

in the corridors and expressing his determination that specific duties should be upheld. The instances of specific duty being restored are few. There are 26 important ones abolished; in 16 cases reductions were from high to low specific duties and there are 10 cases where wholly or partially ad valorem and specific duties were restored to what they were in the old tariff. What becomes then of the statement made again and again in the west, and made in the "Globe" newspaper, although that paper for some time after the tariff was brought down was very fair in its criticism, and made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that when the Finance Minister brought down reforms in the tariff, at the dictation of the manufacturers he had to withdraw them? Sir, I am not now referring to what has been stated in this House but out of this House, and I say I have stamped that statement as what it is—a lie, and after I have proved that exhaustively, no man can make that statement and keep the character of a truthful man afterwards. I am sorry I have had to occupy the time of the House in thus going over the tariff in detail, but it was the only method to adopt unless we could have induced hon. gentlemen opposite to do the fair thing and give us the items on which they based their charge. But hon. gentlemen opposite dare not give their grounds, but by putting forward general statements they hope to influence the farmers and the mechanics. But the fact is we have ample time and opportunity to show the farmers that these extravagant statements are wild and ridiculous. I will not trouble the House by reading the reports of the conditions of farm labour in England, but I will only say this—unless I am challenged to read the report—that the labourer is sometimes in a very bad condition, that his wages are about 10s. per week or \$2.50, making an average of about \$12 per month. I never can understand some of the arguments put forward by members on the Reform side of the House, and what good can follow efforts to make out that the farm labourer in Canada is not as well off as the wretched farm labourer in England I am at a loss to know. All I can say is that we have evidence now before us, taken by an English commission, which shows that while the labourer in Ontario obtains from \$15 to \$17 per month, and is fed with eggs and meat, porridge and milk, and fruit three times a day, the farm labourer in England is fed pretty poorly, and in Scotland he only gets his brose and \$10 a month. But I took the opportunity in the county of Carleton to obtain statements from two of the farm labourers there, one is a Scotchman and the other an Englishman.—Robert Rennie of Aberdeen, Scotland, and the other Henry Winstanley of Derbyshire, England. The following is the letter:

The Rock Farm, Bell's Corners,
Ottawa, May 15th, 1895.

Sir.—In answer to your inquiry as to the comparative wages and board of farm labourers in Canada and England and Scotland, we beg to say that the information we give is based upon our experience in those two countries.

In England wages differ in the different counties, but in Derbyshire, England, where I was for thirteen years in the midst of a county almost wholly devoted to farming pursuits, the wages for a really good man would be about £16 (\$80) per year and board. Lads of about seventeen years of age would get £12 to £14; some only £10, that is, \$60, \$70 and \$50 respectively, and board. The board, so far as my Canadian experience goes, is in Canada far and far away ahead of any to be obtained in England. In fact, the latter is not to be mentioned by the side of the former. In one particular instance I can call to mind where men were required for the hay harvest, 2s. 6d. (60 cents) was offered per day, without board of any description or lodging or beer, which is mostly given on English farms.

In Scotland wages are higher than in England. A really good man is paid £26 per year and board (\$130); one not so efficient, £14 per year and board, equals \$70; the board not so good as in England by far, the principal food being oatmeal and potatoes, bread and tea only on Sundays. Meat, perhaps, in a place above the usual run of farm board, is given, perhaps, once a month; most places one never has it at all.

Most emphatically I state, as an Englishman, that a farm man is in every respect better off in Canada than in England, where he is mostly put down to be a serf and ignorant, being devoid of intellect and wanting in common sense, and is spoken to in a patronising manner by the village squire and parson, and expected to salute each in passing. The labourer's wife and children are the same. But I thank God that, with the ever-increasing power of self-government given to him, the labourer is gradually shaking off the yoke of parson and squire, and is beginning to think and act for himself, and will not, in a few years' time, be led by the nose by either of the two mentioned.

In Canada I find Jack is as good as his master, but in England it is in many places, "God bless the squire. God bless the parson and all their rich relations, and help us poor people to keep all in our places."

Yes, sir, in nine villages out of ten in England it will be found as I have stated. "Hodge," or "Chaw-bacon," is the name usually applied in England to the farmer's man. Possibly, Mr. McMullen would alter his opinion, had he a little experience of English farm labourers' life and position, or even a little talk with

Yours respectfully,

HENRY WINSTANLEY,
of Derbyshire, Eng., and
ROBERT RENNIE,
of Aberdeen, Scotland.

Mr. Thos. Graham,
Rock Farm, Bell's Corners, Ottawa.

Now, Sir, that, at all events, together with the evidence we have in these books, disposes of the absurd statements that the farm labourer in England or in Scotland is better off than he is with us in Canada. For what purpose such a statement is made in this House. Heaven only knows, unless it be to decry Canada, which one can scarce-