advan
an Indian.
know the v
try and are
factures.
procuity, as
manufactu
Wherever
pay as a r
that is if t
ture of flo
has been l
Where wo
been to-da
that but f
cheese—e
not be a p
day, but a
own dema
England a
the consu
price for i
but for t