

country, and rendering its people contented and happy.

At the last general election the people of that country looked forward to a possible change in their political representatives, and it was with considerable regret when the polls closed on the 23rd of June, that we in the west had to recognize the fact that we had not sent a solid delegation against the late Government which had so mismanaged affairs in Manitoba and the North-west. But, Sir, this House and the country are well aware why we were not able to send that solid delegation. We were practically taken by the throat and throttled, the ballot-boxes were stuffed, and a special effort was made to send members to this House who would vote for the coercion of the province of Manitoba. But I ask you and the House to look at the result of the polling in Manitoba yesterday, when nearly 1,200 majority was given in the city of Winnipeg in favour of the Liberal candidate and this Government, and between 300 and 400 majority was given in the constituency of Macdonald for the Liberal candidate there. I think that is the best vindication that the province of Manitoba requires.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I promised to refer to a few of the disabilities under which that province laboured, and I will do so. Let me briefly call the attention of the House to the tariff as it existed, and as I regret to say it still exists, on fruits. The amount of duty paid on fruits at Winnipeg last year was \$58,000. Peaches to the value of \$6,063 paid a duty of \$2,223; plums to the value of \$6,727 paid a duty of \$1,681; pears to the value of \$4,134 paid a duty of \$827; strawberries to the value of \$2,299 paid a duty of \$502; cherries to the value of \$768 paid a duty of \$138; grapes to the value of \$3,086 paid a duty of \$1,333; lemons to the value of \$31,000 paid a duty of \$3,423. It will surprise the House to know that the people of that country pay as much as five cents for a single peach and from five to seven cents for a single pear; and the folly of protection on these articles will be illustrated when I point out that the duty affords very little protection to Ontario fruit, because the fruit imported from the United States is usually imported at a period when the Ontario fruit is not available, and in many cases the Ontario fruit would not stand the long railway or lake passage to that country. The duty on peaches is nineteen cents a box, and five cents on the box, which is no good. The duty on strawberries is two cents a pound, or six cents a box. There are children in Manitoba and the North-west who rarely, if ever, taste fruit at all. In country places it is rare to find any fruit ever brought into the home of the settler. On apples, the duty is forty cents a barrel, and that duty practically amounted to the value of a barrel of apples in Ontario last season. Apples are about

Mr. RICHARDSON.

the only fruit within the range of the farmers of Manitoba. To illustrate how we suffer in regard to fruit, I may say that one of my colleagues, I think the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), made the statement to-day that a car-load of apples delivered in Prince Albert cost some \$600 and of that entire amount the cost of the apples was but \$136, the duty and freight amounting to nearly \$500 on the car-load. Bananas are thirty-five cents a pound in the country. It takes about a bushel of wheat to purchase a pound of bananas.

I will invite your attention briefly to the duty on lumber. The high price of lumber practically compels farmers to live in that rigorous climate in poor houses, and without shelter for their stock. It is almost impossible for them to engage in mixed farming with lumber at the present price, because they cannot afford to buy lumber to construct byres for their cattle and other buildings necessary. Along the line of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, rough lumber is from \$3 to \$7 per thousand cheaper than it is along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, owing to competition on these grades. The Premier of Manitoba, the Hon. Mr. Greenway, informed me the other day that he was able to bring in lumber from the United States and take it on the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway to a point called Mariopolis, some twenty miles from his home, and then cart it that distance, and yet save \$200 on the lumber required for his barn, as compared with the cost of Canadian lumber. Mr. Kenneth McKenzie, one of the pioneer settlers of Manitoba, the gentleman who was defeated by Dr. Rutherford in Macdonald yesterday, made the remarkable statement in Winnipeg to the tariff commissioners, the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs, that he had put up buildings twenty-four years ago with lumber which had to be floated down the Red River and that he had got it just as cheap as it was at present, with all the railway facilities that exist. I am sure you will agree with me that that is a remarkable state of affairs, and I would urge on the Government the desirability of revising its tariff with regard to lumber, and if possible reducing the duty and relieving the people of Manitoba and the North-west. Let me read in this connection a letter which I received two or three days ago from a constituent of mine:

Pilot Mound, April 14th, 1897.

R. L. Richardson, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Owing to so many manufacturers' deputations having met the Tariff Commissioners since Messrs. Fielding and Paterson met the western people, at Winnipeg, it has been deemed advisable that each delegate write to the M.P. for the constituency in which he resides, to press the claims of the farmers' delegation on the Government and the House at the revision of the tariff. It will not be necessary to go over the