

less. The same argument held good with regard to oats, of which we had a large surplus, which we were obliged to send to foreign markets. The same thing must be said of barley and peas, which we largely exported, and which we did not import. The same thing must also be said of horses, horned cattle, sheep, hay, butter, and cheese, which were products we exported, and did not import. But it was not the same thing with regard to corn, which was not grown in this country in sufficient quantity for our consumption; and the price of that produce would be advanced by 7½c. per bushel—the amount of the duty. Now, how many farmers in Canada would receive the benefit of that increase in the price of corn? There was one produce of the farm upon which the imposition of a duty would have been really beneficial to the Canadian farmer—he referred to pork; for, whilst we exported a small quantity of pork, we imported a much larger one for home consumption. It was true that this tariff increased the duty on pork by 15c. per barrel; but this increase was so trifling that the benefit resulting from it to the farmer, could not be appreciable. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his tariff, took good care to protect the woollen goods manufacturer; but he entirely forgot him who provided wool, which would continue to be admitted duty free; he took care to protect the shoe manufacturer, but seemed to forget him who provided hides, which were also admitted free. Now, he (Mr. Bechard) asked what benefit could result to the Canadian farmer from the imposition of duties upon produce which we did not export, or of which we had a large surplus that we were bound to send to foreign markets? He did not hesitate to say that, under this tariff, the Canadian farmer would receive no compensation for the higher prices which he would be obliged to pay in the purchase of a great many articles of which he was a consumer. In concluding his remarks, he called to this fact the special attention of his hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), who had been pleased to allude to him in his speech. The hon. member represented a constituency which was like his, essentially agricultural; and he had no doubt that, within two or three

years, after the results of the tariff had been felt, his constituents would be in a position to tell him that, at least, one of the promises he made them during the electoral campaign, and which his leaders made to the country, had not been fulfilled.

THE CASE OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR LETELLIER.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, by the kind consent of the hon. member for Portneuf, who has the floor, I rise to speak for a moment on a matter personal to myself. There is an article on the front page of the *Globe* to-day, which arrived by wire, in anticipation of the post, and which was communicated to me. I will read the paragraph. It is in the Ottawa correspondence, and is as follows:—

“Further developments affecting the present political crisis are being hourly made. Those which have become public property to-day, in no wise reflect credit on the Premier. Indeed, in so discreditable a light does he appear, that the stigma of cowardice must be in future borne by him as a fitting compliment of a long list of political crime and ingratitude. There can be no doubt that he has sought to betray the confidence of the Governor-General, and make that illustrious personage a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the Government's Quebec followers. He was coward enough in doing this to take advantage of the Governor-General's position, which prevents him from replying to his slanderer. Such was the Premier's action when he informed the House he regretted the Governor-General had declined to follow his advice, and dismiss Mr. Letellier, but had referred the matter to England for consideration. It has been learned from a reliable source that the Governor-General did not personally propose that the matter should be referred to England, but such was done at the personal solicitation of the Premier, who afterwards, in the House of Commons, sought to direct the venom of his angry Quebec supporters towards the Governor-General. The Marquis of Lorne was so shocked on reading the falsehood told by the Premier in the House of Commons on Thursday last, as reported in the newspapers, that he wrote a letter to Sir John, sharply reprimanding him for his cowardly conduct. On Saturday morning the Premier was compelled to have an interview with His Excellency, and as a result of that interview, this afternoon, on the floor of the House of Commons, he contradicted his former statement, and stated that the reference of the matter to England by the Governor-General was not made without the advice of the Government. A more disgraceful proce-