

condition. East, west, north and south, they would find railway cars laden with some of their best men, making for the far west. He was satisfied when they went to Manitoba, but did not like to see them settling in the Western States. A few days ago only, trains left Brockville with over 1,000. From his own part of the country, including county Carleton, a large number of families had recently gone, because they could not make a living here. The reason was obvious, having been explained by the member for Quebec, in regard to the absence of a market for Canadian coarse grains. Hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side had asked: Why was not 10c. or 20c. per bushel imposed on corn instead of $7\frac{1}{2}$ c.? He (Mr. Rochester) believed the duty should have been 10c., because this corn had done immense injury to the Canadian farmer. Twenty years ago they had in this country 85 distilleries, every one fed with the coarse grains raised in this country: rye, barley, oats and pease. But, for a number of years, they had but six distilleries, which made more whiskey than the 85 formerly. What was the consequence? All the whiskey was made from United States Indian corn, which had entered without paying a cent of duty, while the Canadian farmer had to shell out 15c. for every bushel of barley he sent to the United States. They had no wheatland in some sections of Canada, but cultivated oats and pease, having also any quantity of land fit to raise rye. He supposed hon. gentlemen opposite knew a good deal about rye, or, at least, the whiskey that came from it. It entered largely into the manufacture of whiskey twenty years ago, when the farmer got 60c. to \$1 a bushel for it. The price, of late years, was about 40c. a bushel, not one bushel being raised now for every 1,000 formerly. Canadian coarse grains had been superseded by Indian corn from the United States, for which Canadians had been made hewers of wood and drawers of water. If the farmers were not attended to, and suffered, the mercantile, manufacturing and all other interests would suffer with them. Hon. gentlemen opposite had spoken of the tariff raising the prices of articles, but, as the member for Quebec had explained, a man earning good wages could better pay \$6 for a

barrel of flour than a man, poor and but partially employed, \$4 for a barrel. He had found some appropriate remarks on this subject in the *Farmer's Advocate*, which he would read:

"We have examined part of the tariff now proposed, and consider it the best tariff we have yet seen for building up the agricultural interest of the country. We must draw a line between the inferior productions of the States and our products. Canada can and does produce better beef, mutton, pork, wheat, oats, peas, barley, potatoes, apples, butter, and cheese than the United States. The Americans have been purchasing our best products and selling them as their own. They have also palmed off their inferior products under the name of Canadian products. The duty charged on most articles must tend to increase the value of our productions, and to put our produce in its true light in foreign markets. We shall thus be able to obtain better prices, and this means an enhancement of the value of every acre of productive land in this Dominion."

He did not know whether this paper was Free-trade or Protectionist, but he found its remarks correct. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite showed great inconsistency on the tariff question. For instance, the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), on the 9th of April last, proposed the following amendment to the motion of the then Finance Minister, Mr. Cartwright:

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved "That a large quantity of corn and oats having been imported into Canada during the last few years, this House is of opinion that the interests of Canadian farmers would be promoted by the imposition of a duty upon the importation of those products."

Last year he wanted Protection, but now he opposed it. The Finance Minister had brought forward a policy that would benefit every industry, and had he taken twelve months to mature it, instead of a few weeks, he would have deserved much credit for it. All should know that it was difficult to rearrange a tariff; it was not to be expected a Finance Minister should be thoroughly acquainted with every business in the country. He required the opinions of all trades, and also of the merchants. He had been told that the deputations to the Finance Minister had always left satisfied with their treatment, which, he understood, could not be said of those that had waited upon his predecessor. The hon. member