

be an object to them, would drive home and wait for another opportunity, frequently being compelled to return and take what was offered. "How is it now?" I said. They replied: "There is no difficulty now. We sell everything we bring in for cash, and at good prices." Why? Because business is in an active and flourishing state. Manufactories have increased, the number of the employed has increased, and their wages also have increased. They have plenty of money with which to buy country produce—I speak particularly of perishable goods which cannot be sent to a distant market. Some 25,000 more people are employed than in 1878 in these manufactories, and if they represent four for each family you have 100,000 people to be fed, the heads of whose families were without employment or were only partially employed, or not in the country, in 1878. What the effect of this is to the farmer can be clearly understood. But it is said the duty on oats is no protection to the farmer; the duty on corn is very little benefit to the farmer. What is the fact? Do they not obtain better prices for their corn than they did before the duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel was imposed? They certainly do. There is no question about it. Do they not obtain a better price for their rye? I admit that is regulated to a very large extent by the price in Germany and elsewhere, the markets to which it is generally shipped from the Dominion. But the distillers of Canada now buy their rye from the farmers of Canada, which they use as a substitute for corn. That gives an increased market, and to a certain extent affects the price. With reference to the price of oats, we have evidence beyond controversy, in my judgment, that it has been increased to the consumer 3 cents per bushel. But it is said "the European market regulates the price here. It does not matter an iota what you put upon it." Does it not? The leader of the Opposition said in Nova Scotia—and I do him the justice to say he made the same statement in Toronto previous to the West Toronto election—that the duty on coal increased the price of coal to the consumer in Ontario, and that the duty on breadstuffs increased the price of breadstuffs to the consumer in the Maritime Provinces. The operation of this state of things, he said, would create a bad feeling between the people of Ontario and the people of the Maritime Provinces, because the latter had to pay additional for the breadstuffs of Ontario consumed in the Maritime Provinces, and