

is a grievous wrong inflicted upon the trade. Buyers generally buy on a lower grade, and if the farmer produces a superior article, say sixty-four or sixty-five pounds to the bushel, he does not receive the commercial value of his superior article; but the buyer finds that after he has given the farmer the highest price, it may be, for No. 1 hard, he has an article that he can manipulate. He can mix inferior grades with this superior article, and if the mixture comes up to the Government standard he has made money by the mixing of the grain, and often it occurs that the grain is bought upon the one grade and sold upon another. This is a source of great anxiety to the farmer of the west. The wheat goes into the elevator at Port Arthur on one grade and it is shipped to Europe on another grade, and we have good reason to believe that England knows very little of No. 1 hard as it is produced by the farmer of the west. This works decidedly to his disadvantage; it destroys the reputation of the grain in the British market, hence reduces the price, and the loss comes back upon the producer. We hold that there is great room for investigation into this whole business, that the farmer may have the just reward of his labour, and the fair advantage of his superior grain. Now, there is another difficulty under which the farmer labours—I refer to the freight rates, which are bushel for bushel—it requires one bushel to place another upon the market. We hope that in due time, with our deep waterways improved, freight rates may be reduced.

Then, again, perhaps the chief difficulty that we have to contend with is the difficulty and expense of getting the machinery that it is necessary to employ. Considering the position, the North-west farmer occupies in relation to his competitors in the British market, we have reason to fear that the high prices of former days have gone by, and that we cannot hope to receive the prices we realized five or six years ago.

What, then, is to be done to relieve the people under these circumstances? The people have met together and discussed the question themselves with empty pockets and no credit, and with difficulties staring them in the face, they have asked what is wrong. Many of them do not understand the situation, but they have asked what is wrong, and have studied the question carefully; and have arrived at the conclusion, which they expressed on the 23rd of June last, that there was need for a change in the whole fiscal policy of the Government. I think, Sir, we are exceeding happy in appearing as the representatives of the people under a new Government whose fiscal policy is largely in accord with the principles that we have been wont to support. What we chiefly want is tariff reform, but not tariff reform on the principles upon which it has sometimes been asked. We are not here to clamour for everything that the farmer needs in the production of his grain to be

put upon the free list. No, Sir. We want to say to the Government and to this House that we are willing to bear our share of the public expenses; but we wish simply to see to it that every man shall do the same thing. We believe, then, in tariff reform upon the principle of equity and justice; we have no sympathy with class legislation; we believe in the great principle that it should be the object of a Government to secure the greatest good to the greatest number. This being the case, then, we want to say that the idea of protecting certain industries in the country to the extent to which they have been protected in the past was a wrong inflicted upon the agricultural classes of Canada generally, and upon those of the North-west in particular. Let us, then, come to the point that is specially interesting to the North-west farmer. In the new tariff there are many things to encourage him. We have got rid of the forty and fifty and sixty and eighty per cent duties in the new tariff. This must be a relief to the agricultural classes generally. However, as representing the people and the opinions of the people in the west, we are bound to say that we would have been glad if the Government had been able just to do a little more along the same line. We know very well that it is difficult for any Government to make such a revolution on the fiscal policy as to strike out altogether the protective principle, that this would cause serious injury to many who are engaged in manufacturing interests, and that it might produce panic in many quarters. We are glad, however, that such changes have been made, and we believe that the Government have gone as far as they possibly could go, in view of the general interests of the Dominion. But we hope that they had given the manufacturers such a hint as to show them that they have only a taste of that which is to come in future years. They have, in my opinion at least, only administered a homeopathic dose to the manufacturers of the country. We hope it will stimulate their growth and that the infant industries will advance as soon as possible, so to take care of themselves. I know that some hon. members have said that it is not a wise thing to keep the manufacturers or the business interests of the country in any uncertainty, that the mere fact that uncertainty exists will do an injury to all trade. I do not think, looking at the new tariff, that the Government is likely to keep manufacturers in any uncertainty, or the business of the country in any uncertainty. They have declared that they believe it is not to be a perfect tariff, not to be an ideal tariff, but it is all that they can do under the circumstances in which they find themselves placed to-day; and we hope that by and by they will be able to carry out their pledges and their promises to the people and travel still further in the same line. So we regard the new tariff as a very gentle hint to the manufacturers of the country that the time must