



*D. Williams*  
*M.P.*

# REPORT

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED by the HOUSE OF COMMONS

TO ENQUIRE INTO THE

# OPERATION OF THE TARIFF

ON THE

# AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THE DOMINION.

---

Printed by Order of Parliament.

---



OTTAWA:  
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER, & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.  
1883.

HF 1765

A 3

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 8th March, 1882.

*Resolved*, That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report to this House upon the operation of the Tariff on the Agricultural Interests of the Dominion; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and that the said Committee be composed of

Mr. Orton,  
Mr. Wallace (Norfolk),  
Mr. Bain,  
Mr. Trow,  
Mr. Coughlin,

Mr. White (Hastings),  
Mr. Landry,  
Mr. Benoit and  
Mr. Béchard.

Attest,

JNO. GEO. BOURINOT, *The Clerk.*

---

THURSDAY, 23rd March, 1882.

*Ordered*, That the said Committee have leave to employ a short-hand writer, to take down such evidence as they may deem necessary:

Attest,

J. G. BOURINOT, *The Clerk.*

---

---



---

## REPORT

Of the Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons to enquire into the operation of the Tariff on the Agricultural Interests of the Dominion.

---

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM, 4th May, 1882.

The Committee appointed by the House of Commons to enquire into the operation of the present Customs Tariff upon the Agricultural Interests of the Dominion, beg leave to report as follows:—

In order to obtain as wide and reliable evidence as possible, they sent a list of questions, as herewith annexed, to leading and representative agriculturists throughout the country; and in order to obtain impartial as well as correct information from this source, the Clerk of the Committee was instructed to send a copy to the reeves of the various municipalities and presidents of agricultural societies. It was only found possible to obtain the addresses of the reeves of Ontario, to each of whom he sent a copy, and these were supplemented by seven copies sent to each member of the House of Commons with instructions to forward them to the presidents of agricultural societies and other leading and intelligent farmers in their several constituencies. In the other Provinces the whole of the lists of questions were sent through members of the Commons to similar leading farmers. Your Committee further secured the personal or *viva voce* evidence of numerous witnesses engaged largely in agricultural pursuits, and of those engaged in supplying the farmer with farm implements and other manufactured goods in common use amongst them.

In order to ascertain by comparison the relative extent of the Canadian home market under the present protective Tariff and the Tariff in existence previous to 1879, carefully prepared tables were compiled from the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the years 1876-77 and 1877-78, and of 1879-80 and 1880-81; and in order to test effect of the Tariff on the value of farm products in the same years, a comparison was carefully made between our domestic markets and those foreign markets to which any surplus farm products are usually sent. Market prices were obtained from Corn Exchanges and Boards of Trade for two days in each month, *viz.*, 10th and 25th, in the years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881, in Liverpool, Chicago, New York, Toronto and Montreal; also the water and railway freights between Chicago and Montreal, Chicago and New York, and the ocean freights between New York and Liverpool.

It will be seen from the subjoined summary carefully taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns of the years 1876-77, 1877-78, 1879-80, and 1880-81 (1st) that a very large additional domestic market has been secured to the Canadian farmer as the result of the exclusion of American agricultural products from consumption in Canada; (2nd) that the carrying trade of foreign agricultural products in transit to Europe has been increased very largely in 1880 and 1881, as compared with 1877 and 1878; and (3rd) that though the consumption of United States farm products in Canada has decreased to the extent of over \$12,000,000 worth, the revenues collected on imported American farm produce was, for the years 1880 and 1881, \$1,347,967, as against \$514,679 collected in 1877 and 1878, being an increase of \$833,288.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of Imports of Agricultural Products.—Taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns.

	Imported not for Consumption and again Exported.				Entered for Consumption.					
	1877 and 1878.		1880 and 1881.		1877 and 1878.		1880 and 1881.			
	Quantity.	Value. \$	Quantity.	Value. \$	Quantity.	Value. \$	Duty. \$ cts.	Quantity.	Value. \$	Duty. \$ cts.
<i>Agricultural Products.</i>										
Barley .....	517,426	247,526	1,626	888	154,522	76,861		30,940	14,938	4,641 79
Buckwheat .....	8,068,607	4,013,075	10,111,525	4,954,862	7,575,979	3,782,097		152	93	15 22
Indian Corn .....	1,116,631	396,652	116,634	31,404	2,743,609	863,471		3,720,764	1,639,169	279,089 85
Oats .....	7,664	13,911	1,464	858	10,594	20,488		146,226	60,462	14,522 98
Peas and Beans .....	36,595	19,292	12,643	9,522	175,642	101,738		18,252	25,996	2,459 10
Rye .....	5,783,648	5,988,046	14,774,455	15,820,626	4,940,814	5,388,926		6,218	4,639	621 88
Wheat .....	27	24			1,338	1,437		86,828	62,040	13,019 63
Other grain .....										
Buckwheat meal .....										
Indian meal .....	569	1,738	890	3,660	520,623	1,496,119		18,438	2,697	221 65
Oatmeal .....	10	35	28	220	7,007	49,937		349,750	871,036	139,905 87
Rye flour .....					3,862	18,271		lbs.442,843	15,449	2,214 15
Wheat flour .....	10,648	56,672	50,088	249,331	852,938	4,773,702		224	1,080	112 06
Other meal and flour .....			827		5,875	16,834		299,380	1,453,985	149,691 95
Mill feed, bran, &c .....			147			19,623			32,310	6,448 14
									44,077	8,817 07
									4,247,187	625,419 94
<i>Green Fruit.</i>										
Apples and Pears .....	7,298	12,080	10,824	16,071	236,647	298,502		72,768	108,764	29,110 89
Grapes .....			5,000	365	842,502	69,501		992,740	67,440	14,196 07
Peaches .....					91,907	74,462		65,921	77,245	26,367 81
Other fruits, N.E.S. .....				300		179,654			309,846	60,284 79
									611,119	61,121 47
										129,959 66
<i>Animals.</i>										
Turned Cattle .....	2,002	193,209	275	32,215	13,176	304,808		11,041	276,659	55,326 05
Horses .....	63	20,122	92	17,640	3,052	124,024		1,711	82,605	16,521 00
Sheep .....			778	7,780	23,123	43,226		16,171	30,594	6,119 30





---

---

In regard to the admission of Indian corn free of duty, which many cattle breeders and feeders advocate, we may say that the evidence taken before your Committee would show that a very wide portion of Ontario is highly fitted for the cultivation of corn; and further, that it is a most valuable rotation crop. The large proportion of the evidence favors the duty on American corn and coarse grains generally, and expresses the opinion that better prices are obtained in Canada in consequence of the duties now imposed, and that the cultivation of coarse grains has been stimulated thereby. Finally, that it would be unjust to the large majority of Canadian farmers who raise coarse grains for sale to admit cheap western corn free of duty.

That the relative value of farm produce has increased in 1880 and 1881 as compared with Liverpool, may be seen by a comparison of market prices in Liverpool with the price lists of the Corn Exchanges in Toronto and Montreal, as shown by the following tables, as well as from a comparison of the freight rates by rail and water at different periods. This is especially the case with spring wheat. It may also be noted that prices seem to be ruled more by Liverpool during the four months of September, October, November and December, and that the prices which rule during the other eight months do not seem to be affected to a great extent by the Liverpool market.

LIVERPOOL PRICES.  
 STATEMENT showing average Quarterly and Yearly Market Prices from Semi-Monthly Quotations.  
 QUARTERLY.

	Flour, per bbl.	Red Wheat, per bush.	Red Winter, per bush.	White Winter, per bush.	Club, per bush.	Corn, per bush.	Barley, per bush.	Oats, per bush.	Peas, per bush.	Pork, per lb.	Lard, per lb.	Beef, per tierce of 304 lbs.	Bacon, per lb.	Tallow, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.
1877.															
1st Quarter.....	6 14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 57	1 59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 64	72 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	68	52	1 03	16 02	11	18 25	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
2nd do.....	7 68 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 71	1 87	1 89	1 89	73	68	52	1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	14 68	10	20 78 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9	14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
3rd do.....	6 50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 84 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 84 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 83 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 91	74 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	68	52	1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12 39	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	21 72	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9	12
4th do.....	6 50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 32 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 68	1 28	1 92 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	83	68	52	1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	13 20	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	22 06 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	14
1878.															
1st Quarter.....	6 61	1 55 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 69	1 80	1 86 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	84	75	52	1 05 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	13 10	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	20 65	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
2nd do.....	6 25 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 63	1 62 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 70	71	67	52	1 03 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	10 97	8	18 86	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12
3rd do.....	5 76	1 38	1 37	1 49	1 54 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	58 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	99	11 80	8	17 31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
4th do.....	5 43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 34	1 31	1 41	1 46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	69 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	43	94	10 36	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	17 43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	10
1880.															
1st Quarter.....	6 35	1 60 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 63 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 70	76 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	49	98 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	14 33	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	19 26 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
2nd do.....	5 08	1 46	1 52 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 48	1 53	70	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 19 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	15 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	17 09 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
3rd do.....	5 52 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 33 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 36	1 41	1 46	68	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48	1 03 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	15 83 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9	14 62	8	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	13
4th do.....	5 64 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 41	1 43	1 51	75	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48	1 02	17 33	10	15 29	8	8	14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
1881.															
1st Quarter.....	5 57 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 42	1 41	1 40	1 45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	74	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48	96 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	16 30 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	11	18 12	9	7	15
2nd do.....	5 29	1 33 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 41	1 35 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	70	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48	97 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	17 25 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12	20 38	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	13
3rd do.....	5 88	1 44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 52	1 51 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 56 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	72	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	49	1 02 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	18 21	13	22 51	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	12
4th do.....	6 22	1 53	1 53 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 30	1 57	73 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	60	49 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 02	18 65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	22 51	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9	12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>

YEARLY.

1877.....	6 71	1 61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 74 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 78 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 84	75 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	68	52	1 09	14 07 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	20 70 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9	14
1878.....	6 02 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 44	1 47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 63	1 64 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	71 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48	1 00 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	11 53 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	18 56 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
1880.....	5 65	1 45	1 46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 49	1 55	71 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 06	15 65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	16 56 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	8	14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
1881.....	5 76 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 47	1 40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	74	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 00 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	17 60 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12	28 88	10	8	13

**MONTREAL PRICES.**  
**STATEMENT showing Average Quarterly and Yearly Market Prices from Semi-Monthly Quotations.**  
**Q U A R T E R L Y.**

	White Winter, per bush.	Red Winter, per bush.	Spring Wheat, per bush.	Corn, per bush.	Rye, per bush.	Barley, per bush.	Oats, per bush.	Peas, per bush.	Flour, Sup. Ex., per bbl.	Flour, Strong Bakers, per bbl.	Lard, per lb.	Butter, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.	Ham, per lb.	Bacon, per lb.	Pork, per bbl. (200 lbs.)	Dressed Hogs, per 100 lbs.
<b>1877.</b>																	
1st Quarter	1 37½	1 33	1 37½	62	.....	62½	43	81	7 15	6 71	12½	24	14½	13½	.....	19 40	6 71½
2nd do	1 28	1 11½	1 29	62	.....	71	46½	96½	8 94	7 91	12½	21	12½	13	.....	17 91½	6 71½
3rd do	1 15½	1 19½	1 19	57	.....	65	39	85½	7 22½	6 48	11½	21	10½	13	.....	16 66½	6 71½
4th do	1 37½	1 33	1 24	60½	.....	63	30½	74	6 07½	5 73½	11½	21	12½	13	.....	17 21	5 75
<b>1878.</b>																	
1st Quarter	1 36	1 22	1 22	65	.....	65	29½	73	5 91	5 35	10	20	14½	10½	.....	14 37½	5 21
2nd do	1 25	1 32	1 11½	51	.....	58½	31½	77½	5 88½	5 20	9½	17	11	10	.....	12 92½	.....
3rd do	1 12½	1 04½	1 06½	49	.....	66½	29½	75	4 88½	5 18½	10	16	8½	12½	.....	13 46	.....
4th do	.....	0 87	0 88	46	.....	84	28	63	4 43	4 45	9	17	9	12	.....	12 21	3 87½
<b>1880.</b>																	
1st Quarter	1 18	1 27½	1 39½	62	0 83	65	32½	72½	6 18	6 52½	11	25	15	12½	10½	17 29	5 88½
2nd do	1 13½	1 11	1 22	61½	0 89	65	33½	79	5 80	6 55	11	22	13	11	10½	15 37½	.....
3rd do	1 15½	1 18	1 23	57	0 82	65½	33	74	5 43½	6 74	11½	24½	11½	12½	10½	17 92½	.....
4th do	1 15½	1 18	1 23	57	0 93½	72	33	76	5 38½	6 42½	12½	27	13	13	11	16 66½	6 50
<b>1881.</b>																	
1st Quarter	1 24½	1 26½	1 25	.....	.....	.....	36	74½	5 33½	6 21	13	26	14	13	11½	18 63½	7 51½
2nd do	1 35	1 36	1 35	56½	1 04	.....	39	80½	5 51½	6 19½	15½	21	11½	13½	12	20 50	.....
3rd do	1 35	1 35	1 35	67½	1 01	.....	41½	84½	6 21½	6 84	15½	24	11	14	12½	21 91½	.....
4th do	1 39½	1 43½	1 43	74½	0 98	83	40	82	6 29	7 56½	15½	25½	12½	14	13½	21 8	8 00
<b>Y E A R L Y.</b>																	
1877	1 37½	1 33	1 37½	60	.....	63	39½	84	7 25	6 70½	12	21½	12½	13	.....	17 80	6 23
1878	1 28	1 11½	1 29	52½	.....	68½	29½	73½	5 20	5 04½	9½	17½	10½	11½	.....	15 74½	4 87½
1880	1 15½	1 19½	1 19	57½	0 89½	67	33	77½	5 70	6 56½	11½	24½	13	12½	10½	16 79½	6 19½
1881	1 33	1 35½	1 32	66	1 01	83	39	80½	5 84	6 70½	15	24	12½	13½	12½	20 73½	7 15½

**TORONTO PRICES.**  
**STATEMENT showing Average Quarterly and Yearly Market Prices from Semi-Monthly Quotations.**  
**QUARTERLY.**

	Fall Wheat, per bush.	Spring Wheat, per bush.	Pears, per bush.	Barley, per bush.	Rye, per bush.	Oats, per bush.	Flour, Sup. F., per bbl.	Flour, Strong Bakers, per bbl.	Butter, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.	Pork, per bbl.	Lard, per lb.	Bacon, per lb.	Hams, per lb.	Hogs, per cwt.	Corn, per bush.	Red Winter Wheat, per bush.
<b>1877.</b>																	
1st Quarter.....	1 45 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 35	75	75 $\frac{1}{2}$	65	46 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 91 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 08	18	14	18 40	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 56 $\frac{1}{2}$	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....
2nd do .....	1 77	1 65	86	77 $\frac{1}{2}$	85	49	8 43 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 36	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 41 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	12	6 79	57	.....
3rd do .....	1 43 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 34	78 $\frac{1}{2}$	77	65	42	6 47 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 55	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 83 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 58 $\frac{1}{2}$	56 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....
4th do .....	1 28 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 13 $\frac{1}{2}$	69	65	65	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 70	5 30	15	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 58 $\frac{1}{2}$	10	8	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 79	55	.....
<b>1878.</b>																	
1st Quarter.....	1 26	1 07	66 $\frac{1}{2}$	63 $\frac{1}{2}$	62	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 71 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 20	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 71	9	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	10	5 08 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....	.....
2nd do .....	1 17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 06	70 $\frac{1}{2}$	57	60	33	5 05	4 83	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	13 25	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 95	.....	.....
3rd do .....	1 05	1 01 $\frac{1}{2}$	68	83	60	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 71	4 37 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	13 75	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	5 17	.....	.....
4th do .....	0 92 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 84 $\frac{1}{2}$	70	1 00 $\frac{1}{2}$	55	28	4 71	3 88 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	9	11 29	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 40	.....	0 86
<b>1880.</b>																	
1st Quarter.....	1 32	1 29	69 $\frac{1}{2}$	75	78 $\frac{1}{2}$	37	5 80	5 79	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	14	15 83 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	5 96	.....	.....
2nd do .....	1 21	1 25	72 $\frac{1}{2}$	71	80 $\frac{1}{2}$	37	6 06	5 70	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 35	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 00	.....	.....
3rd do .....	1 09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 13	70	68 $\frac{1}{2}$	71	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 08	5 36 $\frac{1}{2}$	15	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 66 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 00	.....	0 99 $\frac{1}{2}$
4th do .....	1 14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 11 $\frac{1}{2}$	67	86 $\frac{1}{2}$	85	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 85	5 30	20	14	17 50	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	6 83 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....	1 06
<b>1881.</b>																	
1st Quarter.....	1 12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 18	70	99	84	36	5 95	5 26	19	14	17 37 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	11	7 34	56	.....
2nd do .....	1 17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 20	76	86	89	39	6 15	5 36 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	20 12 $\frac{1}{2}$	14	10	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 33 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....	.....
3rd do .....	1 29	1 28 $\frac{1}{2}$	73	87	90 $\frac{1}{2}$	41	5 15	5 61 $\frac{1}{2}$	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	21 50	15	11	14	8 50	.....	.....
4th do .....	1 30 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 34 $\frac{1}{2}$	79	92	92 $\frac{1}{2}$	43	5 83 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....	19	13	22 50	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 91 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....	.....

**YEARLY.**

1877.....	1 48	1 36 $\frac{1}{2}$	77	73 $\frac{1}{2}$	70	43	6 88	6 57 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 31	11	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 43 $\frac{1}{2}$	56 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....
1878.....	1 10 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 99 $\frac{1}{2}$	68 $\frac{1}{2}$	51	59 $\frac{1}{2}$	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 54 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 57 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	13 25	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 15	.....	0 86
1880.....	1 19 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 19 $\frac{1}{2}$	69 $\frac{1}{2}$	76 $\frac{1}{2}$	79	36	4 57 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 28 $\frac{1}{2}$	17	13	16 08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	6 63 $\frac{1}{2}$	.....	1 02 $\frac{1}{2}$
1881.....	1 22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 25 $\frac{1}{2}$	74 $\frac{1}{2}$	91	89	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 77	4 03 $\frac{1}{2}$	18	13	20 37 $\frac{1}{2}$	14	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )	56	.....

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

STATEMENT of Average Prices of the Years 1877 and 1878 combined, and 1880 and 1881 combined, with comparison table between both periods.

LIVERPOOL MARKETS.

	White Fall Wheat.	Red Fall Wheat. 1878 only.	Spring Wheat.	Pens.	Barley.	Oats.	Flour, Sup. Ex.	Flour, S Bakers.	Cheese.	Lard.	Bacon.	Corn.	Pork, per barrel.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	\$ cts.
1877 and 1878...	1 70½	1 61	1 52½	1 04½	0 66½	0 50	6 36½	.....	12½	9½	8	73½	12 81½
1880 and 1881...	1 44½	1 48½	1 44½	1 03½	0 61½	0 48½	5 70½	.....	13½	10½	9½	73½	16 62½

TORONTO MARKETS.

1877 and 1878...	1 29	1880 only. 0 86	1 18	0 72½	0 62	0 37	5 96½	5 57½	12	9½	9½	55	15 28
1880 and 1881...	1 21	1 09½	1 22½	0 72	0 78	0 38	5 62	4 66½	13	12	12	56	18 23

MONTREAL MARKETS.

1877 and 1878...	1 32½	1 23½	1 33½	0 78½	0 65½	0 34½	6 22½	5 87½	11½	10½	.....	56½	16 77
1880 and 1881...	1 24½	1 27½	1 30½	.....	0 75	0 36	5 77	6 63½	12½	13½	11½	61½	18 76½

AVERAGE variations in prices between Toronto and Liverpool for 1877 and 1878, and 1880 and 1881.

	White Fall Wheat.		Red Fall Wheat. 1878 only.		Spring Wheat.		Pens.		Barley.		Oats.		Flour.		Flour.		Cheese.		Lard.		Bacon.		Corn.		Pork.	
	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.
1877 and 1878	41½	.....	61½	.....	44½	.....	32½	..	4½	.....	13	.....	27½	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	18½	.....	2 46½
1880 and 1881	23½	.....	41½	.....	21½	.....	31½	.....	.....	.....	10½	.....	8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1½	.....	.....	.....	17½	.....	1 60½

AVERAGE variations in prices between Montreal and Liverpool for 1877 and 1878, and 1880 and 1881.

	White Fall Wheat.		Red Fall Wheat.		Spring Wheat.		Pens.		Barley.		Oats.		Flour.		Flour.		Cheese.		Lard.		Bacon.		Corn.		Pork.	
	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Montreal.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Toronto.	Liverpool.	Montreal.
1877 and 1878	49½	.....	38½	.....	19½	.....	26½	.....	1	.....	16½	.....	14½	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1½	.....	.....	.....	17½	.....	3 96
1880 and 1881	20½	.....	21½	.....	13½	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12½	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2½	.....	.....	.....	11½	.....	2 14



In reference to the effect of large exportations of farm products on the general prosperity of the farmers and people generally, we submit the following comparison of exports from the Dominion of Canada of agricultural products, including animals and their products :

1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$22,436,071
1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,795,175
1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	29,238,457
1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	34,269,312
1875	-	-	-	-	-	-	29,958,865
1876	-	-	-	-	-	-	34,657,319
1877	-	-	-	-	-	-	28,909,993
1878	-	-	-	-	-	-	32,028,611
1879	-	-	-	-	-	-	33,729,068
1880	-	-	-	-	-	-	39,901,905
1881	-	-	-	-	-	-	42,628,545

It will be seen that in 1871, 1872 and 1873 the exports were much below the subsequent years, from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, yet business was prosperous in the former period and depression existed in the latter. Since the Tariff came into operation our people have not only supplied the additional home market of \$12,029,131, given by the exclusion of American farm produce, but have also exported very largely, which would lead to the conclusion that the protective Tariff had stimulated and encouraged the production of farm products.

The home demand and prices obtained for meat stuffs, butter, poultry and eggs, as well as fruit and vegetables, has been demonstrated by the evidence to be largely increased, as a result of the Tariff stimulating manufacturing industries and improving the condition of the mechanic and laboring man, as well as by the exclusion of American competition in many of these articles. Fruit growing has been especially benefitted and stimulated by the operation of the Tariff excluding foreign fruit which competed with Canadian grown. A wider area of land is yearly being devoted to fruit culture, and Canadian nurserymen find a much larger demand at profitable prices for fruit trees of every description which thrive in Canada. Indeed, from the rapidly increasing demand for fruit in Manitoba and the North-West, and from the fact that fruit trees do not thrive in that territory, it is evident that fruit growing will become more and more an important and remunerative branch of husbandry in the older Provinces.

The evidence before your Committee also shows that the interest on money frequently required to carry on farming operations is much lower since 1878 than perhaps was ever known formerly in Canada.

That the burden of taxation upon the farmer is relieved under the Tariff is evidenced by the amount of duties paid by the American people for the privilege of using our markets for farm produce, and by the fact, elicited by the evidence, that the foreign manufacturer gives a greater discount to the Canadian importer, equal very frequently to the amount of increased duties on manufactured goods. The general prosperity among all other industrial classes and the more constant employment at higher wages given to artisans and laborers tends to make these classes larger contributors to our revenue, and proportionately relieves the farming population.

The greater bulk of evidence taken shows that the price of manufactured goods in common use amongst farmers is increased to a barely noticeable extent; and that in many lines they are actually reduced in consequence of competition within the country and the improved facilities for manufacturing incident to the wider home market obtained by the manufacturer.

Witnesses were examined and other information obtained as to the Manitoba market, and it was apparent to your Committee, that previous to the present Tariff coming into operation, farm products of every description were largely imported from the United States, and injuriously affected the farmers of that Province as well as

---

those of the older Provinces, and that farm implements almost exclusively, and to a large extent other manufactures and merchandise, were brought in from the American side; that, in short, the chief trade of that country was in the hands of the people of St. Paul and other American towns. Immediately upon the present Tariff taking effect, large quantities of farm implements and other United States merchandise were stopped at Emerson, the gateway of the North-West, Canadian manufacturers and wholesale houses in the older Provinces began with vigor and enterprise to supply the increasing wants of that portion of our country, and to-day have possession of nearly the whole trade. The evidence further indicated that Ontario and the older Provinces are destined to become the busy workshops for the millions who will find prosperous homes in the vast and fertile regions of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, affording an ever-increasing market to the farmers of the older Provinces at their own doors, saving thereby commissions, interest on money, and freight incident to a dependence upon outside and distant markets.

The Ontario farmers, as a result mainly of the Tariff, now supply the demand for horses in that portion of our country, and to some extent also cattle and sheep. In the winter season, the almost total meat supply is obtained from Ontario in the shape of beef, mutton, hams, bacon, poultry, &c., also butter very largely. In the summer, cattle are driven in from the United States for slaughtering purposes, and pay a duty of 20 per cent. Large droves are also brought in to stock the ranches in the Canadian North-West, free of duty, being for breeding purposes, chiefly cows and calves, which are improved by higher grades of stock from the older Provinces and Britain. Your Committee are of opinion that the summer demand for the better grades of meats can be profitably supplied by the Ontario farmer, sending live fat cattle, sheep and lambs, the duty making up the difference of greater cost of freight.

We beg to submit a synopsis of the views of the farmers whose evidence was solicited throughout the Dominion, on the effect of the Tariff upon their industry, also of the Reeves of Ontario separately, by which it will be seen that a very large majority favor the present Tariff.

QUESTIONS.	General Replies —Total 720.		Ontario Reeves —Total 228.	
	For.	Against.	For.	Against.
Admitting American Indian corn duty free.....	195	339	67	135
do Farm produce generally, duty free.....	116	490	45	158
That the Tariff has beneficially affected prices of corn and coarse grain.....	280	115	104	43
Beneficially affected prices of Oats.....	304	59	96	13
do do Corn.....	244	12	81	5
do do Rye.....	131	34	47	12
do do Wheat and flour.....	295	176	99	63
That the Tariff has beneficially affected prices of live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard.....	480	79	161	28
That increased duties on horses and other live stock has improved market price by giving Canadians home market, especially in Manitoba and North-West.....	427	164	142	62
That horse breeding compares well with breeding other stock.....	457	83	171	18
Farmer raising his own grain to fatten stock (for) or importing American corn (against).....	468	193	149	72
Tariff improved market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter.....	378	204	119	76
Reciprocity with United States.....	419	156	145	46
Canada in better position to negotiate reciprocity than with former tariff.....	383	100	128	40
Tariff beneficially affected price of wool.....	129	270	31	103
Tariff fostered cultivation of flax, tobacco and sugar beet.....	87	60	27	15
Tariff not increased price or deteriorated quality* of farm implements.....	438	160	156	41
Tariff not increased price of woollens in common use among farmers.	389	172	148	53
Not increased cottons.....	348	225	131	70
Not increased hardware.....	351	192	133	58
Tariff increased and improved home market for farm produce.....	496	169	155	60
Tariff given diversity of employment and other encouragement to industrial classes, thereby retarding emigration to the United States, and encouraging Canadians to return to this country....	467	175	148	69
That there is an increased tendency for investment of capital in farm property under present Tariff.....	353	216	100	81
That the general condition of farmers and laboring classes has improved since 1878.....	612	46	198	11

\*NOTE.—The "General Replies" comprise answers from all parts of the older Provinces; 634 are English and 86 French. The Ontario Reeves are also included.

Witnesses before your Committee assert that the removal of the duty from tea and coffee is a boon to the farming community. Upon the whole we submit that from the evidence taken and obtained by your Committee, it appears that the present Tariff is eminently in the interest of the Canadian agriculturist.

All of which, with the evidence herewith appended, is respectfully submitted.

GEO. T. ORTON,

*Chairman.*

# EVIDENCE.

## THE OPERATION OF THE TARIFF

ON

## THE AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

SIR,—The Committee appointed by the House of Commons to enquire into and report upon the operation of the Tariff on the Agricultural Interests of the Dominion, address to you the following questions, to which they hope you will give careful consideration, and favor the Committee with a prompt reply:—

1. Would it be in the interest of agriculturists in Canada to admit any or all kinds of American farm produce free of duty? If so, why?
2. What has been the effect of the imposition of a duty on American Indian corn and other coarse grains upon the price of coarse grains in your section of country? Specify as to oats, rye, corn, barley and pease separately.
3. What has been the effect produced upon the price of wheat and flour by the duties imposed on these articles coming from the United States? Specify the effect on the different classes of spring and fall wheat?
4. What has been the effect of the increased duties on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard, upon the average price of these articles in the Canadian market?
5. Have the increased duties imposed on horses and other live stock improved the market price by giving the Canadians the home market, especially in Manitoba and the North-West?
6. Do you find it profitable to breed horses, and how do the profits compare with the profits on other stock, and where do you find your principal market for horses—in the United States or Manitoba?
7. Can the Canadian farmer raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock? Or would it pay better to import American corn?
8. Is the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter, improved through the effect of the present Tariff?
9. Would the Canadian farmer be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States? If so, are we in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff, or when American produce was admitted free?
10. What is the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool.
11. What effect, if any, has the Tariff upon the cultivation of flax, tobacco and sugar beet?
12. Is the cost of farm implements increased or decreased under the present Tariff, and is the quality as good? Specify articles.
13. Are woollens, cottons and hardware in common used amongst farmers increased or otherwise in price by the Tariff? If so, specify article or articles, and extent of increase, if any.
14. Has the home market for farm produce been on the whole increased and improved by the operation of the Tariff? If so, how?
15. Has the present Tariff given diversity of employment and other encouragement to our various industrial classes, and thereby retarded emigration to the United States, or encouraged Canadians to return to this country?
16. Is there an increased tendency for the investment of capital in farm property under the present Tariff? And have farm lands increased or decreased in value since 1878; and why?

17. Is the general condition of the farmers and of the labouring classes improved since 1878?

18. What changes, if any, in legislation are required to make agriculture a more desirable and profitable occupation?

## ANSWERS TO PRECEDING QUESTIONS.

1. I think it would not be in their interest to admit any.
2. I think it has had the effect of raising the price of all coarse grains, more especially of oats and rye.
3. In my judgment it has helped to raise the price of these products by giving the producers more control over their own markets. I think the price of spring wheat has been most beneficially affected, especially Scotch wheat, which is mostly produced in this section.
4. It has, without doubt given a better market and consequently better prices.
5. It has.
6. I find horses the most profitable stock to breed at present. I don't think they ever commanded a better price. A large number of horses have gone from here to the Manitoba market, and there is at present a good home market. There is also a good demand for draught horses for lumbering purposes.
7. I believe he can. I do not think it would pay better to import American corn.
8. I believe it has largely improved.
9. Probably he would—I think we are in a much better position now than formerly to negotiate.
10. I believe it has improved the market.
11. I cannot say as none of these are cultivated in this section.
12. I think they are cheaper now, and the quality is quite as good, if not better.
13. I do not think either woollen or hardware are increased. If anything woollens are cheaper. I have not observed any increase in cottons.
14. I believe it has. The purchasing power of the labouring classes has increased, and as a consequence the home market is much better.
15. I certainly believe it has.
16. I think so. They have largely increased in value. Money is more plentiful and there is a better market for farm products.
17. There is a very marked improvement.
18. With the exception of a reasonable increase in the duty on pork, I would not suggest any change at present.

S. S. DICKSON,  
Reeve, Township of Pakenham, Co. Lanark.

1. No.
2. The price of oats, corn and rye has been increased.
3. It has raised the price of hard spring wheat 10 cents per bushel.
4. The price of hams, bacon, lard, &c., has been increased 25 per cent.
5. Yes.
6. First class horses are shipped to Europe; the United States is our best market for ordinary horses.
7. Yes to the first question. It will pay the Canadian Farmer to raise his own coarse grain.
8. Yes. 9. Yes; Yes.
10. It has created a demand for our coarse wool for manufacturing, and will have a tendency to increase sheep husbandry.
11. No answer.

12. It has not increased the price of agricultural implements, and the quality is as good as before the tariff was raised, and has secured to us all the trade of the great North-West.
13. No.
14. Yes, by shutting out American produce.
15. Yes.
16. Yes. Yes, because there is a greater demand for farm lands.
17. Yes, by 25 per cent.
18. Stop tinkering at the tariff.

*General Remarks* :—On the whole the National Policy has been beneficial to the country generally, and has given the farmer, the manufacturer, and the miller the sole trade of the country, and has increased the wages of the laborer. In contradistinction to Grit misrule.

JOHNSTON BEATTY,  
President East Durham Agricultural Society.

1. It would be in their interest to admit Indian corn free of duty, because of its cheapness for fattening purposes. I do not see that it would make any difference whether other farm produce were free or not.
2. It has raised Indian corn in price by the amount of the duty; there is little or none raised for sale here, as it is a precarious and expensive crop. Oats, rye, barley and peas have not been affected by the duty.
3. I have not observed any effect.
4. I cannot speak for the general Canadian market; there are not enough hams, bacon or lard raised hereabout to supply the home market.
5. No.
6. It is not profitable here to breed many more horses than to make sure of enough for home use. Our principal market for them is the United States. Beyond as above cattle and sheep are more profitable to raise.
7. It would pay better to import American corn. 8. No.
9. Yes. I do not know whether we are in a better position to negotiate a treaty or not.
10. Wool has been low since the Tariff, but I do not think they have any connection.
11. There is little or no flax, tobacco and sugar beet raised in these parts.
12. Farm implements have been improving under all Tariffs ever since I began to use implements. I cannot separate cost caused by the Tariff from other cost, as the new implements differ from those used even a year or two ago.
13. There is not an advance in price of woollens, I think. White and grey cotton, shirtings, ginghams, ducks and canton flannels are dearer by 15 to 17 per cent. in consequence of the Tariff. Spades, shovels, hoes, forks, locks and screws are increased about 10 per cent by the Tariff. Nails and iron are much dearer, but I do not know what share of the increase is due to the Tariff.
14. It has not increased nor improved.
15. It has not. The emigration to the United States is very great and increasing. No Canadians are returning except to visit friends and take them with them.
16. No, there is not. Farm lands have not increased in price, but they are held little firmer since 1878, because the crops have been good, last crop having been the best in 40 years in these parts.
17. The condition of farmers has improved; of the labouring classes it has not—they are not so well off.
18. The changes needed are to run the Government more cheaply, to compel carriers by canals and railways not to discriminate against Canadians, and to leave farmers as free as possible to sell and buy where they please.

*General Remarks:*—These answers are only intended to apply to this section of country. I have little means of knowing how matters are in the other parts of Canada.

Wm. McKENZIE,  
Reeve, Township of Williamsburg, Co. Dundas.

1. I think not.
2. It has somewhat risen the price of our coarse grain, especially rye.
3. It has given us better price for our wheat, especially the coarsest kind of spring wheat.
4. It has risen the price of hogs and their produce considerable.
5. Yes.
6. I have more profit in raising improved cattles, heep and hogs than horses; the majority of our horses were sold to go to the United States until this spring; Manitoba is going to be our best market in the future.
7. Yes. Duty on corn has forced us to feed oil-cake and linseed meal, which is superior to any other feed for fattening stock and cheaper.
8. Yes.
9. I am somewhat doubtful whether Reciprocity would be a benefit to us just now, or for a few years, till we are established in our own trade. I consider that we are in a far better position, by the Tariff, to get Reciprocity.
10. It has risen it somewhat. 11. A good effect.
12. Somewhat less and of better quality.
13. Allowing the rise on the raw materials, they are cheaper under the Tariff.
14. Yes, because every person gets a full meal now.
15. Yes.
16. Yes. They have increased, but owing to the great emigration to Manitoba there is not a very great demand for improved farms just now.
17. Yes; very much.
18. I cannot think of any just now, except it may be desirable to add more duty on coal and corn.

*General Remarks:*—I think the great crowning effect of the Tariff is that it has established confidence in Canada.

LEWIS DAVIES,  
Farmer, J. P., Capt. Her Majesty's Service,  
Township of Smith, Peterboro'.

1. Yes. The duty no matter how great on foreign products does not increase the price of barley, wheat, oats and pease, which are the principal farm products grown in this vicinity, inasmuch as we raise a large surplus, which is exported; and the price for export determines the home price, and the free importation of foreign grain gives employment to our shippers both by rail and water.
2. We grow very little corn, not one tenth of what is required for home consumption; but our farmers find it pays them to import it and pay the duty and use it for feeding purposes. The duty is simply a burden on the farmers and does not increase in the slightest the price of our grains raised here.
3. No wheat or flour is imported here, and there never have been any importations of these articles, and the duty has not produced any effect whatever on the prices of these articles.
4. The duty on these articles has had no effect whatever on the price. Pork was lower here in 1879 when duty was first imposed, and for some months after, than was ever known. In consequence of low prices the farmers went out of pork-raising. Then followed a scarcity and high prices.

5. The duties on horses and live stock have had a tendency to give us the home market in Manitoba, but have not increased their market price. Most of these animals from this section are marketed in the United States, the Yankee buyers paying the best prices.
6. Horse breeding is carried on quite generally by our farmers, all on a small scale, however. The price has advanced in the United States where our principal market is, since the removal of the depression in that country, and now horse-breeding is profitable.
7. Our farmers find that it does not pay so well to feed their coarse grains, as corn. They feed damaged and unsaleable peas and barley, but when these grains are a good sample it pays to sell them and buy corn.
8. No. Our poultry and eggs go principally to the United States, our butter to England; we do not export many vegetables.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would benefit our farmers a great deal, but the present Tariff does not improve our prospects of getting it. When Sir John capitulated at Washington in 1871, we lost all chance of getting a Reciprocity Treaty.
10. Nothing. Wool was never lower than under the present Tariff.
11. None whatever. We do not cultivate flax, tobacco or the sugar beet.
12. Yes; for implements of the same description. The castings are much lighter than they were, and yet our mowers and reapers are somewhat dearer than more serviceable articles were under the old Tariff.
13. Yes. Cottons have advanced at least 20 per cent. We can buy in Buffalo better cottons to-day by the piece at 6 cents per yard than we can get here for 7½ cents. Our tweeds are also higher than in the United States. The same is true of axes, hoes spades and shovels.
14. We may have consumed at home more produce by reason of the present Tariff, but this increased consumption has not improved the price which is fixed, as Mr. Meredith stated in the Ontario Assembly, by its value for export; we being exporters, not importers.
15. The present Tariff has not been the means of establishing or stimulating our manufacturing establishments in the county of Haldimand, and consequently no diversity of employment has been afforded by it. It has not retarded emigration to the United States; several of our most valued citizens have gone to Dakota, not liking the C.P.R. monopoly and our land regulations in Manitoba and the North-West.
16. No. Farm lands have decreased; a large number of our farmers have thrown their lands on the market, wishing to go to the United States.
17. Prices have been generally good for our produce during the last year; but our fall wheat, which is our largest export, was almost a failure last year, and farmers were never shorter of money for ten years than at present.
18. The sweeping away of all unnecessary duties, and the adoption of a Tariff for purposes of revenue only. The present system enables the manufacturers to use the storekeepers as publicans to gather taxes from the farmers for the benefit of the favored few, while the duties put upon farm produce are a mere delusion and snare and mockery, and an insult to the intelligence of agriculturists. Should you require any further information, I am at your service.

D. T. ROGERS,  
Reeve, Co. Haldimand.

1. It would not be to the interest of Canada to admit American farm produce free.
2. It has caused the the farmer to prepare the soil to raise all the different kinds required to their benefit.
3. It has increased the prices. 4. Increased the prices.
5. Has increased the price of horses and other live stock.

6. I think there is more profit raising cattle and sheep than horses.
7. Can raise it with a profit; encouraging industry.
8. Improved. 9. No. 10. None. 11. Increase on all.
12. Quality is good, number increased and cheaper for reapers, mowers, harvesters, thrashing machines and clover mills.
13. Yes; on cotton only. 14. Yes.
15. Encouraging labourers to return to Canada.
16. Light increase. 17. Yes.
18. Protect the farmer with a protecting duty, and the manufacturers and the labouring class will be benefitted.

Yours respectfully,

ADAM H. SAYLOR,  
Manufacturer, Co. Prince Edward.

1. Admit none except corn as it is valuable for feeding stock.
2. It has raised the price of barley and peas. Corn is not much raised in this section.
3. It has increased the price of wheat and flour materially.
4. The effect has been beneficial to the farmer. The farmer was never in a general good state of prosperity than at the present time.
5. Yes, it has opened up a first-class market for our horses especially.
6. Yes it pays to breed good heavy horses and our market is Manitoba.
7. I think Indian corn should be admitted free, or a less duty, as we are not a corn growing county, and it is valuable feed for stock.
8. Yes, much improved indeed.
9. I do not think Reciprocity would better our condition, and we are in a much better position now than if American produce was admitted free.
10. No particular change. Wool is not commanding a good price.
11. I have no experience in this matter.
12. They are as cheap as before, and at least 15 per cent. a better article, especially reapers, mowers and ploughs, &c. Therefore they are cheaper.
13. No.
14. Yes, materially, by protecting and fostering our home industries.
15. It has done much for the poor man and retarded emigration to the States.
16. Yes, and farm lands have increased on account of good prices and good crops. And stock of all kinds commanding a good price.
17. Yes, quite evident.
18. No particular changes; encourage emigration so as to make labour more plentiful, also importation of good stock.

JOHN MORGAN,  
J. P., ex- Reeve and Warden Co. Middlesex.

1. No. American Indian corn only. This we cannot grow successfully, soil not strong enough.
2. Serious effects on Indian corn only; we cannot grow any other kind of grain at the price American Indian corn would cost us, if no duty were imposed. Farmers would make money by growing other kinds of grains and exchange them for Indian corn. A duty should be imposed upon all other kinds of coarse grains, as we can grow them successfully at home.
3. Do not know. 4. Have not studied this market.
5. I think so.
6. Cannot say, I am no breeder. Ask Moses Springer, ex-M.P.P., he knows.
7. Pay better by 100 per cent. to import Indian corn if no duty were imposed.

8. Do not know.
9. Better position with a high Tariff to negotiate such a treaty.
10. Do not know. 11. Do not know.
12. I do not believe that the Tariff had any effect upon the cost of this branch of manufacturing industry; as good as any American at least.
13. Yes; hardware for building has increased about 20 per cent.
14. Do not know.
15. The Tariff has improved the manufacturing industries by 100 per cent., and should on many articles be increased rather than decreased. It has stopped emigration among mechanics successfully, and in some instances has caused among mechanics emigration to Canada from the United States.
16. I do not believe that the Tariff has any effect upon farm property in any way.
17. I do not believe that the Tariff has anything to do with the condition of farmers, unless it can take the place of Divine Providence and give good crops. Public works have improved the condition of labourers very much.
18. None that I know of.

J. M. STAEBLER,  
Reeve of Berlin, Co. Waterloo.

1. No.
2. A great advance in the price of oats and peas, also rye.
3. Has held the price of wheat and flour firm since the Tariff came into operation.
4. The effect has been very great on all kinds of meats.
5. They have.
6. It pays well now to raise horses, I think, better than any other stock. Heavy horses go mostly to the States the lighter ones to Manitoba.
7. The want of coarse grain has been a drawback to fattening cattle for export trade I think it would pay to import American corn free of duty.
8. It is, and I feel great satisfaction, and am well pleased.
9. I think they would as the duty on barley alone would counterbalance the most of other things not speaking of horses, cattle and sheep. I think we are in a better position now; if not we can live as it is.
10. To my mind not very much. The price has been low since the Tariff took effect.
11. No answer.
12. Decreased. Can buy reaping machines now at \$90 that used to cost \$110, can buy horse rakes now for \$28 that used to cost \$35.
13. No.
14. Most decidedly it has, by higher prices for almost everything we have to sell.
15. It has certainly.
16. There is. Farm lands have greatly increased; the reason why is higher prices for farm produce.
17. Very much so indeed.
18. Let well enough alone, I for one am satisfied.

*General Remarks*:—Dear Sirs,—I think it would be an advantage to import corn free for the following reasons: We have protection on pork, but all kinds of grain is dear, wherein if corn was free we would have cheap feed and dear pork. The duty is quite low enough on fruits and vegetables, I would rather see it higher.

EVOR LEONARD,  
Farmer and Fruit Dealer, Co. Northumberland.

1. No, I should say not. We can raise all we want and keep the capital at home to stimulate our own industries.
2. It has raised the price of corn in Canada, and there is more raised and enough for all use for feeding. Oats are a better price. Rye is better.

3. Wheat is a better price; and we have kept our flour market.
4. Increased price for pork. We feed our hogs and retain our profits at home much better.
5. The prices of horses have increased lately very much; some go to Manitoba and others to the American side.
6. Beef and mutton, they are the most profitable going to English market. On the frontier the most of the horses go to the Americans.
7. We can raise all we want now, because we would send the money out of the country to stimulate the Western States farmers.
8. Yes.
9. Leave them alone; we can take care of ourselves.
10. I cannot answer.
11. Sugar should help us very much. Husband our means again.
12. They are as good and have become cheaper.
13. The woollens are no dearer. Hardware is a trifle dearer.
14. Yes.
15. Yes. I should say that our people have been kept at home for home employment at their own doors. Many have come back.
16. Yes. 17. Yes.
18. Let the Ship of State alone; she is sailing very well. I have no fears for Canada or the Canadians.

*General Remarks:*—My honest belief is the more tinkering there is done with the Tariff, the more you weaken the Government. If you want to kill the Government, destroy the N. P.

D. J. LOWREY,  
Farmer, Fruit-grower and Miller, Co. Lincoln.

1. I cannot say that it would be any advantage to this section.
2. Oats, rye and peas are worth more on an average, 5 to 10 cents.
3. Has a tendency to increase the price of spring wheat.
4. These articles are higher in price since the imposition of duty.
5. Horses and live stock have increased in value; we can't compare prices with those of United States.
6. It is now profitable to breed stock other than horses; principal market United States and Montreal.
7. Farmers can here raise all that is required for fattening stock cheaper than they can import corn.
8. Yes. Particularly in localities near manufacturing towns.
9. I think we are better without Reciprocity—we are in a better position to negotiate now than before.
10. Better.
11. Don't grow any in this section. 12. Decreased.
13. Increase, if any, so slight as to be immaterial.
14. Owing to the increased demand for labour, and the greater purchasing power of the people, agriculturists have been benefited thereby.
15. It certainly has, all labourers fully employed and at better prices.
16. There is an increased tendency to invest in farm property. Land has increased in value owing to good crops, more money, lower interest, and a more secure feeling generally.
17. Yes. Greatly improved.
18. Do not know of any change required.

JAS. S. FOWLDS,  
Reeve, Grain and Lumber Merchant, Co. Northumberland.

1. No.
2. It has raised the price of each kind.
3. It has not changed the prices as much as on coarse grain.
4. It has raised the price. 5. I think so.
6. The profits on other stock is better in this section.
7. He can raise enough to fatten his own stock.
8. It has improved. 9. He would not be. 10. Raised the price.
11. Could not say. 12. Think not increased.
13. Not increased. 14. It has. 15. It has.
16. Yes, and farms have increased in value on account of better prices for produce.
17. Yes. 18. No answer

JAMES H. KNOX,  
Reeve, Marysburgh, Co. Prince Edward.

---

1. I think it would not, they would take the place of our coarse grains which we can raise ourselves.
2. It has increased the price of all of our coarse grains, such as oats, peas, barley and rye. We do not raise any corn around this neighborhood of any account.
3. It has given us a better market for our fall wheat, also for our flour; our wheat is ground at home and the flour is shipped to Montreal and the Lower Provinces, which before, the American flour came in there and took the place of our flour, it has not raised the price of flour materially, but it has given the millers a market for to sell in, our wheat is now ground at home, and the flour is consumed in our own provinces instead of shipping it away to foreigners.
4. The price of pork is gone up, hams, bacon and lard, have increased in price also; our pork is now consumed in Canada, instead of the American pork; it gives our Canadian farmers a chance to breed and raise their own hogs, and they have a market at home instead of sending it away to other nations.
5. I consider it has increased the price of horses and other live stock wonderfully, horses and cattle have gone up one-third more in value this last year in particular; demand for horses and cattle in the North-West is great around these parts; car loads are going away every day for Manitoba; at good prices.
6. No answer.
7. The farmers around here are capable of raising all the coarse grains required to fatten their stock, and have a surplus left to sell. It pays the farmer best to raise his own grain to fatten his stock instead of buying corn. If corn from the United States came in free of duty it would take the place of some of our coarse grains, such as peas, barley and oats, and our coarse grains would have to be sold to buy the corn, and our grain would undoubtedly come down in price.
8. I have not looked into this question.
9. I think the Canadian farmer would be benefitted by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I think the present government is in a better position at present to negotiate.
10. I am not prepared to answer this question.
11. No answer.
12. I have not seen any difference in farm implements as regards the prices, they stand nearly about the same as in former years, the quality is just as good now as in other years.
13. They have not increased in value under the present Tariff, as far as I have had any dealing with the said articles.
14. It has; we have a market for our farm produce at home, before American produce came in our market and took the place of ours to a certain extent, so that we had to look for foreign markets to dispose of our surplus.

15. Manufactures of all kinds have started up since the present Tariff came in force, and have given employment to all our mechanics, instead of getting employment in the United States, and have encouraged our Canadian young men to come back to get employment in Canada.
16. Farm lands have decreased in value since 1878, I am now speaking of farms around here. There are a great many farmers leaving for the North-West and it has had the tendency to bring down the prices of farms in this neighbourhood, from \$10 to \$15 per acre.
17. It has improved greatly.
18. I do not see that it requires any changes in legislation to make agriculture more desirable.

*General Remarks*:—I have not studied up the different questions or I would have answered them more accurately. Questions 6, 10 and 11, I am not prepared to answer, as I have not studied up the questions, but I have answered the most of them, as I thought right in my own estimation and knowledge

C. S. SMITH,  
Esquising, Co. Halton.

1. No.
2. It has had the effect of raising all kinds of coarse grain.
3. Am not fully prepared to give my opinion.
4. Prices remain about the same. 5. Yes.
6. (1st) Yes. (2nd) Ten per cent. better. (3rd) Manitoba.
7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. No. Yes. 10. About the same.
11. Not grown in this section. 12. Cost a trifle less. 13. About the same.
14. Been increased. 15. Yes. 16. Increased. 17. Yes.
18. Keep in the Tory Government.

JAMES TAYLOR,  
Farmer, Lansdowne, Co. Leeds.

1. It would not be to the interest of agriculturists to admit American farm produce free of duty.
2. It has made a better demand and advanced the price of coarse grains, oats, rye, corn, barley and peas.
3. I cannot give a really intelligent answer to this question.
4. It has given us our own market, a better price and a better article of food than that imported from the United States; and I hope that duty will be maintained.
5. It has, very decidedly.
6. The profits on breeding good horses are about the same as on first class cattle; Manitoba is our market now.
7. We had better grow roots and peas and oats than to import.
8. Yes.
9. I am not sure about the effect of Reciprocity; but I am sure we are in a much better position now.
10. Not much change.
11. I am not sure, as we do not cultivate them to any extent.
12. The cost is a trifle less in most cases; ploughs are less, so are mowers, also reapers; in fact, in this township we think we get most implements 5 per cent. less and of better quality.
13. No; prices are about the same with a good deal less of American shoddy.
14. It has been very much increased and improved: 1st, by giving us our own market; 2nd, by starting up dormant and new industries, and giving constant work to the mechanic. He is able to buy our produce.

15. Yes! a thousand times yes!!
  16. There is a healthy growing demand for good farms at advanced prices. In 1878 interest was 10 per cent., and no person would put money in farms. Now, 6 per cent. is the rate, and there is a strong tendency to invest in farms and farming
  17. As kings are to serfs, so is the condition of farmers and laborers now, compared to 1878.
  18. Good stock laws, cheaper ocean freight on cattle, horses and farm produce, encourage beet sugar, keep out diseased cattle, keep the price of money at 6 per cent., no bankrupt Acts, low salaries, give us a free sheet and a fair field and farming will be both desirable and fairly profitable.
- General Remarks* :—Keep in a good honest Government.

WM. A. WEBSTER,  
Reeve, Landsdowne, Co. Leeds.

1. Canadians producing in excess of the home demand—it makes no difference how much comes in, the prices being governed outside. But their introduction benefitting the carrying trade, indirectly benefits all classes.
2. Oats, rye, barley and peas have not improved in price since 1877-78. The consumption of corn has decreased since the introduction of the present Tariff.
3. None, for the reason given above that prices are governed from the outside.
4. Owing to the previously depressed state of the lumber market, the production of these articles has much diminished; but within my knowledge much higher prices have been realized for these articles than at present.
5. No. Whatever small increase there is, must be credited to the increased demand by the lumbermen.
6. Do not engage in it.
7. Not coarse grains. Importing corn for the purpose would be a benefit.
8. No.
9. 1. Yes. 2. No; from the fact that a sensitive people are not easily moved by threatened or actual retaliation, and the Washington Treaty lost us our best lever.
10. The value of Canadian-grown wool has decreased about 100 per cent.; and if the Tariff is credited with advances on some articles, it must be debited with the loss on others.
11. Cannot say—none grown in this neighborhood.
12. Prices slightly higher; articles not so good, being made lighter. Ploughs, reapers, mowers, thrashers and cultivators.
13. Woollens and cottons—but especially the latter—are largely increased.
14. No. 15. No visible effect here.
16. No. Decreased.
17. Yes; owing to the better harvests; and would have been still better under the former fiscal policy.
18. Trade, commerce and agriculture will doubtless be better left alone.

*General Remarks* :—Farmed in this neighborhood for over fifty years, and at the same time dealt in all kinds of produce since 1872, have relinquished farming and confined myself to grain dealing. Am certain that I could not now realize as much for my farm by 100 per cent., as when I sold in 1872, whilst the cost of living has considerably increased.

JAMES WALLACE,  
Grain Dealer, Almonte, Co. Lanark.

1. It might if ours were admitted by them on the same terms.
2. Greater demand, prices advanced, sales more easy since the lumber got scarce here; coarse grains fell, but these two years a great market has sprung up. In 1878, rye, 50 cents; peas, 55 cents; oats, 25 cents. In 1881, rye, 85 cents; peas, 80 cents; oats, 40 cents; beans, \$2.
3. We are now producing more wheat than we use; good markets, good prices, a little advance.
4. Pork much dearer, farmers can now raise it at a profit.
5. Horses never sold as well as now, nor beef cattle for Manitoba and England, but a large home market.
6. Yes; yes; both.
7. Yes, we are far better since less corn was imported.
8. Everything of this nature sells well.
9. Believe Free Trade would be beneficial where terms are equal, our farmers do not fear American competition.
10. Wool has been selling at rather low prices this long time; do not think the Tariff made much change either way.
11. No flax or sugar beet grown here, considerable tobacco; the farmers should be allowed to grow this, and twist, and sell it the same as other farm produce.
12. Mowers, reapers, rakes, ploughs, drills, &c., have decreased; the demand nearly doubled for thrashing machines. Also, I am not aware of any increase of price on anything.
13. Have not advanced in price; where some three or four years ago they bought inferior goods at low prices, they now buy best goods, having more money to spare.
14. Increased very much; every few miles along the Ottawa River storehouses are built, and quick and good prices the rule.
15. Yes, every one can find employment; wages 50 per cent. higher; emigration to United States stopped—many are returning and stopping here now.
16. Capitalists are more willing to lend on farm property; lands have increased since 1878, especially improved farms, over one-third in value.
17. Improved certainly, like a change from darkness to sunshine.
18. Remove the tax of 14 cents per lb. on home grown twist, allow our farmers to sell this the same as any other product, it recoups the manufacturers; the revenue is small from this. Many here grow it for their children, the children work it, get the produce, and it seems hard to make young Canada pay this tax on their little frocks and boots.

*General Remarks:*—Our farmers here are quite happy and contented, and are constantly comparing the present with past times, where this is talked of, the good times are in five cases out of six attributed to the change of Government in 1878, so no change is wanted here.

JOHN TYTLER,  
Reeve and Warden U. Cos. Prescott and Russell.

1. Certainly not. It would be detrimental to the interest of farmers to permit the Americans to flood our markets with coarse grain.
2. It has increased the quantity of oats consumed, and consequently the demand for them has not increased the price of oats, as the increased demand has caused a greater quantity to be grown. Has increased rye about 30 cts. per bushel.
3. Has given a steadier market, and given us a better price for spring wheat.
4. Increase about 2 cts per lb., and induced to increase their hog crop.
5. Yes. 6. About the same quantity shipped to each market.
7. Yes; we can raise all the peas we require and supply the demand. Pea-feed is superior for fattening animals than corn-feed.
8. Price of butter, certainly.

9. I think the farmer is doing well under the present Tariff. We certainly are in a better position to treat with the Americans, because they respect us now.
10. Price of wool has increased; here about 5 cts. per lb.
11. Not grown much in this locality.
12. Mowing machines, reapers and drills, cheaper and quality better.
13. No. 14. Certainly improved. 15. Yes.
16. About the same, from the fact that other fields have been opened in the North-West.
17. Certainly; from the fact that money is kept at home instead of being sent to the States for our supplies.
18. No answer.

P. C. STRICKLAND,  
Reeve of Wakefield, Co. Peterboro'.

1. No.
2. Good on all coarse grains. On oats, rye, corn, peas and barley—all better prices here.
3. Has brought better prices on flour, Red Winter wheat, and what we call Five spring wheat.
4. Has had a good effect on all, as it brings better prices for the farmer, and it encourages, so that more is produced.
5. Yes; to a large extent. The eastern American cities in the States, and Winnipeg in Manitoba, have men in different places in Ontario buying horses and paying good prices for them.
6. Yes; it pays. The Eastern States, Winnipeg and other places in the North-West.
7. The Canadians can raise all that is necessary. Think better not to import any corn, as it would discourage our farmers here.
8. Yes. 9. I think not.
10. Cannot say so well on that. But think had a good effect, as it will in the end produce more woollen manufactories in the country here.
11. Good.
12. Think the cost has not increased. There is an increase of manufactories, which causes competition in reapers, mowers, seed drills, thrashing machines, ploughs, and in fact all implements.
13. No lower than formerly.
14. Yes; by stimulating the farmers to produce more.
15. Yes; it has.
16. They have increased, and will show it more after the North-West excitement is over.
17. Yes.
18. This all important question, I must confess, I am not prepared just now to properly answer, as our legislation has been good on this point so far.

*General Remarks*;—Taking things as a whole, on the protective Tariff, since the National Policy came into operation, I think it has done good for the whole Dominion of Canada.

JOHN CLUNAS,  
Farmer and Justice of the Peace,  
South Dorchester, Co. Elgin.

1. Not to the interest of agriculturists in Canada.
2. It has raised the price of coarse grain, oats, rye and peas especially.
3. Wheat has been steady and good prices since 1878.
4. It has raised the prices of those articles.

5. It has given us the Manitoba market.
6. Horses are in good demand.
7. Better to raise grain than to import. We fatten stock with our own grain.
8. Yes; certainly the prices are better.
9. We are in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. No answer.
11. We do not raise those articles in our locality.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased under the present Tariff. It is also improved.
13. The prices of those goods are not increased.
14. Most certainly the home market has been increased by the present Tariff.
15. Yes, the present Tariff has given more employment to the people.
16. The price of farm property has increased.
17. Yes, the general condition of farmers and labouring classes is improved since 1878.
18. The present legislation is doing very well.

WALTER GOVAN,  
Seymour, Co. Northumberland.

- 
1. No.
  2. Oats an increase of from 10 cents to 15 cents per bushel; rye, an increase of 20 cents per bushel; barley, an increase of 20 cents per bushel; peas, an increase of 15 cents per bushel.
  3. On the whole the effect on spring wheat has been advantageous, rather better on spring than fall wheat. Tariff a benefit.
  4. From 3 cts. to 3½ cts. per pound.
  5. Yes.
  6. It is profitable to breed horses, but not so much so as other live stock. United States for heavy draught; Manitoba for general purposes.
  7. Can raise with profit all grain required to fatten stock.
  8. Yes.
  9. Cattle command a higher price than they did heretofore.
  10. Fine wool not a good effect. Coarse wool market not so much affected.
  11. Good.
  12. Price not increased. Material better.
  13. Woollens and cotton not increased. Hardware on the whole no increase.
  14. Yes; by home consumption.
  15. Yes.
  16. Owing to the emigration to the North-West, farm property has not increased in value. Rates on investments by capitalists are lower.
  17. Yes.
  18. No change required.

*General Remarks:*—The farming community in this Province have been greatly benefitted by the present policy, and also the mechanics and laborers.

NEIL McCALMAN,  
J.P. and Reeve, Collingwood, Co. Grey.

- 
1. Certainly it would not.
  2. We obtain a better price for oats, barley and peas.
  - 3, 4 and 5. No answer.
  6. Montreal is the principal market. From there they are shipped to the United States.
  7. Certainly; they can raise a great deal more grain than they require for their stock.
  8. Butter in 1878 would not realize more than 10 cents per pound. In 1881 increased to 20 cents.
  9. The Canadian farmer, I believe, would be benefitted by a Reciprocity Treaty, and I also believe we are in a better position at present to negotiate terms.
  10. The wool is a better price.
  11. No answer.

- 
12. No change noticeable in the price of implements in this section of the country.
  13. They are not. 14. It has been increased and improved.
  15. To a certain extent it has, and employment is more readily obtained.
  16. Farm lands have increased in value, and farms find ready purchasers.
  17. Certainly they have.
  18. Long live the Premier Sir John A. Macdonald.

FARQUHAR McLEOD,  
Reeve, Lancaster, Co. Glengarry.

---

1. No; it would bring us into competition with the American agriculturist, which would not be for our benefit.
2. The effect of a duty on Indian corn has been the means of giving us a home market and better prices for oats, corn, barley and peas; don't know as to rye.
3. The effects produced on the prices of wheat have tended to keep the prices more uniform for both, and moreover have prevented fluctuation in the market, and also given us a market in the Maritime Provinces.
4. The effect of the duties on live hogs and dried meats has given the increase at home, but I believe the farmers would be more benefitted by adding more duty, especially on live hogs, for it affects our beef market.
5. The increased duty imposed on horses and other live stock has not advanced their prices here as I know of.
6. We do find it profitable to breed horses. Comparing profits with other stock the horses to-day would have the advantage. The principal market for horses here is the United States.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required for fattening stock. Cannot see why it is necessary to import American corn for that purpose.
8. Cannot see that the present Tariff has any effect in raising the price of vegetables in our part of the country. There is no manufacturing here. It would be an advantage to have the duty off poultry, eggs and butter, but so long as the Americans retain the duty on such articles, I think we should meet them with the same duty.
9. I believe the Canadian farmer would not be benefitted by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, as we are in a much better position now than when we had a Reciprocity Treaty, and without doubt the Government are in a much better position to negotiate a treaty with some such thing as the present Tariff than without it.
10. Don't exactly know. 11. Don't know.
12. The cost of farm implements has not increased, besides we are getting a much better article than we used to get.
13. The woollens and hardware goods used amongst the farmers are not increased in price by the Tariff, but cotton goods has increased somewhere about from 10 to 12 per cent.
14. The home market for farm produce has been increased by the Tariff for grains of all kinds, especially by giving us a market we could not otherwise have had without it.
15. The present Tariff has given increased employment to farm labourers, and increased wages to about 25 per cent. Don't know much about emigration. All the emigration from here has been to Manitoba or the North-West Territories, which has been the great cause of the rise in wages.
16. There is an increased tendency now for the investment of capital in farm property, especially amongst farmers, an undeniable increase in value of farm property since 1878.
17. It undoubtedly has.

38. In my opinion, if any legislative changes take place for the benefit of the farmer, it would be an increased protection, and especially in keeping money easy, as thereby improvements take place that cannot otherwise be obtained when money is high.

JOHN McKERCHER.

Rceve, Winchester, Co. Dundas.

1. No; decidedly unfair, unless reciprocated.
2. It has enhanced the price of all kinds of coarse grains with us.
3. Spring and fall wheat have met with a readier sale at advanced prices. There is no local trade for flour from the States with us.
4. Prices here are very much influenced by the Chicago market.
5. Yes; the market has advanced materially, and especially on horses.
6. Yes; we find it more profitable in breeding horses than cattle, although the local trade for cattle has improved very much.
7. He can; and it is to his advantage in using the coarse grain on his own stock. We do not want corn free.
8. Not much improvement in price. Butter is exported direct to England. Present Tariff is acceptable.
9. It might be an advantage if certain ports were closed in both countries, otherwise prefer present arrangement.
10. There is a better local trade for our wool.
11. Cannot say; not cultivated in these counties.
12. All kinds of farming implements improved in quality and not increased in price.
13. No general increase in price; a little fluctuation at times, owing to the raw material.
14. Has improved very much through the greater consumption, ready sales and advanced prices.
15. It has had a very encouraging effect and encouraged Canadians to remain in this country.
16. Farming lands have increased in value since 1878, but not in the same ratio they would in consequence of the great inducements held out for settlers in the North-West, although every man that sells finds a Canadian or British buyer.
17. The general condition of both classes has materially improved since 1878; money plenty and good wages.
18. Cannot advise any changes; am perfectly satisfied with present Tariff, and hope there will not be any relaxing on any one article, and strongly urge an export duty on elm, ash, pine, spruce, hemlock, cedar, and any other unmanufactured logs or timber.

SAMUEL AULT,

Farmer and J. P., Osnabruck, Co. Stormont.

1. No. 2. Beneficial.
3. The price of spring wheat has been rendered worth about as much as fall, or an advance of 10 cents per bushel.
4. This market has always been a good one for hog products.
5. The market is decidedly improved, and many horses &c., now go from here to Manitoba.
6. No answer. 7. Yes; no. 8. Better. 9. No answer.
10. None as yet. 11. None hereabouts. 12. No. 13. No.
14. Yes. By increased home demand. 15. Yes.
16. Rather decreased, but that is owing to the Manitoba fever.
17. Yes; especially the latter.
18. Increased home markets and home demand is what the farmer wants.

*General Remarks*:—The National Policy is doing much good and will do more in the future, if maintained.

HENRY COLLINS.

Warden of the County of Peterboro'.

1. It would not.
2. Price of coarse grain not affected except in time of scarcity, excepting oats.
3. The effect has been that when the stocks of wheat have been sold too low the price is increased to the few who have held.
4. We think the duties have increased the price, to what extent we are unable to decide.
5. The demand until very recently has been mainly from the United States; the present demand for Manitoba has, of course, increased the price. We are unable to say what effect the duties may have upon the price.
6. At present prices the breeding of horses would be very profitable.
7. We can, of course, raise all the coarse grain required to fatten our stock, but there are times when it would be a great advantage to be able to import American corn.
8. Not with us.
9. Yes, think we are, but cannot tell the feeling of the Americans as to that.
10. Not affected; duties on long wool absurd.
11. None whatever with us.
12. Price not increased; quality improving every year.
13. Cannot say that prices have increased.
14. It has to some extent. Where factories have been established there are more consumers.
15. To some extent it has.
16. There is not at present on account of the Manitoba fever. Farm lands have not increased for the above reason.
17. Yes, largely.
18. Farmers require the affairs of the country to be honestly administered by competent men, as to the rest we can take care of ourselves.

R. CLARKE,	}	Cramahe, Co. Northumberland
Reeve.		
E. COCHRANE,		
Deputy Reeve.		
J. W. PHILIP,		
Councillor.		
WM. PICKWORTH,		
Councillor.		

1. It would not.
2. It has increased the price of coarse grains.
3. It has increased the price of flour and fall and spring wheat.
4. Raised the value.
5. Yes.
6. Yes. Both in United States and Manitoba.
7. He can. It would not.
8. Yes.
9. Yes; better position under present Tariff.
10. Not much raised here.
11. None here.
12. No increase in cost and equally as good.
13. No increase.
14. It has. By the prevention of American produce coming in.
15. It has.
16. No answer.
17. It has.
18. None.

*General Remarks*:—In answering question (16) I would say that owing to the great emigration of farmers to Manitoba, it has had a tendency to lower the value of land just at the present time in this locality.

A. FRASER,  
Reeve, Thorold, Co. Welland.

1. I think it would not.
2. It has raised the price of our coarse grain, particularly oats, corn and pease, rye and barley also bring remunerative prices.
3. The price of wheat at the present time under the present Revenue Law, compares favorably with former years.

4. To increase the price in a very limited degree ; prices here remain about as previously.
5. I think it has; prices for horses here vary from \$100 to \$150, well fed cattle also command a high figure.
6. It has been found profitable, and quite a trade has been carried on in this County in such traffic.
7. Canadian farmers here can raise profitably grain to fatten stock, and I think it pays better than to import American corn.
8. All find a ready sale here at remunerative prices.
9. I think a fair and equitable Reciprocal Treaty would be a benefit, as much so to the Americans as to ourselves, and I think we are in a better position under the present Tariff to get it.
10. I can't answer as to wool, but I believe the low price of wool here is not the result of Tariffs. 11. None cultivated in the county.
12. Prices remain about the same, quality as good probably better. Seed-drills, reapers and mowers, rakes, ploughs, cultivators and drags, &c.
13. No material advance under the present Tariff.
14. I think it has been increased. By our towns and villages being filled with artizans, who require sustenance. 15. I think so.
16. Yes. Certainly not decreased in this county.
17. Yes; prices for farm labor in this Township never higher than now, farmers have had an abundance, and if this is the result of the Revenue Tariff, let us have more of it.
18. No change required—as in my opinion the agriculturists are at present contented and satisfied, except a few "Croakers" that exist in all communities.

*General Remarks* :—I believe the existing Tariff regulations have benefitted all classes of the community, and that a return to anything like Free Trade, particularly with the United States, would be a great calamity, at least so long as they continue their present Tariff regulations *in re* Canada.

JAMES BENSON,

Township Clerk, Ameliasburgh, Co. Prince Edward.

1. No. 2. The general effect has been to benefit the farmer by better prices than before the imposition of the Tariff.
3. Prices have been advanced about the amount of the duty.
4. Prices have been advanced fully the amount of duty in every case.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, as far as breeding prices are better.
7. Can raise all necessary grain for fattening and would pay better than importing corn.
8. Yes. 9. No; Yes. 10. It is in better demand. 11. None raised.
12. Decreased in prices and the quality better, viz. : Reapers, mowers, horse-rakes ploughs, &c.
13. Woollens cheaper; cottons are about the same; hardware a trifle cheaper all round.
14. Increased by a larger consumption at home; due to higher wages being paid and more employment to the labouring classes.
15. Yes. 16. Fully up the prices that ruled before the Tariff.
17. Yes. 18. No change desired; retain the present Tariff as nearly as possible.

*General Remarks* :—The foregoing questions were placed before a committee of ten agriculturists, and the answers given are generally thought to be correct.

JAMES TUTTLE,

Merchant and Reeve, Elzevir, Co. Hastings.

1. No I, think not.
2. It has increased the price of oats ; cannot say for the others.
3. Do not think it has any effect. 4. It has increased the price.
5. The prices of horses are higher, but do not know what caused it.
6. The profits compare favorable with other stock ; United States for heavy horses and Manitoba for light ones.
7. Yes, he can. 8. No, I do not think it is.
9. Yes, he would ; and we are in a much better position than before the Tariff was imposed.
10. Do not see any change. 11. Do not know ; do not grow them.
12. Do not see any change. 13. Do not know. 14. Do not know.
15. Not in this neighbourhood. 16. Do not think so. 17. Yes. 18. Do not know.

JOHN ROSS,  
President S. S. & E. B. A. S., Ennisfil, Co. Simcoe.

1. No. 2. Higher price, from 10 to 20 per cent. Oats, 25 per cent. Rye sold at 50 cents ; now 80 to 90. Barley, 50 per cent. advance.
3. Wheat advanced in price. 4. Large increase, 80 per cent. 5. Yes.
6. Yes ; Manitoba. 7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. Better as now. 10. No answer.
11. Demand for sugar beet. 12. Fully as good and as cheap. 13. No. 14. Yes.
15. Yes. 16. Yes. Increased. 17. Yes. 18. Can't say.

JOHN GALLAGHER,  
Reeve, Tossorontio, Co. Simcoe

1. No, it would not ; we can raise our own coarse grain cheaper than to import from the United States.
2. It has had the effect of us getting a better price for our peas and oats, and a keener demand for them.
3. It does not appear to have a great effect on wheat or flour ; fall wheat is lower than formerly, but spring wheat is higher and a keener demand for it.
4. Pork in general, is higher and a better demand for it, especially the lighter kind of pigs ; and there is a great demand and a great many dealers scouring the country in search of live hogs.
5. There is a far better demand for them than formerly, and a better price ; I sold a colt for \$190 last fall ; There is a very great demand for good horses, for the States and Manitoba.
6. Breeding horses or other stock are equally profitable here just now ; both the United States and Manitoba are equally good now. I could not say which is best.
7. They can undoubtedly raise coarse grain cheaper than buy it from the Americans to feed their stock.
8. I am of opinion that all these are a better price since the National Policy came in force.
9. I could not venture an opinion whether Reciprocity with the States would be a benefit to us here or not. A year of bad crop in the United States it would. With the present Tariff we are in a better position to talk to them on equal terms. The laboring class has greatly improved ; they can dictate their own terms here just now.
10. I don't see any improvement in the price of wool.
11. There is not much flax or sugar beet raised in this section, and no tobacco.
12. I think new farming implements is dearer. Reaping and mowing machines ; they are greatly improved of late, but dearer on the whole.

- 
13. Woollens remain about the same; hardware a little higher; common factory cotton is higher also.
  14. I think it has; prices taken altogether are better, and I believe the people in general in the country are better fed and clothed these two or three years past than formerly.
  15. There is abundance of employment for the industrial class, but I do not see that any change has taken place in retarding emigration to the United States; they will always be crossing backward and forward over the border no matter what our Tariff is.
  16. No. I do not see any increased tendency to invest capital in farm property at present; farms are selling at about the same as formerly when a good farm is sold in this section.
  17. In general they are improved; there were more farms mortgaged in 1877, 1878 and 1879 than either before or since, and will take some years of good times to straighten up these bad years; the working classes are better.
  18. I could not suggest any cure at all in legislation, I am of the opinion that our legislators are doing their very best to pass measures for to satisfy the farming community, as far as I can see.

*General Remarks:*—Gentlemen of the Committee,—I have filled up these spaces very sparingly, as I am aware that others from this section better posted in the working of the Tariff than I, will give you reports of the feeling of this neighborhood.

WM. GIBSON,  
Farmer, Garafraza, Co. Wellington.

---

1. No, it would not. 2. It has raised the price of all our coarse grain.
3. Increased the price. 4. Increased the price. 5. It has. 6. Manitoba.
7. We can raise all we want. 8. It has. 9. Be benefited. With the present Tariff.
- 10 and 11. No answer. 12. Decreased and better. 13. Increased 10 per cent.
14. Increased. 15. Encouraged them to return. 16. Increased. 17. Improved.
18. No answer.

G. C. THORNE,  
Farmer, Brighton, Co. Northumberland.

---

1. No, because we raise a sufficiency for our own requirements.
2. No great difference in the price of coarse grains, except Indian corn and seed for fodder corn.
3. Any effect produced in the way of extra price, is occasioned by a short crop in other countries.
4. To increase the price of articles mentioned.
5. The demand for horses and live stock in the United States, Manitoba and the North-West, has tended to increase the price here very much.
6. Just now it is profitable to do so, and the United States is the larger purchaser of the two.
7. The Canadian farmer certainly can. 8. Only in the article of tomatoes.
9. We as farmers, would like to see a Reciprocity Treaty in force, same as we formerly possessed.
10. The Tariff on wool, we think not sufficient to protect the Canadian farmer, especially on the coarse grades.
11. Not being producers in this county to any extent we cannot say.
12. We find the quality quite as good and the prices no higher. All agricultural implements.
13. Only cotton goods, and the increase so small as to be barely discernible.
14. The duty on Indian corn has increased the price, and as peas are the best substitute, the price has increased in the same proportion.

15. The Tariff has certainly had this effect.
16. Land has certainly increased in value, attributable more to the general prosperity of the country than any change in the Tariff.
17. Certainly. In the most remarkable manner.
18. A general reduction in the expenses of governing the country from the Governor-General down to the lowest official in the Township Councils.

*General Remarks* :— Unless emigration from the old, over-populated countries is encouraged and fostered in some immediate and tangible form, we Canadian farmers shall have to let our lands lie uncultivated, as the demand for labour occasioned by the many new enterprises springing up around us, has so increased of late, that we cannot get farm hands at any rate of wages.

R. Y. GREENE,  
Warden, March, Co. Carleton.

1. It would not be to the farmers interest to admit free all American produce, as it would decrease the prices of home produce. It might, and I think it would, be to our interest to admit American corn free.
2. The effect has been to increase the home production of Indian corn, and also to increase the prices of our coarse grains. Oats increased in price from 30 cts. to 45 cts. ; corn from 50 cts. to 70 cts. ; barley from 60 cts. to 90 cts. ; rye, none raised ; peas, but few raised.
3. Both fall and spring wheat have increased in price, also flour ; cannot say what classes are most affected.
4. The increase of Tariff has increased the prices of live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard
5. The increased duties on horses and cattle has greatly increased the price of them in this section as we have now the markets of Manitoba wholly to supply.
6. It pays well to breed heavy horses. The profits compare favorably with those on other stock. Our principal markets are Manitoba and the North-West.
7. Our pea crop has failed for four or five years owing to the pea bug. I think it would be advisable to admit American corn free for feeding purposes.
8. The market has improved but cannot give the cause ; think Tariff helped to advance prices.
9. The Canadian farmer would, I have no doubt, receive a direct benefit by Reciprocity with the States, but taking into consideration the benefit the home manufacturers are to the farmer (by way of producing a home market) we may be as well off as we are. We are certainly in a better position to negotiate such treaty than we were prior to 1878.
10. Wool has increased in price.
11. Tobacco and sugar beet not raised ; flax to some extent, cannot say as to the effect of the Tariff.
12. Prices of farm implements I believe have decreased under the present Tariff ; quality better. Reapers, mowers, ploughs, harrows and cultivators.
13. Woollen goods have not increased ; cottons have increased a trifle.
14. The home market for home produce has generally improved by the operation of the Tariff, by shutting out American produce and causing a greater number of hands to be employed in mills and factories.
15. The Tariff has caused a greater diversity of employment, and thereby induced many Canadians to return to the Dominion.
16. Farm property has increased in value ; but owing to Manitoba lands being so cheap, I cannot say that the tendency to invest is greater.
17. The condition of farmers and labourers has greatly improved in the last three years.
18. An increase of Tariff on waggons and buggies would better secure the Manitoba market to Canadian manufacturers. The Americans now have the market that we should have.

PETER STEWART,  
Reeve, West Willlam, Co. Middlesex.

- 
1. No. 2. Corn about a fourth; barley about a fourth; rye, very little traffic, or raised in the Township; peas, very few raised in Township on account of bug.
  3. Fall wheat about one-fourth, spring wheat about one-fourth. 4. About one-third.
  5. Yes. 6. Yes, United States. 7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. No.
  10. Decreased in price. 11. Not any.
  12. They have not increased or decreased in price; the quality is as good as before.
  13. They have not increased. 14. It has improved, but not increased as yet. 15. Yes.
  16. Not as yet. 17. Yes. 18. By adopting the National Currency.

S. O. SECORD,  
Reeve, Grantham, Co. Lincoln.

---

1. No; not so long as the Americans put a duty against our produce going into their country. 2. No answer. 3. No answer. 4. No answer.
5. Yes, the Canadians have now nearly the exclusive market in Manitoba for the sale of horses. 6. No answer. 7. No answer.
8. Yes, as is witnessed by the large prices farmers now get in the vicinity of manufacturing cities and towns for that class of produce.
9. It is questionable whether the farmer would be benefited by reciprocity with the States or not, but if it would be a benefit, we are in a better position to negotiate such a treaty than we were under the low tariff. 10. No answer.
11. No answer.
12. Farm implements to my personal knowledge are now sold as low as they ever were, and the quality of the same has very much improved.
13. There has been no increase in the prices of cotton, woollens and hardware, except in so far as the rise in the price of the raw material imported from foreign countries.
14. Yes, just in proportion to the increased number of men employed in manufactures and the increased wages they receive for their labor, increase in wages from 20 to 30 per cent since 1878.
15. Yes, many men who had to leave our country during the dull times have come back, and are now working here at good wages, and the large demand for our own manufactures gives employment to all. 16. No answer.
17. Yes, farmers in many cases have been able to pay off mortgages on their farms, and labouring men are a great deal better off, wages having increased from 75 cents per day to \$1.25. 18. No answer.

*General remarks:*—I would advise the Government to continue their present policy of fostering and encouraging the various branches of Canadian industry, as on the continuance of this policy depends the progress and advancement of our Country's best interests.

R. McKECHNIE,  
Reeve, Dundas, Co. Wentworth.

---

1. No. 2. The effect has been to render our farmers more attentive to raise peas and barley as a substitute for Western corn, and consequently to allow our farmers to keep the money they used to pay for that corn to improve their farms, and to raise the price of oats some. As regards rye there is but little raised here.
3. It has had the effect of making our farmers more attentive to raise wheat enough to feed their own families, and some to spare to our laborers.
4. It has the effect of increasing the value of our own pork, lard, &c., to some 20 or 30 per cent.
5. Yes.

6. Not extensively, as we find it more profitable to raise horn stock and keeping dairies than raising horses, which we consider risky stock. Manitoba has been our market for our horses for three or four years past.
7. I think that most of our farmers can raise all the grain required to fatten their stock cheaper than they can buy the imported corn.
8. Yes some 30 to 40 per cent.
9. Yes, as it would help the sale of our cattle and sheep. Yes.
10. To raise the price of our wool some 20 per cent.
11. There is but very little flax raised here. Tobacco raising has been benefited by the Tariff on imported tobacco, and I think that tobacco might be raised with profit in this part of the country. Sugar beet has proven to be a failure with us.
12. The cost has decreased, and the quality is as good, especially on axes, sythes, mowers, harvesters and ploughs.
13. Not worth mentioning.
14. Yes, of some 20 to 30 per cent. by creating a home market, caused by the revival of business in general.
15. Yes without the least doubt.
16. Yes. Farm property has increased some 25 per cent. since 1878, because we find farming more remunerative than ever it has been in this part of the country.
17. Yes without the least doubt.
18. Free importation of dairy utensils, so as to facilitate the establishment of butter factories and cheese factories, until we manufacture those utensils in our own country upon the improved system.

F. PREFONTAINE,  
Farmer and J. P., Durham, Co. Drummond.

1. It would not by any means, as all produce bring a better price on account of the Tariff.
2. The effect would have been that these grains would not have brought the price they do now to our farmers.
3. Wheat has brought a higher price and also flour; not much spring wheat raised here of late years—principally fall wheat.
4. Effected a great improvement and command a higher price.
5. A great deal so, over 20 per cent.
6. Yes, it is profitable to those who understand it—some sold to United States being so close to it—but the largest market has been for Manitoba or the North-West.
7. Yes, he can raise it all. To import American corn would destroy the farmers' interests.
8. Yes, it has.
9. The present Tariff is the best can be had for the general welfare of this country.
10. That it brings a better price.
11. Cannot exactly say; the Tariff is an improvement on tobacco.
12. Prices have not increased, the quality is as good; some implements have decreased.
13. Not as I know; I think somewhat cheaper.
14. It has increased on account of the Tariff.
15. It has in this part of the county, encouraged labourers &c., to remain here, as better prices were paid than across the border.
16. Yes, farming property has increased at least 20 per cent., because the protective Tariff gave better prices on all grain raised.
17. It has considerably.
18. Do not know of any, unless a higher duty could be put on corn and oats.

*General Remarks:*—There lies in this Township a valuable stone quarry consisting of 130 acres, of the best qualities of building block, flint and limestone; before

the Tariff it did not pay running expenses, but since the Tariff a large trade has been opened. Last year the stone could not be quarried fast enough on account of the large demand, also, the scarcity of men.

THOMAS B. WHITE,  
Reeve, Anderdon, Co. Essex.

1. Yes, corn—as our farmers would save money by feeding corn and selling their coarse grain. I don't think any other grain would come here at present prices.
2. I don't think it made any difference as to oats, for I paid the same for them a year ago as they are worth now. I bought American corn, delivered in March, 1881, for 60 cts. per bushel; now it is worth 64 cts. in Chicago. Duty and freight would make it worth about 76 cts. here; it is raised in price more in proportion than oats, barley, rye and pease.
3. There is no spring wheat used here. I don't think the Tariff has had any effect on price of wheat or flour. I have paid more for fall wheat in 1872, '73, and '74 than I have paid these last two years.
4. I can only speak as to pork; it is from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 cents per lb. higher.
5. Horses have increased in price owing to all the old, poor and unsound horses having been bought up for Manitoba, and leaving good, sound, young horses scarce in this township.
6. I think good grade cattle the most profitable stock to raise. For good horses, the American market is the best. Yankees won't buy the poorer class of horses.
7. Some can; but, as a general rule, it would be better to import American corn, as it is good feed, and cheaper than oats or barley.
8. There is no difference in vegetables or poultry here. Eggs and butter are dearer now than 18 months ago—they are always dearer at this time of the year.
9. Yes.—No, I think not; retaliation by a weak power against a strong will not accomplish anything.
10. Wool is cheaper now than it has been for some time past.
11. None raised here.
12. I can't answer from personal knowledge. Two of the most active agents told me that the price was very little changed, but that the same quantity of material is not now used in the making of farm implements—that they are lighter and not worth so much as formerly.
13. Bleached and unbleached cottons, coarse shirtings, ducks, tickings, are from  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 cent a yard higher, and the most of the cottons are a lighter make.
14. Prices of farm produce are higher than in 1878. I don't think the Tariff had anything to do with it, as it is simply a matter of supply and demand.
15. Not here; there is less employment than formerly, and during the last year the population of the township has decreased 146—some gone to Manitoba, more to Michigan and Dakota.
16. No. Decreased 10 per cent.—everybody anxious to sell out and go west.
17. Farmers who are not in debt have improved during the last two years, but most of them being heavily mortgaged, are not doing more than holding their own. Labouring men here are no better off; wages are not higher, and it costs them more to live.
18. Go back to a Revenue Tariff—and just let the farmers alone; they will then find their business more profitable and desirable.

*General Remarks:*—This is solely an agricultural township. Last year there were some very good fields of wheat, but most of it very light. Spring crops were good, and these bring good prices. The most of the farmers have managed to pull through the winter. There are no manufactories here, although there is unlimited water power between Brantford and Dunnville, on Grand River.

A. A. DAVIS,  
Reeve, Seneca, Co. Haldimand.

1. Yes; we could sell our coarse grains and buy corn for feed, if we found it cheaper.
2. I cannot say exactly but I know that oats have been lower in price since the N.P. than they were before for the same number of years.
3. I can't say.
4. The average price is lower; of course the scarcity has caused a greater demand; therefore higher prices this year.
5. I think not. We would have had the Manitoba market now without the N.P.
6. I think there is more profit in raising beef for the British market. The most of our horse-buyers are for the American market.
7. Yes. That depends on the crops and prices.
8. I don't think they are.
9. Yes. I think we ought to be in a better position now.
10. To reduce the price. 11. I cannot say.
12. Yes, they are increased, because the raw material costs the manufacturer more.
13. Yes. 14. No. 15. I think not.
16. No. Decreased on account of dull times.
17. Not until this year, which is caused by a good harvest and good prices.
18. To allow us to buy where we can do best, and sell where we can do best.

JOHN LANG,  
Reeve, Otonabee, Peterboro',

- 1, 2 and 3. Can be more intelligently answered by the representatives of purely agricultural municipalities.
4. The supply in this town not equal to the demand. One packing establishment has to import hogs from the American market. Prices range high owing to the scarcity of the supply of hogs raised by the farming community. Large quantities of pork pass through here for the lumber shanties in bond from Chicago.
5. No. There is a ready sale at good prices here, sales being, I think, exclusively for the American market.
6. As answer 1 to 3. 7. As answer to 6.
8. The Tariff has no influence on the market here, the supply and demand being purely local.
9. Reciprocity generally desired. I am not prepared to say what the influence of the existing Tariff may have towards obtaining a reciprocity of Tariffs.
10. As answer to 6.
11. These articles are not grown in this section of the country. Flax was once tried, but as it seemed not to be in demand it has been practically abandoned.
12. Very serious differences of opinion exist on this subject.
13. I find in my personal expenditure a certain amount of increase, but up to the present very little affected by the existing Tariff.
14. This town has always been a good market for farm produce. Some of our operators offered high prices last season, and all said we have lost by their liberality and public spirit.
15. The town of Lindsay has in no way benefited in this respect. We are entirely supported by an excellent agricultural country. We are, however, now negotiating with a paper factory and implement factory, by offering great inducements as to site and exemption from taxation.
16. On the whole, I think the tendency has been downwards. Some of our best agriculturists are leaving for Dakota and the North-West Provinces of the Dominion.
17. Yes; owing to excellent crops and the shortage of the crops in England.
18. As answer to 1, 2, 3, 6 and 10.

*General Remarks*:—I have been connected with the several agricultural societies in this district, and consider that liberal grants should be given to these societies. Scientific farming taught in schools and agricultural colleges, and above all impress on agriculturists that industry and intelligence is more to be relied on than any legislative action on the promotion of this all-important interest.

J. DEACON,  
Reeve, Lindsay, Co. Victoria.

1. Yes; all kinds. Because at present the States buy all our surplus peas, oats and barley and rye—and frequently our butter, eggs and potatoes, consequently there is no danger of competition from there; and we would have the advantage of cheap corn.
2. It has made no difference beneficially. But it has increased the price of corn, which was used as a substitute for peas sold and exported.
3. No observable difference. Flour, if anything, a trifle dearer.
4. Am not in a position to judge.
5. No; as 90 per cent. of our surplus stock are exported to the United States.
6. It is profitable to breed horses of good stock. Profits compare favorably with other stock. To the United States.
7. Not at all times. It pays better to import American corn, and so be enabled to sell our barley and peas.
8. No; as most of the surplus of these articles are sold for export to the U. S.
9. Yes. I fail to see what better position the present Tariff places us in for the negotiation of a Treaty.
10. Wool has been lower since the Tariff came into operation.
11. I have observed no difference.
12. Difference, if any, a trifle higher and quality not quite so good.
13. Yes; all kinds of fine woollen goods, cottons and calicos from 2 to 3 cents per yard. Hardware a trifle dearer.
14. No. 15. There being no manufacturing of any extent hereabouts, I cannot say. But so far as the labouring classes are concerned, hundreds have left and numbers are still leaving for the United States. Do not hear of any returning or any that are likely to return.
16. There is an increased tendency for investment in lands here, owing to the influx of French Canadians from the Province of Quebec.
17. Most certainly. But their increased prosperity cannot be accredited to the Tariff—but to good crops.
18. Cheap goods of all kinds are required; and present prices can be reduced by adopting a Revenue Tariff, as the price of all purchased articles consumed by farmers are enhanced in price under a Protective Tariff.

JAMES VAN BRIDGER,  
Reeve, North Plantagenet, Co. Prescott.

1. Yes; as my coarse grain imported is used chiefly by the farmers themselves, as corn, &c.
2. With a fair, average crop here, I can't see that it has any effect, as we grow more than we require, therefore we export more or less, especially barley and peas, the market for the former being the United States entirely, and peas chiefly Britain. It also diminishes the profit of the cattle feeder; as with an average crop of corn on the other side, the farmer could sell his peas and purchase corn at a profit, provided the duty was removed.
3. It has no effect on the price of wheat and flour in this locality, unless the crop is short. 4. No answer.

- 
5. I have no doubt that the Tariff must, to a great extent, have given us the Manitoba and North-West market, but not to their advantage. Our chief market for horses is the United States, and if the duty of 20 per cent. imposed by that Government could be thrown off, the farmer here would gain just by that limit.
  6. At present one of the best paying investments a farmer can make if he breeds the right class of horses, viz: Clyde or Percheron, or that style.
  7. Yes; in this locality. 8. I don't think so.
  9. Greatly so. That will depend entirely upon what view the American Government take of our Tariff. 10. No answer. 11. No answer.
  12. Owing to competition by the manufacturers, prices remain about as they were, although they claim that the duty has increased the cost to them. I refer to reapers, mowers, waggons, &c., and implements generally used on the farm.
  13. No answer. 14. I cannot see that it has.
  15. I don't think it has; emigration is greater so far this spring and likely to continue more so this summer than ever before; chiefly to the North-West; some for going to the North-Western States; more returning.
  16. No. Decreased from 15 to 20 per cent. Emigration.
  17. Yes; the large yields of grain, combined with the good prices for the last two years, have certainly had a beneficial effect on this Province. 18. No answer.

JAMES PENNOCK,

Reeve, Ellice, Co. Perth.

---

1. I consider it would be to the interest of the farmers of this section if corn was free, for the purpose of feeding cattle. 2. It has had very little effect.
3. Very little, if any. 4. I think it has increased the price.
5. I do not know, but I find that the Americans give as a rule, the best prices.
6. It will pay the farmers to breed horses; as regards markets they are about equal.
7. I have always maintained that it would be better for farmers to have corn admitted free of duty for feeding purposes. 8. No.
9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by Reciprocity, but I think the present Tariff would have the effect of retarding any chance we might have of getting Reciprocity with the Americans. 10. None whatever. 11. I do not know.
12. It has had very little effect on the prices of implements, as we never imported to any great extent. It certainly has the effect of raising the price of iron, steel and coal, to the manufacturers.
13. Yes; a little, but I am not prepared to say how much.
14. To some extent in some articles.
15. I don't think it has had the effect of retarding emigration to the United States.
16. Farms have decreased in value since 1878, but I think the Tariff has had very little effect, but the bad crops we have had since 1878.
17. This last year the farmers have improved their condition, but it is on account of the good crops and prices, and not on account of the Tariff.
18. I do not consider that legislation will ever make agriculturists wealthy or otherwise, but if the duty was taken off corn and coal it would be a benefit to farmers in general.

WILLIAM FINDLAY,

Pilkington, Co. Wellington.

---

1. It would be to our interest to admit corn free; as to other kinds of grain it seems immaterial.
2. Imposing a duty on corn has been an injury to farmers. Rye, corn and peas little grown here; other grains not affected.

3. Am not aware that any effect has been produced by the duty imposed upon the articles mentioned.
4. Am not able to say.
5. Not at all. The better class of horses from this neighborhood go to United States. There are a number of horse dealers here—some buying for the United States market and some for Manitoba—the second class and plugs go to Manitoba.
6. At the present time it is profitable to breed horses; the principal market being United States.
7. We can raise all the grain necessary to fatten stock, but it would pay better to import corn if free.
8. For vegetable and poultry, no; for eggs and butter, can not say.
9. I think so—do not know, ask Uncle Sam. 10. No effect whatever.
11. No effect at all as to flax; tobacco and sugar beet not grown here (as to flax I have some knowledge being engaged in the business.)
12. Slightly increased; improvements are constantly being made in farm implements—quality is as good.
13. No material increase in price of such articles.
14. Am not aware that the home market has been improved by the Tariff.
15. Emigration instead of being stopped or retarded is increasing—heretofore going principally to the Western States—this spring being divided in favor of Manitoba.
16. No, the opposite being the case; farms have only materially decreased in value here; farmers for various reasons going to United States and Manitoba are forcing a sale of their farms.
17. The condition of the farmers has improved since 1878, but are not so favorable as they were some years previous to 1878.
18. I give it up—kindly ask me something easier—anything you can do to cheapen all articles purchased by us would be a benefit; if you can give us better prices for our farm produce by legislative means by all means let us have it.

D. U. FORRESTER,  
Mayor, Clinton, Cc. Huron.

1. Canadian agriculturists would be benefitted by the admission of American corn free of duty. Respecting other produce it is immaterial.
2. Less corn is bought by farmers for feed, they use their own coarse grains in lieu thereof. The duty has not affected the price of our coarse grains, because we raise more than we consume.
3. The duties have neither affected the price of fall wheat, spring wheat or flour in our opinion.
4. The duties may have raised the price of hams, bacon and lard somewhat.
5. The market is about equally divided between Manitoba and the United States. The demand has increased the market prices.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, but not more so than other stock to the average farmer. Horses are sent in about equal proportions from this locality to Manitoba and United States.
7. He can raise all the grain necessary to fatten stock, but it would pay better to import American corn free of duty.
8. No. 9. Canadian farmers would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, but we are in no better position by putting on retaliatory duties.
10. We do not consider it favourable to the Canadian farmer.
11. It has no effect in this part of the country.
12. The prices have been increased, but no appreciable difference in quality.
13. Goods are considerably higher, especially woollens, cottons and hardware.

- 
14. The home market has not been improved in our estimation.
  15. It has not had that effect.
  16. No increased tendency: Farm lands have decreased very materially in this locality since 1878, we believe partly owing to so many farmers selling out and going West.
  17. Not in this locality. 18. Trade as free as possible.

*General Remarks* :—We have answered these questions to the best of our knowledge and belief.

JAMES BILL,  
Reeve, Grimsby, Co. Lincoln.

---

1. Think it would be to the advantage of agriculturists to admit Indian corn; as to other grains would make no great difference.
2. No effect on our coarse grains, except on our corn, of which but little is raised in this section.
3. Do not think it has made any difference. 4. No difference. 5. No.
6. Yes, favorably in United States. 7. It pays to import American corn for stock.
8. No. 9. I think he would; think not, perhaps not so favorable.
10. Price lower than ever known, but do not attribute it to Tariff.
11. No effect on flax, know nothing of tobacco and sugar beet.
12. Quality and price about the same as before the Tariff.
13. Have not the *data* to judge from. Think no great difference. 14. Think not.
15. No.
16. No, the reverse, decreased in value leaving Manitoba and the Western States.
17. Farmers position improved by the good crops and prices of last two years. Labourers also improved owing to the scarcity caused by migrating westward.
18. Strike duty off corn and reduce it on sugar and dry goods generally. Or were it practicable a closer union and free trade between Britain and all her colonies, with discriminating Tariff against the rest of the world.

ROBERT MURRAY,  
Reeve, West Zorra, Co. Oxford.

---

1. Yes; it would give us cheaper feed for our stock, and the consumer would have to pay a less price.
2. It has raised the price of corn from 25 and 30 cents per bushel, before present Tariff, to 75 and 80 cents now—and hard to be got at that price. Made no difference on price of oats here; price for barley lower.
3. Wheat is lower here than in the United States; flour is cheaper; spring wheat—none grown here; depends on the United States market.
4. The consumer has to pay larger prices. 5. No.
6. No; do not find it profitable as compared with other stock; profits are less. Our principal market is the United States.
7. No, he cannot, it would pay better to import American corn.
8. No; we export all our surplus to the United States.
9. Yes; decidedly. Can't say whether we are or not. 10. Canadian market lower.
11. Don't know; none of these things raised here.
12. Increased, and the quality not so good. Sulky rakes, mowing machines and drills.
13. Yes; increased to the amount of difference in the Tariff.
14. None that I am aware of.
15. No; decidedly not. It has increased emigration to the United States. None have returned; quite the reverse.
16. No; farm lands lower, because people all seem to be going to the United States.
17. No; not at all.

18. Legislate to give us a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, as it would be a greater inducement to our farmers, and especially farmers' sons, to remain here and occupy their land, than go to the United States, where they all get better wages for their work.

T. P. BLAIN,  
Merchant, Niagara, Co. Lincoln.

1. It would be in the interest of agriculturists in Canada to admit some kinds of American farm produce free of duty. Corn, for fattening stock most particularly.
2. Has had the effect of advancing the price of oats and pease.
3. Has had no effect on either kinds of wheat.
4. Has had the effect to raise lard about 2 cents per lb.
5. I do not think they have raised the price any.
6. The principal market is the United States.
7. Would pay the farmer better to import American corn.
8. No improvement by the present Tariff.
9. Would be a great benefit to the farmer. Our position would be a disadvantage to negotiate such a Treaty with our present Tariff. Much better when American produce admitted free.
10. A bad effect on our wool. 11. No effect. 12. Increased.
13. Woollens and cottons have increased about 15 per cent.
14. No increase on farm produce, only oats and peas for feeding purposes.
15. An increase in cotton factories and underclothing factories. Had not the effect to retard emigration to the United States, nor has encouraged Canadians to return to this country.
16. No increased tendency to invest capital in farm property under the present Tariff. Farm lands have decreased. What the farmer has to buy has raised in price; what he has to sell, with few exceptions, has not been raised in price. Therefore dissatisfaction and selling out, thinking to do better in the North-West.
17. Have not improved their condition.
18. To allow all their wants to come in as cheap as possible. As Europe is the market for their whole surplus products, nothing to gain, but everything to lose, by high Tariffs.

*General Remarks.*—As low a Revenue Tariff as can be imposed on the people, the better for this or any other country. As a whole, high Tariffs make the few rich. Allow everything we need, that we cannot produce, to come in free. The more grain comes into our country from the United States, the better; it gives our railways work; it gives our mills work to grind flour. Would not affect prices as the surplus has to go to the foreign markets anyway, and the price controlled there. We can be employed milling and carrying it there for them. Allow raw cotton and sugars to come in free. Now the farmer is getting cheaper tea—the first thing to open their eyes. Those advantages tell; they are beginning to see it.

GEO. KERR,  
Reeve, Lucknow, Co. Bruce.

1. It would not. 2. It has made a better market for corn, oats, peas, barley and rye, a few cents per bushel.
3. It has raised the price of spring wheat more than fall wheat; both a little.
4. It has raised all those, especially dried hams.
5. It has improved the market.
6. We do find it profitable, as much so as any other stock; we are now selling to go to Manitoba.

7. We can raise all the grain we need for stock ; we do not want American corn.
8. It is improved.
9. It would depend upon how the Treaty could be made. We think we are in a better position. If the American produce was admitted free, we would have no chance for reciprocity.
10. Raised the price a little. 11. Encouragement to raise it here.
12. We think we can buy cheaper and better articles.
13. We can buy woollens a little cheaper. Cottons are a trifle higher.
14. Increased in price and better sale.
15. Has given employment to all kinds of industrial classes. Farm labour is scarce.
16. Increased tendency. Farm property has advanced since 1878, on account of better prices for farm produce, and money being got at less interest.
17. They are improved since 1878 very much.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—We farmers in Thorold township think the N.P. a grand affair for the country, compared with affairs in 1878. There are several Globe readers in my section, and they have been asked to answer those questions same as I have answered. I am happy to say I have assisted in filling some of them, and they are all now N. P. men.

JOHN WILSON,  
Reeve, Thorold, Co. Welland.

1. Would not. 2. Oats and corn better price. (Can't say in reference to rye. Barley and peas have not been affected.
3. Better prices for both classes of wheat. 4. To raise the price higher.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, compares favourably. Manitoba at present.
7. Yes. It is not necessary to import American corn. 8. Yes.
9. Yes. We are in a better position; to negotiate with Americans for Reciprocity under present Tariff.
10. Has had the effect to slightly increase the price.
11. Do not think those Articles have been affected much either way by Tariff in this locality.
12. Reapers and mowers have slightly increased in price, quality as good, rise in price is probably due to the demand from Manitoba.
13. The finer grades of woollens have slightly increased, cottons and hardware have not.
14. Yes. Better prices, larger demand. 15 Yes.
16. Our lands have slightly increased in value and would have increased very largely if it had not been for the emigration to Manitoba. 17. Yes.
18. I think as a class the farmers are doing well and the present legislation relative to the Tariff is favourable to them as a class.

*General Remarks:*—I have endeavored as far as possible to answer these questions fairly and frankly, and have obtained the opinions of the Mayor and other parties. I am a farmer myself.

JAMES STEPHENS,  
Reeve, Dresden, Kent.

1. To permit corn to come in free of duty would assist the farmers very materially —by purchasing somewhat cheaper to feed, lessening the price of bran as well —thereby allowing the farmers the advantage, in this section, of obtaining cheaper food for their milch cows.
2. It has raised the price somewhat on pease and corn by the duty imposed. I do not think it has affected the price of oats, but am not sure. It does not affect

- barley in the least. The market for barley is the United States, and therefore the duty is of no use to the farmer here whatever.
3. I do not think it has affected the price of wheat or flour here, because the Liverpool markets regulate the price of wheat.
  4. I cannot say, but presume it has increased the price by the duty imposed.
  5. The duty imposed on live stock has not, so far as I know, assisted the farmers here. All horses bought that I have any knowledge about, have been shipped to the United States.
  6. I have not done anything in this line, but the principal market for horses here is in the United States.
  7. It will, in my opinion, pay best to import corn when the crop is not short.
  8. I cannot say that it has.
  9. I believe so, but cannot say whether we are in any better position now than when American produce came in free. I cannot see as it makes any difference to the Americans whether their produce comes in free or not, for they do not, by any means, depend on the Canadian market to sell their produce.
  10. I know nothing about the wool trade.
  11. I grow the sugar beet for feeding cattle only, and can give no opinion as to the effect of the Tariff on these articles.
  12. I purchase my mowing machines in the States, because I get a better article; made of better iron, and prefer to pay the price and duty, rather than to buy any machine made in Canada. Mr. Walker, the head of one of the foundry shops in Belleville, looked at the "Clipper" mower I use, and said I might travel from Gaspé to Sarnia, and I would not find any such castings as in the "Clipper" mower.
  13. I should say, yes. Hardware is mostly all made in the United States, I understand, and must cost the duty more. Also on cotton: there can be no doubt it costs more by the price of the duty imposed. Surely no one should ask about cotton. I can't say about woollens.
  14. I can see no difference about the market. Scarcity and demand make good prices; plenty, and no demand, poor prices.
  15. In this part of Ontario no encouragement whatever has been given by the Tariff. Belleville is worse off than 15 or 20 years ago, and emigration is going on all the time to the United States and Manitoba. No encouragements whatever to return after once away from here.
  16. No. Farm lands are somewhat cheaper, but not to any very great extent, principally on account of the opening up of the North-West.
  17. I think they are somewhat as to the farmers, but I fail to see much in the laboring classes, I should say none on account of the increased cost of living.
  18. Take the duty off corn and breadstuffs and reduce the Tariff as low as possible on all implements, cotton and other articles used by the farmer, giving a protection of not more than 15 or 20 per cent. to the advantage of manufacturers in this country, and I should say that any manufacturing business that could not compete with the Americans with a Tariff of 20 cents at the most was not calculated to be carried on in this country, and ought not to be carried on unless in some very special cases. The farmer has to compete with the world and should not be compelled to pay too high a duty on articles which he has to purchase to enable the manufacturers to enrich themselves too fast. The labouring class stand in the same position unless you stop immigration.

HARFORD ASHLEY,  
Réeve, Thurlow, Co. Hastings.

1. Certainly not, I trust the Government will never again introduce such a jug handled policy.
2. All kinds of produce are in better demand than in 1877 and 1878, and command higher prices.

3. Our home market is much better, as we are not flooded with American grains, besides we have our outlet to the old country market.
4. Farmers largely benefited, demand greater and prices better.
5. Good prices for cattle here; several car loads left here for the North-West in the last two weeks. Horses are generally exported, seldom imported from the States.
6. A good breed of horses would be profitable for the United States market, but Manitoba is our best market at present and will be for a long time.
7. Certainly they can, it would never pay to import grain to raise stock of any kind.
8. In better demand, not much difference in price round here.
9. Decidedly not. Equal Reciprocity or the present Tariff. Wages very low in 1877 and 1878, and men plenty; wages are now good and men scarce, by all means adhere to present Tariff if you desire Reciprocity.
10. A little better price and in greater demand.
11. Can not say, do not grow any just here.
12. Farming implements are cheaper and in better demand; farmers can better afford to buy, and mostly prefer Canadian machines.
13. Can not perceive much difference, if any.
14. Largely beneficial to home market, ready cash for all kinds of produce.
15. Lots of employment for all classes; do not know of any leaving here for the States, but lots going to our Canadian North-West.
16. Property is in better demand, but there is such a flow to the North-West, that prices do not advance as much as they otherwise would do under the present Tariff.
17. It certainly has, there can be no two opinions on that point.
18. Nothing better can be done than adhere to the present Tariff against all things we can produce here.

JAMES QUINN,

Reeve, Orillia, Co. Simcoe.

1. We think not. 2. The farmer realizes a better price for oats, rye and pease.
3. The farmer realizes from fifteen to thirty per cent. more for spring and fall wheat, and can afford to pay better wages for farm labour.
4. Before the duty farmers raised very little more than sufficient for their own family use, but now hog-raising is a profitable advantage to the farmer.
5. Yes; fully one-third.
6. We find it profitable. They compare equally with other stock. There are a great many horses shipped to Manitoba from this section of Ontario.
7. Yes; the farmer can raise all the grain he requires. More profitable than to pay for American corn.
8. Yes. 9. We think so. Yes; fifty times better.
10. We can see but little change. Canadian wool is too cheap for a profit to the farmer.
11. We don't know.
12. We cannot see much difference. If increased we can afford to pay a little more. We think the implements are better in quality.
13. We cannot see any difference in the price of these articles.
14. Yes; we have a market in every town and village in Ontario since the National Policy.
15. Yes. 16. Yes. Yes. National Policy. 17. Yes. 18. We do not know.

WM. ANDERSON,

Township Clerk, Belmont, Co. Peterboro'.

1. It would not. 2. Has not affected the market much. If anything, we can get more for coarse grains now.
3. Cannot say. 4. Farmers have received from 2 cents to 3 cents per pound more for them now than formerly.
5. It has, decidedly. 6. Yes. Manitoba.
7. Yes. We can raise all the corn we need.
8. Cannot see as it makes any difference.
9. Cannot say. Certainly we are in a better position now to make a treaty with the present Tariff.
10. Cannot see that it affects the wool market. 11. None raised here.
12. Decidedly cheaper and better than before.
13. Woollens and cottons are cheaper. Some kinds of hardware are a little dearer.
14. It has been greatly benefited by the building up of home industries, which makes a greater demand for farm produce.
15. It has. 16. Yes; but not so great on account of the emigration to Manitoba. If it were not for that the advance would have been greater (25 per cent.)
17. Greatly improved. 18. The Government has done all it could.

*General Remarks* :—Before filling this out I consulted James Bradburn, Deputy Reeve of Durham, who is a first-class farmer, and also E. D. Tillson, who is a large farmer and manufacturer of oatmeal, split peas, pot barley, &c., and they gave the same answers as I have given you. Everyone seems satisfied, both Grit and Tory.

M. S. SMITH,  
Warden, Co. Oxford.

1. No. 2. Good. By first using up our home supply and raising prices.
3. Abundance of both kinds raised in this section and none imported; consequently no marked difference perceptible.
4. Good. In first using up our own production and preventing importation till necessary.
5. Yes. 6. Yes; fairly. Manitoba.
7. In our section yes, as we always raised a surplus, and two acres to one of corn since the Tariff.
8. Yes. 9. No. 10. Good.
11. Good on flax. No tobacco or sugar beet raised as yet.
12. Decreased. Quality better in reapers, mowers, ploughs, drills, rakes, &c.
13. No increase in price.
14. Yes; by home consumption. Increased manufacture, giving employment to a much larger number of hands than before the Tariff.
15. Yes; five out of twenty-five hands now working in one establishment in this place, and one Yankee came over to work.
16. Yes; increased in value, as money is much more plentiful, and to be had at such rates as to make it profitable to invest in farming.
17. Yes; at least 30 per cent. 18. I know of no material change necessary.

*General Remarks* :—I am not now farming, but know from personal enquiry and observation of both farmers and manufacturers that I have answered your questions as you would be answered by at least six out of every ten farmers and all manufacturers in this section.

J. C. WEISBROD,  
Reeve, Malahide, Co. Elgin.

1. Admit all free—corn for feeding, and other grains for railway carriage and consequent lowering of freight rates on Canadian grain.
2. None on oats. Rye not grown here. Corn raised in price by amount of duty, and there being not enough grown at home, farmers have to pay the extra.

price. If duty was off eorn, it would pay better to buy corn and sell barley. Peas not raised much here on account of the bugs.

3. Previous to the present Tariff, prices here were higher in comparison with Chicago market than since.
4. Think it has benefited us by excluding live hogs, which were formerly brought in, fed for a time and then shipped to Britain and France as Canadian, which is not done now on as large a scale.
5. Don't think it helps us any, as horses are not brought in from the States. American buyers still buy here for American use.
6. At present horses pay as well as other stock, but usually other stock pays better. Both places.
7. Would pay better to import American corn. 8. No. 9. Yes. No.
10. None. 11. None grown in this section.
12. Increased in price; decreased in weight of metal. Reapers, mowers, &c.
13. All increased. 14. It has for the growers of corn; not for any other produce.
15. No manufactures in this section, except agricultural implements. More emigration from here than formerly.
16. More farms changing hands, but prices lower, in consequence of removals to the North-West and United States.
17. Yes; in consequence of good crops and good foreign demand.
18. Make trade as free as possible, thereby giving us the world's competition for what we require to buy—our selling prices being already almost entirely governed by foreign demand.

C. T. CAMPBELL,  
Ex-reeve and J. P., Ekfrid, Co. Middlesex.

1. It would in this county, to feed cattle for British market.
2. It has increased the price of corn, oats and peas.
3. The Tariff has not changed the price of wheat in the least.
4. It has increased the price of hams, bacon and lard.
5. No, No. 6. Yes. Average. In the United States.
7. No. It would pay better to import American corn. 8. No. 9. Yes. We are.
10. None whatever, it is a fraud. 11. None in this county.
12. Increased on all articles not manufactured in Canada. 13. No answer.
14. No, No. 15. No. For the past two years more people have left this county than ever before, about one-half to Manitoba and the North-West and about one-half to the United States. In this township three-quarters have gone to the United States.
16. No, no. Decreased, at least ten per cent. going West, more farms for sale than ever before.
17. No. Yes, farm labor is higher than ever before.
18. (1.) Give us free markets in our own country. No market fees. (2.) Give us free trade with all countries. (3.) Let us have an assessment law that will tax all property equal and alike, especially railroads, banks, &c., &c. Farmers pay the bulk of the taxes. (4.) Abolish the Senate. (5.) Give us a National Currency secured by real estate.

ANSON GARNER.  
Farmer, Cheese Maker and Reeve, Stamford, Co. Welland.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit American farm produce free, if we had a short crop and they a good one it would reduce the price of our produce as it has done before the duty was on, we used to export large quantities of oats but not since 1879, also hard spring wheat, none since 1879.

2. Very little Indian Corn ever fed in this section, oats much better price, we sell largely to the north shores of Lakes Superior and Huron, duty prevents American corn and oats coming into these parts, rye very little grown; corn very little grown, not much used; peas better price; barley being exported does not effect price much.
3. We never imported flour, has increased price of hard spring wheat very much, as farmers sell the most of their spring wheat to Millers at home, as it is much cheaper to export flour than wheat, and a home market for bran and shorts, all classes of wheat have increased in price.
4. It has fully increased the price to the amount of duty levied.
5. Yes, it has very much improved prices of horses and cattle, as the class of horses sold in Manitoba would not suit the American market at the same figure.
6. Horses pay as well as other stock, and Manitoba is a much better market at present than the American market.
7. Can grow grain for fattening cattle better and cheaper than Americans can, Peas and turnips to feed them with would be much cheaper than American corn.
8. We never imported any of those articles in this section.
9. We are in a much better position to negotiate a treaty with the present Tariff, as we have something to offer if we negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty.
10. We produce more long combing wool than we manufacture; do not think the Tariff affects the price.
11. We grow no tobacco or sugar beet here; very little flax now can be imported in raw state.
12. There has been an increase in farm implements under the present Tariff.
13. Woollens cheaper, good cotton about the same; there has been an increase in hardware.
14. Has much improved our home market in this section, as we now sell largely to the mining and lumbering districts that used to get their supply from the States before the Tariff was imposed.
15. Large number of young men left this section between 1874 and 1878, not near so many since a number of labouring men and quite a few mechanics have returned home from the States this last year.
16. Not much increase in improved farms. Farmers are in a much better position than in 1878; have paid off a large amount of indebtedness to loan companies. Emigration to Manitoba has affected the price of improved farms; so many want to sell to go there, very few propose to go to the Western States.
17. Very much improved in this section of the country.
18. Do not know of any change I could name at present.

*General Remarks*:—Good demand for mechanics, over 150 men employed at our dry dock; two large tugs building and one completed; engine and boiler works, more orders than they can fill, working up to full capacity; another large foundry and machine shop very busy, filling large order for machinery for cotton mill, also filling large order for propellor-wheels; also a large woollen manufactory, very busy; a farm implement manufactory very full of orders; a factory for the extraction of tan-bark has just been completed, every interest has very much improved since 1878.

JOHN CHISHOLM,  
Reeve, Owen Sound, Co. Grey.

- 
1. Think not. 2. Oats from 8 to 10 cents higher. Rye not much change. Corn, more grown and much better price. Barley, very much higher this last year. Peas, about the same.
  3. Wheat has been higher; cannot specify particularly as to classes.
  4. Prices much higher and a very much larger quantity raised.

5. The price of horses have increased at least 25 or 30 per cent.
6. Yes, very profitable; heavy draught and coach horses for English and American market; light and ordinary horses for Manitoba.
7. Yes, he can raise what coarse grain he may require for feeding purposes; but we find cotton seed, meal and oil cake excellent aids in fattening cattle; these we have to get from United States.
8. Prices very much higher here and greater demand owing to the increased number of hands employed in our large manufactory since the new Tariff came into effect.
9. Would think not. 10. Not in the business. 11. Do not know.
12. The cost to the farmer has not increased, owing to a much larger demand and keener competition between manufacturers.
13. Do not know. 14. Yes, owing to the new life that has been thrown into the manufacturing interests.
15. Yes, it has very much increased the diversity of employment, and has prevented emigration to the United States, and in many instances Canadians have been induced to return.
16. There has been an increase in some localities while the prices in other districts have decreased; think on the average about the same.
17. Yes, very apparent improvement.
18. Should like very much to see a very strict law made and enforced, compelling owners of cattle, hogs, &c., to keep them confined or prevented from running at large and being kept at the expense of others; also, think it very desirable to have the thistle law more rigidly enforced.

JAMES M. LOTTRIDGE,  
Brewer and Farmer, Hamilton, Co. Wentworth.

1. Admit none free; under present Tariff all our produce markets are more stable and satisfactory to our farmers.
2. Present duty on corn has tended to increase the prices of all our coarse grains to the benefit of our farmers.
3. Present duties has had the effect of causing all our large millers to purchase more largely our Canadian wheat, and causing a better market all the year round.
4. Present duties has tended to increase and make our home market more stable and profitable for our Canadian produce.
5. Most certainly it has, this is the verdict of all dealers, and should remain so.
6. United States are large buyers of our best breeds and stock of horses, so is also Manitoba a good market for draught horses.
7. Yes, our farmers need import no grain for stock or anything else.
8. We believe the Tariff has a good effect on these articles generally.
9. Our position is better now than at any other time for any such negotiations; fair Reciprocity would we think be a benefit to Ontario.
10. Do not think the Tariff is very favorable to our coarse description of wool.
11. No experience here in these articles, very little of them grown here.
12. Not increased; we believe, considering the increase of wages, they have decreased if any change.
13. Do not think Tariff has increased value of any of these goods as a Tariff.
14. Our grain dealers say it has very much.
15. From observations we believe the Tariff has benefitted all the industrial classes of our country, and as a consequence must have retarded emigration.
16. Tariff has not interfered with value of farm property, emigration to our own North-West has done so in many localities.
17. Yes, very materially.

18. Consider present Tariff sufficient, carefully applied as the growth of the country require it. Some changes are always found necessary in many branches of trade.

C. R. BARKER,  
Reeve, Kincardine, Co. Bruce.

1. Yes; in order that traffic and mills may be employed and increased.  
2. Raising price of Indian corn to the extent of duty, to the detriment of the farmer. Oats, rye and barley not affected.  
3. None. 4. None. 5. No. 6. United States. 7. No. Yes. 8. No.  
9. Yes. No. 10. No effect. 11. No effect. 12. No, no. 13. No. 14. No.  
15. No. 16. No; decreased; emigration to the United States and Manitoba.  
17. Yes, of farmers; not of laborers and mechanics.  
18. Lower duties for revenue purposes only.

D. M. SMITH,  
Township Clerk, Euphemia, Co. Lambton.

1. I think not. Farmers in this locality were formerly much injured by the competition of American oats; so much so, that oats for which our soil is best adapted would scarcely pay for raising; but we now get a paying price for them.  
2. The effect has been to create a demand for our coarse grains. Has improved the price of oats, peas and corn; rye and barley but little sown here.  
3. The prices have changed but little here. In this new back country we do not raise enough wheat for our own use, consequently have to buy flour; and we get better and stronger flour now ground from Canadian wheat than we formerly got when American wheat was used by the millers.  
4. It now pays farmers to raise pork for sale, which it did not before the duties were increased.  
5. Yes; the duties secured us a large and profitable home market, and improved prices so that the American buyers coming in here have to pay much higher prices for our horses. Horned cattle and sheep have also very much improved in price.  
6. It pays well to raise a superior class of carriage and heavy draught horses for the American market; but this locality is better adapted for stock-raising, which pays us better and brings quicker returns.  
7. We can raise coarse grain here cheaper than we could import American corn for feeding stock.  
8. Our market for vegetables not much affected, but prices of poultry, eggs, and butter has improved. We have now a better home cash market. Everybody under the N.P. has work and fair wages, and can afford to live now, not as formerly, when there was no work in the country, and it was either starve or emigrate.  
9. I decidedly think not. We are, and wish to continue to be, a producing country ourselves, consequently it is much better to retain our own home market and look to Europe for an export market for our surplus produce. Under the N.P. we are rapidly developing our natural resources and increasing our national wealth. We are maintaining our British colonial independence and showing Americans we can live without either them or Reciprocity. Consequently, if a Reciprocity Treaty were under discussion, we are in a much better position to secure advantageous terms than before.  
10. It certainly has not injured the Canadian producers of wool.  
11. Very little grown here. Not being interested either in their production or sale, I cannot give any reliable information respecting them.

12. Farm implements are cheaper now and better. Canadian workmanship and timber were better in agricultural implements than American, such as has been formerly in use here; besides the Canadian article being made expressly for our work, it is more suitable and better adapted to the purposes for which they are intended. So much is this found to be the case that we never see a new American implement of any kind here now.
13. They are fully cheaper now, besides we are getting Canadian tweeds and cottons much better quality and more serviceable than any imported goods at the same prices. Hardware is lower at present, being largely governed by the price of iron. We have any quantity of iron ore here of very superior quality, which, if it were only developed, would still further reduce the price of that article in Canada.
14. Yes. The general prosperity of the entire country under the N.P. has largely increased the purchasing capacity of the thousand of busy mechanics now happily earning good wages, who were formerly idle. It has secured the Canadian market to Canadian producers. It has given our farmers improved prices; a home cash market which did not exist prior to the introduction of the N.P.
15. The present Tariff has given an impetus to every branch of the manufacturing and industrial interests of Canada, giving remunerative employment to all classes of workmen, stopped the emigration of skilled mechanics, farmers and labourers from Canada to the United States, by supplying them with profitable labour at home, and induced the return of many loyal Canadians whom poverty had exiled from their beloved homes to earn their bread in a foreign State.
16. Owing to the large emigration of our settlers to the great North-West and Manitoba, farm property here has decreased in value, but there is a tendency at present to enlarge the farms and prosecute stock-raising more in the future. This rough broken land is better adapted for stock-raising than for raising grain, as it affords most excellent pasture and is well watered.
17. The general condition of both the farmers and laboring classes in this locality has very much improved since 1878.
18. As general improvement and prosperity is the order of the day under the existing legislation, which was so admirably and opportunely provided by the present Government, I think it would be well to "rest and be thankful" for what we enjoy at present.

*General Remarks* :—I have endeavored to answer the within questions as fully and conscientiously as my best judgment could dictate. I have only had the document in my possession since yesterday. I most sincerely hope my answers will be in accord with those from all parts of the Dominion.

JOHN. H. DELAMERE,  
Reeve, Anson and Hindon, Co. Haliburton.

1. It would not. 2. It has tended to raise prices of all kinds, except barley.
3. I think it has affected wheat or flour very little.
4. It may have raised the price of cured meats, but until the duties on pork are increased; it will have very little, if any, effect on the price of live hogs.
5. It may have slightly. 6. Yes; compare favourably. In the United States.
7. They can; and should never import feed for stock. 8. I think not in this county.
9. This is a wide question, and one I think should not be kept before the public continually as it has heretofore been.
10. It does not appear to affect it favorably. 11. None here; they are not cultivated.
12. They do not appear to be increased, and the quality is better.

13. I think they are, but am not familiar with the trade; and am satisfied that no man can answer this question with any degree of certainty; have no space to give reasons why.
14. It has somewhat. By increasing the number of consumers.
15. I think it has. 16. There is. They have increased in value I think, because of the general impetus given to the trade of the country by the investment of capital for manufacturing purposes.
17. It is materially. 18. Another wide question. In my opinion legislation can do little directly for agriculture. The encouragement given to manufactures will help it some, by improving the home market, but that will take time. In the meantime such a duty should be placed on farm produce of all kinds as would secure such a home market as we have to Canadian farmers.

*General Remarks*:—These answers simply reflect my opinions. Many of them would be disputed by references here, but I believe the general feeling among the people in this part of the county is that the National Policy has on the whole benefited the country.

ADAM HARKNESS,  
Farmer and Reeve, Matilda, Co. Dundas.

1. It would not. 2. This is a corn section. Corn has been from 3 to 5 cents per bushel higher, over duty, than formerly. Oats, 5 to 10 cents; rye, 10 to 15 cents; pease and barley very little changed.
3. Only fall wheat grown here. During the exporting season, the duty imposed is not perceptible, but, say, from the 1st of March to the 1st September, the price is higher relatively, 5 to 10 cents per bushel.
4. The Tariff has a marked effect on the price of these articles, they being fully 2 or 3 cents per pound higher.
5. It has improved prices, and the country is full of buyers for the North-West.
6. Until lately it was not considered profitable to breed horses, now it is. Draught horses find a market in Manitoba—fancy, or trotting horses in the United States.
7. The farmer can decidedly make it profitable to raise grain to feed his stock. It will pay better than importing American grain.
8. For vegetables, poultry and butter, the market is decidedly better, and, to a certain extent, for eggs.
9. He would not be benefited. He now, generally, gets a better price for his stuff than Americans do.
10. Wool has been low in price under the N.P. If the producer suffers, he more than makes it up in the lower price of woollen goods.
11. I think a beneficial effect.
12. Prices are lower, and quality is much better.
13. Woollens are lower. Cottons may be a shade higher—from want of facilities to manufacture fast enough. Hardware is generally cheaper.
14. The home market has been increased and prices better, mostly from the greatly increased labour and manufacturing industries in the country, and by keeping foreign produce out.
15. It has had the effect of keeping Canadians at home, and of bringing a good many back.
16. Farm property has increased in value, and would increase faster, were it not for the great emigration to the North-West.
17. They have both greatly improved, farmers finding a ready market for all they have to dispose of; labourers, by having all they can do at high wages.
18. This is a hard question to answer. Everything is in such a flourishing condition that it would be hard to say what would make it better.

W. M. EMERY,  
Merchant, Port Burwell, Co. Elgin.

1. No. 2. Since the imposition of a duty on American coarse grain we have received a more remunerative price for our oats, rye, barley and peas.
3. The price has risen 25 per cent.
4. We received a better price for our hogs this year than ever before.
5. They certainly have. 6. Yes, very favorably—United States.
7. We think we can keep American corn away. 8. Do not know. 9. No.
10. Do not know. 11. Do not know.
12. They are not any higher and the quality is just as good.
13. Do not think they are.
14. It has been; the duty has kept back American dried bacon, cheese, and grain, and this gave the Canadian farmer a larger demand for his produce.
15. No answer. 16. Much about the same. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

E. A. LITTLE & BRO.,  
Allandale, Co. Simcoe.

1. On all grains on which Canada has a surplus for export, the duty can make no difference. On corn and grains where the deficiency is made up by importation the duty is of advantage to the Canadian farmer.
2. On corn it has increased the price by the amount of duty levied. So many other causes, not affected by the Tariff, influence the prices of other grains, that a positive opinion cannot be safely given.
3. I cannot understand how the price of wheat can be affected by the Tariff in any way, as we always have a surplus, although small, for export.
4. Not well informed; think we can raise sufficient to prevent prices being materially changed by the Tariff.
5. Can only judge that it has by the large number of horses now being shipped from Ontario to the North-West.
6. The United States have got most of their horses from this district heretofore, but the demand from the North-West is likely to take them all for some years.
7. Think it will pay every farmer best only to raise as much stock, and of such kinds, as he can grow his own feed for.
8. Yes, very much improved, both on account of the increased number of mechanics and their increased ability to purchase such food.
9. Think that the Canadian farmers would be considerably benefited. The nearer our Tariff is to the American one, the better our chances will be to get a Reciprocity Treaty from the United States.
10. Can make little or no difference as yet, the Canadians growing so little of the kind of wool required for tweed making.
11. None grown about here.
12. The cost of farm implements purchased through agents has been so much in excess of cost of production, that no safe answer can be given to this question.
13. No. 14. Yes; by the increased home demand for fresh meat, fruits and farm products which could not be grown for export, thus giving the farmer a better rotation of crops.
15. Yes. 16. A decided answer cannot be given to this question. The price of farm lands having been affected in one direction by the growing cheapness of money, and in the opposite direction by the opening up of the North-West.
17. Yes. 18. None; excepting that as Reciprocity is desirable, our Tariff should be made equal to the American, so that in framing a treaty the concession on both sides would be equal.

*General Remarks:*—The great difficulty which the British Government finds in its efforts to secure a commercial treaty with France, is the fact that they have nothing to give away in exchange for the concessions asked from France.

JOHN R. BARBER,  
Warden, Georgetown, Co. Halton.

1. It would not be in the interest of Canadian farmers to admit American farm produce of any kind duty free.
2. The effect of a duty on American Indian corn has given us our own market for our coarse grains and raised them in price. Oats, from 1873 to 1878, sold at 25 cents per bushel, now they sell at 40 cents. Barley, then 45 cents, now 80 cents. Peas have been, for the last three years, a failure.
3. The duty on wheat has raised the price of fall wheat about 20 cents per bushel, on spring wheat about 30 cents per bushel.
4. The duty on hogs has raised the price of pork about \$1.50 per cwt., hams, bacon and lard have risen in greater proportion.
5. Horses have risen 30 per cent. and horned cattle 20 per cent. in consequence of having Manitoba and the North-West markets to ourselves.
6. Horses are at present the most profitable stock, but they require longer to mature than horned stock, the chief market now is the North-West for horses.
7. Canadians can raise all the coarse grain required for fattening stock. The country is well adapted for growing barley; this chopped with oats makes the best of feed. Barley does not impoverish the soil but cleans and mellows it. Admit American corn free of duty and you close the home market for all coarse grains, besides sending the money to enrich foreign countries.
8. The market for vegetables, fowls, eggs and butter is improved. The manufacturing classes get better wages and steady work, they can indulge in more luxuries, and thus benefiting the farmer—and all this through the National Policy.
9. When American produce was admitted free we had no home market, and little money. There is no desire for a renewal of reciprocity as the North-West and Maritime Provinces take all our spare stock and cereals.
10. Manufacturers import much wool from Asia and Australia where it is cheap; the farmer is little, if any, benefited by the duty.
11. In this section of country the Tariff on these has little effect, as not much of them is raised.
12. The cost of farm implements is not raised under the present Tariff, the quality of the home article is better as American articles sent here *were made to sell*; ploughs, harrows, mowers, reapers, &c., are cheaper and better than under the old Tariff—home competition the cause.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are not increased in price, but a shade lower under the present Tariff, the result of home competition.
14. The home market for farm produce has been increased by the Tariff as previously stated, "*now you ask*," by an increase of 20 or 30 per cent. on stock and cereals, which gives the farmer more purchasing power, thus benefiting the merchant and mechanic by farmers buying many things that in the *hard times*, from 1873 to 1878, they had to do without.
15. The industrial classes are all benefited by the present Tariff, as there is constant work and good wages for all who are willing to work. Emigration to the United States is thus checked, and many Canadians have returned to share our general prosperity.
16. The immense area of the North-West and its presumed capabilities for grain and stock raising has lowered farm property here, as no man with a family of sons will give from \$50 to \$80 an acre for improved Ontario farms when he can buy a section of land so cheap in the North-West.
17. The general condition of farmers and laborers is much improved since 1878; then it was low prices, no employment, and the natural result, grumbling and discontent. Now, money and work are plenty—all through the present Tariff.
18. No changes in legislation that I can think of will make farming more desirable: as many of our young men do not take kindly to farming, wishing to become professional men and leave the farm entirely. To make it more profitable is that over which we have no control. The admission of meat and grain to England from foreign countries free of duty, were a duty placed on these and admit colonial produce free to England, farming would be more profitable.

*General Remarks* :—I cannot add anything to my previous replies to the questions asked. I may, however, be permitted to state that the general impression is (Grits always excepted) that a continuance of the present Dominion Government in power would give an increased impetus, permanence and stability to our manufacturing industries that would materially benefit the agricultural community still in advance of what they at present enjoy.

JAMES PATTON, Farmer,  
Clerk, Goderich, Co. Huron.

1. It would not. 2. All kinds of coarse grains, and especially peas and oats, are grown with more profit to the producer than when American corn was admitted free of duty.
3. It has reserved the market for Canadian producers, instead of giving it to Minnesota as formerly.
4. I can only say that these articles have sold higher in this locality during the past year, than ever before in my recollection.
5. I believe they have.
6. Yes; the profits compare favorably with the profits on other stock. Large numbers are shipped from this locality to both places.
7. I am convinced that he can, and therefore profitably dispense with American corn for fattening or feeding purposes.
8. It is. 9. I believe he would; and also that we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff than under any other which we previously have had.
10. It seems to affect it favorably for producer, and also the consumer, the demand for wool being better, while the manufactured article is cheaper.
11. None cultivated in this locality.
12. The cost is decreased and the quality is quite as good, and in some cases better. Scythes, axes, ploughs, reapers, mowers, seeders, waggons and carriages—any of which can be purchased cheaper than before the present Tariff was imposed on raw material from which made.
13. Cottons and some kinds of hardware may have slightly increased in price, but I cannot say this is caused by the Tariff. The increase, if any, is trifling.
14. It has. Manufacturing industries having been established in almost every section of the country, the operatives in which are fed and otherwise maintained by the products of the farm. 15. I believe it has.
16. There is. Farm lands have increased in value since 1878, on account of money being more plentiful and cheaper, and also on account of the advance in price of farm produce.
17. No person disputes this. The condition of all classes is materially improved.
18. The agriculturalists (and all others) in this community seem to be well pleased with the present state of things, and are not anxious for a change.

JAMES PARR,  
Reeve, Cartwright, Co. Durham.

1. No. 2. Oats, price better; barley and pease are a better price; rye and corn are not cultivated in this part.
3. On all classes of wheat the price has been raised from 20 to 30 per cent.
4. The price in all cases has been increased. 5. Yes.
6. It is very profitable to breed horses at the present time, chiefly owing to the increased demand in both Manitoba and the United States.
7. I think it more profitable to raise and use our own grain.
8. Yes. 9. I am of the opinion that affairs are as well as they are.
10. No answer. 11. Tobacco and sugar beet are not cultivated. Flax pays very well.

12. The quality of implements fully as good, and prices lower on all kinds.
13. The prices range about as usual.
14. The home market has been largely increased, chiefly owing to the increase of home industries. 15. Yes.
16. The price of land is gradually improving, but owing to the emigration to Manitoba the increase has not been much, so far.
17. Yes. 18. No answer.

THOMAS J. KNOX,  
Reeve, Elma, Co. Perth.

1. We think that it would be to the interest of the Canadian farmer to admit all kinds of American farm produce free.
2. I do not think the duty on corn has raised the price of pease or oats, as we cannot grow good pease on account of the bugs. The duty on corn is against us.
3. We admit that there is a good paying price, but fail to see the price affected by the duty.
4. Live hogs have been high, as they generally are with a failure of the American corn crop, and partial failure of our pea crop. I think that is the cause of pork being high.
5. The horse market seems to be good. A great many of our horses are going to Manitoba, and some to the United States. I am not prepared to say if the duty affects the price or not.
6. In my experience, I have not found breeding horses pay, as I could only sell a good horse at a paying price, and there is a great many blanks in breeding horses. I find cattle and sheep a great deal better.
7. If a farmer wants to fatten extensively, he must import American corn.
8. I do not think the Tariff affects us either way on butter and eggs; in this section we manufacture cheese.
9. I think most certainly we would be better with Reciprocity, but cannot see that we are in any better position to negotiate a treaty, as the United States do not import enough to make it worth their while.
10. I cannot tell the cause, but the price of wool has been too low to grow with anything like profit for the last few years, but the price of sheep has been very fair, which thus counterbalances it.
11. We do not grow flax, tobacco, nor sugar beet in this neighborhood.
12. I have heard that some manufacturers have advanced the price of reaping and mowing machines, while others have taken it out in the quality.
13. Woollen goods about the same as before the Tariff, but cotton from 1 to 3 cents per yard higher than before the Tariff. 14 We do not think it has.
15. I cannot tell the cause, but a great many are leaving here for the States and Manitoba; so much so that the price of farm hands has advanced from \$2 to \$4 per month.
16. You can scarcely sell farm property to anything like advantage. I do not think there is a good 100 acre farm in this township that would sell within from \$1,500 to \$2,000, as much as it would have done some four or five years ago. We do not think, with the great decrease in property, the farmers are quite so well off; but do not think the Government had anything to do with it, one way or the other.
17. But the labouring class must do better, as wages are higher; that will be another drain on the farmer.
18. Reciprocity with the United States.

THOS. CURRELLEY,  
Deputy Reeve, Fullarton, Co. Perth.

1. No. 2. No effect. Fair remunerative prices received for all our coarse grain.
3. Taking the last two years as an example, there is no perceptible difference, as a number of farmers in this locality generally purchase more or less flour.
4. No answer. 5. There was never a better demand for good marketable live stock in this locality.
6. Profitable. Manitoba. 7. Yes, better to raise than import.
8. Improved, except eggs, which are low at present.
9. Farmers in this locality are well satisfied with the present prices, consequently we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. Same prices realized as in previous years.
11. None grown here of any consequence. 12. Decreased; quality better.
13. Decreased. 14. Improved. 15. Yes. 16. Increased. 17. Improved.
18. Farmers in general are well pleased with the prices they receive for both stock and produce.

**HUGH M. DIARMID,**  
Secretary, Stormont Agricultural Society, Lodie, Co. Stormont.

1. No. 2. 1881 was an exceptional bad year; the duty has had the effect improve the price of corn and other coarse grains, and encouraged the farmer to sow a greater breadth of oats, and corn particularly; very little of rye, barley or pease sown.
3. Have had the effect to encourage small millers to ship flour to the Eastern Provinces; a home market for wheat at advanced prices, say 20 per cent., as compared with American prices in other years. Large millers buy the most of our wheat for Eastern Provinces. No spring wheat raised.
4. A ready market at home at better prices. 5. Yes.
6. Yes, better profits; Manitoba. 7. Yes. 50 per cent. better don't pay to import.
8. Yes. 9. Yes, under present Tariff. 10. No answer. 11. No answer.
12. reapers, mowers, hayrakes, ploughs, better article at less price. 13. No.
14. Yes. Found work for hundreds of good men who had to leave the country, steal or starve, who now find employment at good wages and want everything the farmer can raise, at good prices.
15. Has prevented hundreds from leaving, and encouraged many to return.
16. Yes. In this vicinity farming lands have increased 30 to 40 per cent in three years.
17. They are to a very large extent in this neighbourhood. 18. No answer.

**JOHN G. MOUNTFORD,**  
Farmer and Reeve, Blenheim, Co. Kent.

1. No. 2. It has had the effect of helping the farmer to get a better price for oats, peas, rye, corn, and has diminished the price of barley.
3. It has had but very little effect on wheat or flour.
4. I cannot answer these questions correctly, therefore let them pass.
5. It has. Live stock—such as horses, cattle, &c.—is at least 15 per cent. higher.
6. The principal market for horses at present is the States.
7. He can raise all the grain required; besides, those in the grain raising business have a home market.
8. All these articles are higher now than under the old Tariff.
9. I believe we are better off with a Protective Tariff; it creates home industries.
10. Nothing of any account.
11. It has created some of those industries to my knowledge in several places.
12. Ploughs, harrows, reapers and all farming implements are fully cheaper than heretofore.

13. Those goods hold about the same price, but more active operations are carried on.
14. It has; from the fact that we have home industries to supply, which causes a demand for farm produce.
15. It has made an increased demand for laborers, and has retarded emigration to the States.
16. There is; they have increased in price. 17. They have; over 25 per cent.
18. The people as a majority are satisfied with the legislation of the Dominion Government; but quite the reverse with the Ontario Government.

PETER M. GUNTER,  
Reeve, Tudor, Co. Hastings.

1. Do not think it would be in their interest.
2. Oats have been higher in price since the Tariff was passed, and higher than for several years before. Rye has been little if at all affected; corn has sold at a higher price, and more of it has been grown in this section than formerly. As a result of this, there has been a considerably increased sale of corn planters. Barley and peas unchanged in average price.
3. Cannot say. 4. Cannot say. 5. Yes; decidedly. 6. Not in the business.
7. He can, and with good results to the cultivation of his farm. It would not be more profitable to import, so far as this section is concerned.
8. There has been a much better market here for these articles than before the Tariff, owing to the impulse which the Tariff has given to manufacturing industry.
9. Think the benefit very doubtful. With American produce admitted free, I see no prospect that a Reciprocity Treaty would be agreed to by the Americans.
10. Cannot say. 11. Cannot say.
12. The prices remain about the same as before the Tariff was passed; in some cases cheaper, but the manufacturers are doing a much larger business, and are making larger aggregate profits. The quality of the article is fully sustained and many improvements have been made. Ploughs, reapers and mowers, lawn mowers, seed drills, cultivators, and corn planters are cheaper than under the old Tariff. 13. Cannot say.
14. The increase in manufacturing industry has increased the farmers' home market to a very notable extent, in the neighbourhood of cities, towns and thriving villages.
15. It has increased the diversity of employment to some extent, but its chief value has been in expanding the operation of industries which were in existence, but languishing before.
16. There has not been an increase in the price of farm lands, but I attributed that to the considerable emigration to the North-West.
17. Most decidedly; the improvement has been very great.
18. Enforcing the thistle law would be a great improvement, and is likely to become an absolute necessity, if the evil against which it is aimed is not soon checked.

ROBERT EVANS & CO.,  
Seed Merchants, Hamilton.

1. No. 2. It has raised the price of those grains, as it always comes in competition for feeding purposes with those grains. As the consumer always asks the question:—"Which is the cheapest to feed, American corn or those grains?" It therefore comes in direct competition with those grains.
3. It has raised the prices of our wheats, as nearly all extensive millers on the shores of our Lakes and Welland Canal, and for some distance inland, have ground American wheat under old Tariff.

4. It has had a tendency to raise the price of Canadian pork, as nearly all our large grocers and packers formerly purchased the principal part of their supplies from the West, which is now brought in to pay duty, therefore helping the farmer to pay the taxes of the country. 5. Yes; it has.
6. Yes; I find the profits compare favorably with other stock; our best breeding animals and heavy draught horses go to the United States; our common or working horses, to Manitoba.
7. I believe the majority of Canadian farmers do raise enough coarse grain to fatten their stock, but many now sell a large portion of it. I think all coarse grains raised on the farm should be sold in beef, pork and mutton; American corn is too dear to feed with profit to stock at the present time. 8. I do not know.
9. I think a Reciprocity Treaty fairly negotiated would be a benefit to the Canadian farmer, as we would have one more market on equal terms. I think we are in a better position under the present Tariff, as now we would have something to give; without a Tariff we would probably have to impose.
10. I cannot tell. 11. A beneficial effect.
12. I find reapers and mowers cheaper; as to other implements, I find them about the same; quality improving, owing to enterprise of manufacturers.
13. Those goods are about the same price as under former Tariff.
14. Increased immensely; millers, &c., using Canadian products, whereas formerly American products were largely used, and our productions were sold for export to the highest bidder.
15. To a certain extent it has, but as long as we find cheap lands in the West, there will always be a large emigration there.
16. It is difficult to say; many farmers are very anxious to sell and go to the North-West, and consequently a great many farms are now for sale.
17. Yes; immensely. 18. Our higher educational institutions are too free, the farmer paying for the education of the professors (which to all intents and purposes is their farm), but has to buy his own; again, the farmer is taxed on his capital—the professionals almost free.

*General Remarks:*—Sir,—I will attempt to illustrate my answer to question 18:—Say a farmer owning fifty acres of land in this county will be on the assessors roll for three or four thousand dollars—a school teacher who has received a free education, will be receiving four or five hundred dollars a year income—which will place him in as good a position financially as the farmer owning fifty acres. Query—How much, or what amount is the school teacher on the assessors roll for?

WILLIAM LANG,  
Farmer and J.P., Downie, Co. Perth.

1. Yes; the duty does not increase the price of wheat, barley and other grains, and prevents the free interchange of seed so useful to agriculturalists.
2. The effect has been to shut out American corn, which was much used for fattening purposes and for green fodder, while it has not raised the price of oats or barley; rye and maize are hardly grown here, and very few peas, owing to the bugs.
3. Spring wheat is a failure, but millers who require it have bidden up so that it is higher than fall; but this does not benefit the agriculturist, as it is not grown. We raise a large surplus of fall wheat and no Protective Tariff will increase the price; the same applies to flour.
4. Hogs in Ontario and the Western States have been very high owing to scarcity. We think the Tariff on American corn has raised the price somewhat, as we have not been raising enough coarse grain for fattening purposes.
5. The duties have not increased the prices of horses; all our good horses are sent to the United States, none but the poorer class go to Manitoba. A free trade in horses would be a boon to Canadians.

6. The raising of horses is profitable and compares favorably with the raising of cattle. Raising sheep is not now so profitable, and swine raising is precarious owing to the fluctuations in markets. Manitoba is now competing with the States for our horses, the best going to the States.
7. In this section it would pay better to import American corn; oats have not been a success for fattening, and the farmer will not use barley while it commands a good price.
8. No; we raise a large surplus of these products and send to the States and Britain. A Protective Tariff will not increase the price of this surplus.
9. He would, and the more convergent the lines could be drawn towards a Free Trade policy the better. We cannot say, not having any idea of the past or present feeling of the American people.
10. Wool is down about 40 per cent., the price is probably affected by the Tariff both ways. The fine wool coming in we pay more for on account of Tariff and get less for our coarse wool on account of the American Tariff.
11. These products are not grown here.
12. Decreased, and the quality is as good. The extra demand caused by the new markets in Australia and Manitoba, has caused a keen competition, and machines are now manufactured with much more facility than formerly, hence reapers, mowers, drills, harrows, ploughs, &c., are cheaper.
13. Woollen goods of Canadian make are cheaper, owing to the cheapness of wool, but old country manufactures are dearer, especially carpets. Hardware for building purposes is dearer. We have not followed the prices of cotton goods sufficiently to discriminate between the prices now and four years ago, but think there has been little change. 14. Cannot say it has.
15. Not in this section or township; we have no new industries and people have been and are flocking to Manitoba and Dakotah.
16. There is not; at least one-third of the farms are for sale. First class farms owing to improvements and good financial standing of their owners have held their own, but second class farms are cheaper, probably caused by the large efflux of Canadians to Manitoba and the North-West.
17. No; there are two mortgages given on farms to every one discharged; and the laboring classes eat up in winter what they earn in summer.
18. The only change in legislation which we conceive will benefit us is a careful political economy, less taxes and a lower Tariff.

ADAM OLIVER, Reeve,  
M. F. AINSLIE, Tp. Clerk,  
Blenheim, Co. Oxford.

1. It would. Farmers can obtain corn for fattening stock cheaper.
2. It has raised price of corn, but has not materially affected prices of other grains, which have of late been much higher in Buffalo than on this side.
3. Wheat and flour command much better prices in Buffalo than they do here, and I cannot see how the Tariff can have affected prices here in any way.
4. Nil; except in rare cases of importation when, of course, price to consumer has been increased.
5. I do not think they have here.
6. It is certainly profitable; United States is the chief market.
7. No. It pays better to import corn.
8. Not with us. These products command a far better price in Buffalo than they do here.
9. Certainly. I cannot see how the Tariff can have improved our position since it has avowedly placed us in a more hostile attitude to the United States.
10. I do not think it has affected it in the least.
11. I cannot tell. There is scarcely any of these crops grown here.

12. The cost has been somewhat increased, the quality is about the same.
13. There is a slight increase. 14. No.
15. Not here. Emigration has increased from this section.
16. No. I do not think there has been any change of consequence.
17. Of the farmers; yes, because they have had better crops and better prices, and of the laborers, yes, because they have in consequence been able to obtain steady employment.
18. By Reciprocity and better representation in the House of Commons.

ERNEST CRUICKSHANK,

Reeve, Fort Erie, Co. Welland.

1. No, I am convinced that it would be an injury.
2. It enhanced the value of oats, corn and peas, by giving us our own markets to supply.
3. Red winter wheat is now ground for bag flour instead of spring, should say that it is worth five or six cents per bushel more by having a good home market for it.
4. About \$1 per cwt. for dressed hogs.
5. Horses are very dear. 1st. Money is plentiful. 2nd. Good demand for them in Manitoba.
6. It pays well to raise good stock and more especially horses; breeders should be careful to breed from good well bred sires. We expect Manitoba to be our best market for horses.
7. Farmers should raise everything that they require for stock raising. Indian corn grows finely here, and very superior in quality to American. Should never import anything that can be raised at home.
8. Yes; mechanics and other laborers are now getting such good wages that they make the demand so much more, consequently higher prices.
9. Barley is the only produce that we care to send to the States; would be willing to admit corn and oats free, by they admitting our barley free any other dealing we would not care for, as we can take care of ourselves if well protected.
10. Cannot say; expect that our own manufactories will soon be large enough to consume our wool if present Tariff is not altered. 11. Cannot say.
12. All farm implements are decreased in value and equally good; cannot mention one article dearer.
13. Canadian tweeds about the same; hardware about the same; cannot state particulars as I do not see any alteration in retail prices.
14. Yes. By our our people working for us and we supplying them.
15. Yes; the Tariff now in force has been a blessing to the poor man. He is now working for us at increased wages instead of being half idle as before, whilst foreign labor was supplying us with goods.
16. Do not think that farm property has increased in value, and not likely to whilst there is so much good land in our North-West to be had for nothing.
17. Yes, very marked indeed.
18. Nothing but our own market for our own people; we are well able to grow and make what we require. Keep out foreign goods and farm products, and this country will soon be wealthy, contented and independent.

*General Remarks:*—I would not like to hazard any changes in the Tariff Policy of the Government as the country is now so prosperous.

WILLIAM STANLEY,

Reeve, Village of Lucan, Co. Middlesex.

1. Most decidedly not. 2. The effect has been that the growing of coarse grain has become remunerative, which was not the case prior to the imposition of the duty, to the material benefit of the Canadian farmers, more especially in the case of oats.
3. I think it has increased the price of spring wheat in comparison to fall wheat.
4. A steady market, remunerative prices and increased production; formerly we were unable to compete with the Western States on account of their cheap corn.
5. Yes, as far as Manitoba and the North-West are concerned because the class of horses in demand for those places are nearly as cheap on the American side as the Canadian.
6. Yes; heavy horses for the United States and lighter ones for the North-West.
7. Yes, and to spare, it would be injurious to the Canadian farmers to admit American corn free.
8. For vegetables directly improved and for all a better local demand.
9. Possibly the farmer might be benefited by Reciprocity, but the country as a whole is better without such a Treaty. We are in a better position with the present Tariff.
10. To increase the price of fine wool. 11. Eventually it may have a good effect.
12. Cost decreased; quality better. 13. No noticeable difference.
14. Materially increased on account of more people being employed in manufacturing at higher wages, consequently they are better able to purchase.
15. Most certainly. 16. The large emigration to the North-West has materially checked the increase which was quite evident a year ago.
17. Yes; most decidedly. 18. To admit free if possible everything which we cannot produce, and protect all our own productions.

*General Remarks* :—Those colonization societies are doing a good work in preventing many from going to the United States, some of them having friends there, and may be the means of inducing a considerable number to leave the United States and settle in the North-West. It might be advisable for the Government in the near future to deal more leniently with the above named societies.

HENRY DUNCAN,  
Reeve, York, Co. York.

1. No. 2. The threat of introducing cheap corn for use in the shanties used to be made by lumberers, to induce farmers to ask a lower price for their oats. Farmers have no fear of corn before their eyes now.
3. Better prices are realized and a better demand for farmers' flour.
4. Home fed pork is in better demand.
5. The price of horses has increased fully 50 per cent. in the last six months, and the first shipment of horses from here for Manitoba made last month.
6. No answer. 7. If the farm is worked intelligently, there can be no better soil than ours for raising all kinds of grain with profit.
8. Cannot say. We are too far from railway facilities.
9. Before the present Tariff, the Canadian farmer had always to carry the big end of the log at the international bee. We are in a good position now to wait for a treaty of Reciprocity from the United States.
10. Cannot say. 11. Cannot say, such crops not being raised here. 12. No answer.
13. Canadian tweeds are cheaper and of better quality than the same class of goods sold to and used by farmers three years ago, also blankets. Axes and common tools are also cheaper and better.
14. Wheat was a good crop last season, and the price of flour is \$1 a barrel better than in any previous good season.
15. There are no hands looking for work without getting it, at a great advance in wages. There is no emigration to the States talked of as in former years.

16. No change noticed. 17. The general condition is vastly improved. There is double the amount of cash moving around to what there was three years ago.
18. We want good leading roads through the county, put into and kept in good repair. The loss to the farmer in farrier work, harness and wheelwright repairs is a serious tax and impediment. Statute labor is a farce. The so-called road repairs, under Government grants through members, is thinly disguised wholesale bribery.

JOHN S. J. WATSON,  
Reeve, Brunell, Co. Renfrew.

1. No, our markets would be overstocked and prices would then be much lower.
2. The effect is beneficial to the farmer; oats command a better price, rye, corn, barley and peas have increased in value.
3. The effect of the duties imposed on wheat and flour is very much in favour of the farmer; spring wheat brings a much better price at present in this country than when the McKenzie Government were in power. In fall wheat the price has increased since 1878.
4. The duties on this description of farm produce is very much in favour of the farmer; prices are more remunerative than in 1878.
5. The price of horses and other live stock has increased very much, particularly with the former, large numbers being purchased for Manitoba.
6. We find it profitable to breed horses, the profit on these animals is sooner obtained than on other stock; our principal market is Manitoba.
7. The farmers in this municipality can profitably raise all the grain required to fatten their stock, and prefer doing so rather than purchasing American corn.
8. The market for these articles is very much improved by the operation of the Tariff.
9. I think the Canadian farmer would be benefited by such a Treaty, Canada is now in a better position to negotiate a Treaty of this kind than when American produce was admitted free.
10. The effect of the Tariff has considerably improved the price of this article.
11. These articles, particularly the two former, are not cultivated in this part of the country, the latter to a limited extent only.
12. The price of farm implements under the present Tariff is less than formerly; the quality of reapers, mowers and other articles under this Tariff is very much improved.
13. These articles are quite as cheap, and in many cases cheaper than they were previous to the operation of the Tariff.
14. The home market is very much increased and improved, money being plenty, the labouring class can find constant and remunerative employment, and business men of every sort are in a prosperous condition from the effect of the present Tariff.
15. Yes; the Tariff has given employment to hundreds of men who were idle, and had no means of supporting themselves or their families, and in consequence were under the necessity of going to the United States in search of employment, which they could not find in Canada. But the unprecedented success which all industries now enjoy through the operation of the Tariff has encouraged these men to return to Canada, where they can obtain plenty of employment and good wages.
16. Yes, under the operation of the present Tariff, farm lands have increased in value, consequent on the increased value of farm produce of every description since 1878.
17. The depressed condition of the farmer during the reign of Mr. McKenzie was very distressing, many of them were compelled to mortgage their farms in

order to meet pressing demands upon them, since 1878 a very agreeable change has taken place; money has become abundant and can be had at very moderate interest, this together with good prices for their produce has enabled very many of them to redeem their lands, and thus render them prosperous and content; the labouring classes are quite content, their condition being quite improved since 1878.

18. This is a question which I cannot take upon myself to answer, convinced as I and the people of this Township are, that our present Government is anxious to introduce any legislation which would promote the welfare and happiness of the people of Canada.

**CAPT. CARLETON CATHCART,**  
Township Clerk, Goulbourn, Stittsville, Co. Carleton.

1. No. 2. The effect of the duty on American Indian corn and other coarse grains has greatly increased the price of oats, rye and barley here. Rye has increased in price 75 per cent., oats and barley about 35 per cent. Indian corn not grown here.
3. The Tariff has raised the price of wheat and flour, especially spring wheat. Spring wheat brings a higher price than fall wheat here, which never was the case before the present Tariff.
4. Has increased the price of live hogs, ham and bacon nearly 100 per cent. Lard not so much. 5. Yes.
6. I find it profitable to breed horses. The best market I think will be Manitoba. Horses have increased in price over 50 per cent. since 1878.
7. I can raise coarse grain and roots profitably to fatten stock, I think it pays much better than to import American corn free of duty. 8. Yes.
9. Cannot say as to the benefit of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. We are in a better position to negotiate such Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. Not sufficient duty yet. 11. Cannot say as they are not cultivated here.
12. The price has not increased here, decreased if any, quality better than formerly.
13. No. 14. Yes. 15. Yes.
16. There is a tendency to invest capital in farm property. Farm property has increased 10 per cent and over in value since 1878. 17. Yes. 18. Cannot say.

**JOHN HOEY,**  
Farmer, Arlington, Co. Simcoe.

1. It would not affect the price of farm produce, with the exception of hog products, as the European market rules the price.
2. Very little, if any, on the grain mentioned. I do not consider it has affected the price of spring or fall wheat in any way.
3. The system of grinding in bond seems to have an injurious effect on the back country millers. 4. It has increased the price of the articles mentioned to the full extent of the duties imposed.
5. There has not been any horses or cattle shipped from this section to Manitoba or the North-West up to the present time.
6. Yes; about equal. United States.
7. It would pay better to purchase corn for fattening purposes, and sell coarse grain.
8. Not in the least, except eggs, which have been firmer, caused by the advance in pork. 9. Yes. Yes; I think in a better position. 10. It seems to be injurious.
11. None grown in this locality. 12. No material change.
13. Cotton, 15 per cent higher; woollens, very little change; hardware, heavy, 20 per cent.; nails, 10 per cent.; spades, forks, 10 per cent.; malleable and other cast iron, about 50 per cent. higher; stores, 35 per cent. higher.

14. No ; except hog products. 15. Not in the least.  
 16. No. Decreased. Emigration to the United States and Manitoba.  
 17. Yes ; the good crop of 1881 has been a great benefit to the farmers and working-classes.  
 18. A reduction of the Tariff to a point that would protect the manufacturers, and not place them in a position to form rings, so as to exact enormous prices from the farmers, such as they are now doing in some cases. Any Tariff that would create monopoly, will be injurious to the farmer.

WESLEY BRANDON,  
 Reeve, Cannington, Co. Ontario.

1. It would be in the interest not only of agriculturists but of all classes, to admit all kinds of American farm produce and coal to convey and manufacture it free of duty. Little or nothing will be imported except corn for feed. Because, prices are higher in Buffalo, Detroit and Port Huron, than in Toronto, Guelph or London. Reciprocity in farm products is desirable.
2. No effect, except on corn which is higher. Oats, peas and barley are dearer in the United States than in Ontario. Rye is not cultivated in this section of the country.
3. Fall wheat is higher in the States than in Ontario, but spring wheat is cheaper owing to the failure of our own crop, and is required to mix with our fall wheat to make the class of flour required in Ontario, but cannot be imported except by grinders in bond.
4. No perceptible effect so far as farmers are concerned.
5. The increased duty has no effect on horses in this quarter, none are imported except for breeding purposes.
6. The market for horses is booming just now, and first class horses command high prices, but as a rule it is more profitable to raise mutton, beef and pork, the returns are quicker and more certain. The States is decidedly the best market. A few horses of inferior quality are sent to Manitoba.
7. It would pay to import corn.
8. As to vegetables—except the kinds raised by market gardeners—poultry, eggs and butter. The Tariff is innocent of either improving or depressing the market.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would most assuredly benefit the farmer. We do not think that any manipulation of the Tariff will have any effect on the negotiation of a Treaty, except it be to irritate our neighbours.
10. None, good or bad. The price of wool under the present Tariff is lower than at any period during the preceding decade. 11. None cultivated in this quarter.
12. The cost of farm implements is in every case increased by the amount of the enhanced Tariff on raw materials. Threshing-machines, mowers, reapers, ploughs, barrows, waggons, carriages, &c., &c., are either increased in price or constructed of lighter materials.
13. Woollen goods, cotton goods and hardware, fluctuate in price according to the markets of the world ; but in every instance the consumer pays the original cost together with the enhanced Tariff freight charges and profit of the merchant.
14. The home market of the farmer is not improved by the Tariff. 15. None in this section.
16. There is not, the reverse is the case to an extent that is becoming alarming. Farm lands have decreased in value materially. Our laboring men, farmers, mechanics and artizans are emigrating to the United States and to Manitoba to an alarming extent.
17. Yes—crops were good, foreign demand for farm products of every kind good at prices that are remunerative to farmers, hence the general prosperity.

18. Take specific duty off food and clothing, admit the necessaries of life at the lowest *ad valorem* Tariff consistent with the exigency of a fair revenue, and put the specific duty on luxuries and articles that minister to the pride of life, resist monopolies in lands, in the carrying trade and in manufacturing, &c., &c. British fair play to all, special favor to none.

JAMES McLEAN,  
Municipal Clerk, Aberfoyle, Co. Wellington.

1. No. We get more for our coarse grain by keeping theirs out.
2. We find a better home market for oats and peas since duty put on, corn and low grades of barley now sell for a better price. Rye is not affected either way, it mostly going for German export demand.
3. When we have a fair average crop of wheat the duty makes little difference as the price is governed by export price. In a short crop it adds the price of duty on what we would otherwise get.
4. It adds nearly the price of duty to what we would otherwise get.
5. In our locality most of the horses are sold for the American market; do not think increased duty has affected price as we never brought horses here from the States.
6. Yes, profit compares very favorably with other stock. Market for horses in the States.
7. Can raise all the grain required and do not want American corn. 8. Yes.
9. Yes, and we are in a better position to get it now than when American produce came in free.
10. Can see no effect in price so far. 11. Do not know, none grown in our locality.
12. We get mowers, reapers and thrashing-machines a trifle cheaper, quality as good.
13. Woollens are as cheap, cottons are dearer, hardware has been cheaper since the Tariff but is now about the same.
14. Our market for all coarse grain is better owing to the American corn being dutiable, and butter, eggs, poultry and vegetables, owing to increased home consumption, bring more money. 15. Yes.
16. Farms have not increased in value owing to the most of our farmers going to Manitoba. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

R. S. PATTERSON.  
Reeve, Pittsburg, Co. Frontenac.

1. Decidedly no. Farmers are now reaping the benefit of the duty imposed.
2. In my opinion it has enhanced the price of oats and peas.
3. My answer to this question is that farmers are now getting better prices for all kinds of wheat mentioned.
4. I cannot give a direct answer to this question. But I do know that a few years since we could not sell pork at paying prices; to-day it commands a high price.
5. Decidedly so. 6. Yes; to buyers for different markets. Manitoba.
7. A farmer who raises stock generally grows the feed to fatten them. In my opinion it wouldn't pay to import at all.
8. To this question I can only say that they are all dear, and command the market.
9. I think so. If it would be reciprocal in every sense.
10. Don't know. 11. Don't know.
12. I do not think they are any higher, unless it is a Grit agent who is selling. He may clap on a few dollars extra, and say it is owing to the Tariff.
13. I do not think so. The latter part of my answer to the previous question will answer it—only put in storekeeper for agent.
14. In my opinion, yes. By the Tariff.

15. I think so. Where there was enterprise enough in the people to encourage manufactures.
16. I think in view of the North-West "boom," this question is irrelevant.
17. Decidedly so, in most cases. For if the cost of living has increased, so has the wages of the working man. With plenty of work at that—which they could not obtain "when it was a cheap country to live in."
18. In answer to this question, that legislation direct can do little for the farmer—only in the way indicated in previous questions in relation to the Tariff, namely, giving him a better cash market without an outside competition, which increase of manufactures do.

*General Remarks:*—As to "general remarks," I have only to say that in my humble opinion you could scarcely coax the country to go back to the dark, depressing days of five or six years ago. The present Government has changed the times for the better in spite of its would-be so-called friends. Persevere.

GEORGE CLARK,  
Ex-Reeve, Tiny, Co. Simcoe.

1. Only corn, which we cannot raise profitably in Eastern Ontario. If corn were admitted free, we could sell pease at a profit, and buy corn, which I consider more suitable for feeding purposes.
2. It has created a readier market for our coarse grain, especially oats and pease. Rye and corn not grown much, I can say but little about them. Barley being used for brewing purposes, the price fluctuates; it is low now.
3. We get a better price for spring and fall wheat, which would cause flour to be correspondingly higher.
4. The effect is that farmers try to raise more to meet the demand, as we get a better price. I think the increased duty has been a benefit to the agriculturalist.
5. I think, had the duties not been increased, Manitoba and the North-West would be supplied by the Western States; as it is now, we have a chance to supply the Western States and Western Canada, so the market is raised.
6. We find a paying margin in raising all kinds of stock. There has been a number of horses bought for Manitoba, but more for the Eastern States.
7. Owing to the great increase in butter and cheese production, and also the raising of all kinds of stock. I think it would be an advantage to import Indian corn, if the duty were off.
8. The present Tariff has certainly stimulated the manufacturing industries of the country, as well as other classes; so the articles in question must be benefited.
9. I was always in favor of a Reciprocity Treaty, on equal basis; but now, under our prosperous condition, I would be willing to hold the Tariff as it is. No doubt, we are in a better position to negotiate a treaty than when the Americans had the advantage. 10. Favorable, I think.
11. This question is one that I am not practically acquainted with.
12. I bought a reaper in 1881, which is the best used in this neighbourhood, fully cheaper than I could have bought three years ago, and also an improved mower, for less money than I could have bought the same machine four years ago without the improvements.
13. I cannot say that I have found any increase in price; if there is any difference, cottons and prints are lower.
14. I find that we have a better home market for farm produce, and in my answer to other questions, to be consistent, I must say that the present Tariff has been beneficial to all classes.
15. Since the present Tariff came into operation, we find that the population has increased, and also given encouragement to our various industrial classes.
16. Real estate has increased since 1878; interest on borrowed money has gone down, so land went up. It is more encouraging to buy land when farm produce commands high prices.

17. The general condition of all classes has improved since 1878.  
 18. If the Dominion Parliament would pass an Act, directing that when there would be a surplus, that it be divided amongst the farmers in each township according to their equalized assessment, I think it would make agriculture a more desirable and profitable occupation.

A. J. GRANT,  
Farmer, Williamstown, Co. Glengarry.

- 
1. It would not be to the interest of the Canadian farmer to admit American farm produce free, as it would tend to deprive us of a home market.  
 2. The effect has been to raise the price of oats, peas and corn in this locality; rye and barley are grown to a very limited extent.  
 3. Cannot say, as this section does not produce enough of wheat for its own consumption.  
 4. The effect has been to increase the average price of hog products from 15 to 20 per cent. 5. Yes; very much.  
 6. I find it profitable to breed heavy draught horses, but the profits are not so great as keeping cows for dairy purposes. Our principal market for horses is the city of Montreal, whence I believe they are mostly shipped to the United States.  
 7. In this section we can raise profitably all the grain we require to feed our own stock. 8. Cannot say.  
 9. In my opinion both the Canadian and the American farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty, and I am satisfied we are in a much better position to negotiate such a Treaty under the present Tariff, than if American produce came in free of duty.  
 10. Cannot say, as there are not any more sheep kept by the farmer here than is required for the use of the family. 11. Little or none grown here.  
 12. We can buy reapers, mowers, horse-rakes, ploughs, harrows and most all other farm implements considerably cheaper now than three or four years ago, and the quality is as good if not better. 13. Not perceptibly increased.  
 14. The market for all kinds of farm produce has been increased, and prices are much better than four years ago, but whether this is all to be attributed to the operation of the present Tariff, is a question I would not undertake to answer. But, whatever is the cause, the fact remains that farmers are getting good prices for every kind of produce they have to dispose of.  
 15. It has to a very large extent.  
 16. There is, and farm property has risen in value in this Township 20 per cent. over what it was two years ago.  
 17. The condition of both farmer and labourer has improved very much since 1878; the farmer gets good prices for all he has to sell, and, as a consequence, the labourer gets better wages and steadier employment.  
 18. Any legislation that would tend to increase factories of all kinds in the Dominion, and that would protect our own market, would be beneficial to the farmer.

WILLIAM ALLISON,  
J. P. and Division Clerk, Barb, Co. Prescott.

- 
1. No. 2. It has raised the price of all coarse grains especially rye and barley.  
 3. A beneficial effect, since it prevents the early ripening wheat of the south and west adjacent States from being marketed before our own comes in. This is the case in fall wheat particularly.  
 4. Has induced a very ready sale for live hogs, for our own bacon and hams. The average price of live hogs here was \$6 to \$6.50 per 100 pounds.

5. Yes, all ours have gone to Manitoba.
6. Yes; think it the most profitable kind of stock; in Manitoba.
7. Yes. No, as we can sell any stock alive.
8. Yes; a better and a cash market is now found as people are more fully employed.
9. No. 10. Slightly beneficial, since it has increased home consumption.
11. None raised in this section.
12. Decreased; quality is better. Reapers and mowers.
13. Woollens are lower, and cottons are not any higher.
14. Yes, both, by giving us a home market for all our produce. 15. Yes, both.
16. Yes, farms offered for sale by parties going to Manitoba are readily bought up at increased prices since 1878.
17. Yes, very materially. 18. Not any.

ANDREW WILSON,  
First Vice President, North Lanark Agr. Soc.,  
Appleton, Co. Lanark.

1. It would be against the interest of Canada unless the United States would reciprocate. 2. It has increased the price.
3. It has encouraged home manufacture and helped the farmer.
4. It has increased the price. 5. Horses never were as high here as at present.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, as our market is about equally divided between United States and Manitoba. 7. He can raise it all.
8. It is at least 50 per cent. better.
9. I think if we admitted raw material under a Reciprocity Treaty, it would be benefit; but I would not consent to reciprocate in manufactured articles.
10. It has increased the price of long Canadian wool. 11. No effect here.
12. Quality better and price lower. 13. There is no increase, but a slight decrease.
14. It has been increased by bringing in manufacturers; by having increased the consumers. 15. Yes.
16. They have increased, but not to the extent they would have, owing to the opening of the North-West. 17. Yes, one hundred fold.
18. Encourage the manufacturing interests and make more consumers.

*General Remarks:*—I think a Tariff on iron, so as to start smelting in Canada, would help the farmers.

WM. H. RIKELY,  
Councilman, Parma, Co. Lennox.

1. It would have no bad effect, as the prices are higher in the United States than here.
2. Very little effect except on Indian corn; oats, rye, corn, barley and peas, higher in the United States than here.
3. It has shut out American wheat and flour, but it has not raised the price in Ontario—as we are governed by the Liverpool markets.
4. Very little, as we raise more than we consume.
5. I don't think they have, as horses are scarcer in the United States than in Canada.
6. Yes, well. Before the duty was put on, the United States, but now Manitoba, as the Americans can't pay as much as the Manitobans have to.
7. He can generally. Sometimes it would pay to get American corn. 8. No.
9. He would. Can't say. 10. Reduces price. 11. Can't say.
12. Increased in every article on account of the Tariff taxing the material.
13. Increased. Woollens 10 per cent., cottons 30 per cent., hardware 10 to 30 per cent.
14. No. 15. In some cases, but not in proportion to the tax imposed on the consumer.
16. No. Decreased on account of emigration to United States and Manitoba.
17. Don't think so. 18. Reciprocity.

J. H. SMART,  
Reeve, Gosfield, Co. Essex.

1. No. Where it would benefit one feeder, it would injure one hundred.
2. It has given us a home market for our own coarse grain. Oats are 10 cents higher, pease 20 cents higher, rye 30 cents, partly on account of the German demand.
3. It has given us a home market for our wheat, at a higher price, instead of being compelled to export it to Europe after the Americans would glut our market with their wheat.
4. It has given us a home market for them all, at far better prices.
5. It has given us the benefit of the Manitoba market, at far better prices, for cattle and farm horses.
6. The profits are about the same on all kinds—fancy horses for the United States, farming horses for Manitoba.
7. Yes; every bushel of Indian corn that is imported here injures our market to that extent.
8. Yes, we have been largely benefitted by the imposition of the present Tariff on them all. 9. Yes, on a fair basis. Yes.
10. I cannot answer, as there is very little raised in this section.
11. There is none of this class of products raised in this section of Ontario.
12. The price is lower than in 1877-78, and I think the quality as good, if not better.
13. Woollens about the same. Cottons and nails, a trifle higher. The Tariff did not affect nails, for they were unusually low in 1877-78.
14. Yes, largely. By giving us a home market, and through the mechanics and labouring men having plenty of money to buy with. 15. Yes, largely.
16. There is not much land selling in Ontario. Yet it is higher than in 1878; and had not the great North-West been opened up, it would have been very much higher, but it is as high now as will produce any profit to the investor.
17. Yes, a very visible improvement in both classes.
18. None; except to compel the farmer to learn his profession, to be industrious and prudent in his business, and he has a chance of becoming independent.

PETER D. DAVIS,

Farmer and Ex-Reeve, Adolphustown, Co. Lennox.

1. I think it would be of advantage, because we raise a surplus and we would get the carrying trade, because our market is like the United States in England.
2. The duty on corn is a disadvantage to our farmers; barley, oats and peas are worth more in the United States; our farmers could buy corn for feeding and make a profit by the exchange.
3. I cannot see that we have gained any advantage, because the importers of grain who grind for export get the duty refunded, and as we do not raise spring wheat enough for our own consumption we loose a good deal of the carrying trade.
4. I think it has had the tendency, because the product is in the Western States, of making it higher in price here.
5. I do not know that it has, for the Americans buy horses here yet.
6. No answer. 7. Pay better to import American corn. 8. I think not.
9. I think they would be better off. If four and a-half millions of people can bring fifty millions of people to terms of Reciprocity by retaliatory duties, then we are in a better position for Reciprocity.
10. The effect is altogether in favor of the manufacturer, because the duty imposed is on wool not imported in any great amount to this country.
11. A duty on tobacco raised in this country is against the producer here, and in favor of the producer in other countries, as for flax and sugar beet I cannot say.

12. In some cases they are higher, the increase on pig iron of two dollars a ton, and duty on coal tends to make them higher and causes the manufacturer to use less weight of iron and steel in their machines.
13. They are higher in proportion to duty except Canadian tweed. I do not think they have advanced so much owing to the duty on wool.
14. Not through the Tariff as I think, but by our having good crops in this country and short crops in England.
15. It has in some instances but not in proportion as we expected through Protection, for this reason:—You cannot protect the labouring classes by legislation, because if labour is higher in Canada than in the United States, we get the immigrants to this country and *vice versa*.
16. I think farming lands have decreased in this section, but I think it is on account of the opening up of the North-West.
17. The farmer is better off by having good crops and higher prices in foreign markets, but I cannot see that the wages of the labouring classes have increased much since 1878, if they have, the extra duty they have to pay on what they consume overbalances the difference I think.
18. In my opinion take the duties of the produce off the farm, we raise a surplus for export, except corn.

SENECA PITCHER,

Reeve, Village of Warwick, Co. Oxford.

1. It would be to the interest of farmers to admit all free ; there is no produce but corn and pork, but what a foreign market rules the price mostly in sympathy with the American market.
2. As we have to take the market prices as our guide prior to the imposition of the present Tariff, it has had no beneficial effect on our coarse grains, except Indian corn ; oats has ruled quite as high in the American market as with us ; rye is governed by foreign markets as the distillery would not consume all we raise, and they have to pay market prices ; barley is our staple crop, governed entirely by the American markets ; we could not consume one-eighth of what we raise ; peas are also governed by outside markets, as it does not pay to feed and make pork of them.
3. Wheat and flour are invariably governed by foreign markets always in sympathy with the American, as also with the European markets.
4. It has increased the price no doubt to the amount of duties imposed, but they are not a staple article for farmers to raise, consequently but little benefit to them, but a tax on consumers.
5. The consequence of transit being high to Manitoba, rather higher than the American duties, besides risks, and the American prices governing our market, it has been no benefit, the Americans being the largest buyers, and their market our best market for prices ; most of the horses taken to Manitoba from here were for settlers' own use.
6. It is profitable to raise a good class of horses ; the American market is our best market, as the demand is greater than in Manitoba.
7. It would pay better to import American corn for feeding, as we cannot raise any kind of coarse grain as profitable as corn for feeding purposes, less the duty, which is a tax on the farmer who feeds it.
8. It has but little effect on vegetables, if any, but poultry, butter and eggs are ruled by foreign markets ; as to eggs and poultry, mostly by the American market.
9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by Reciprocity, as a whole ; any Tariff we may impose on American produce could not hurt or affect them or their market, as they are to a large extent our consumers, the Tariff could not have any effect to cause or compel them to adopt Reciprocity, we think, but four millions can have but little influence to coerce fifty millions or thereabouts.

10. The Tariff does not help the price of wool, as it is lower now than for some years, and our growth has no protection.
11. We raise no flax, tobacco nor sugar beet in this section of the county; do not know.
12. They have increased, especially reapers, mowers and ploughs, with all implements whose raw material is taxed; the quality has improved, as the country demands it.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are increased in price in proportion to the Tariff imposed, especially on raw material in manufacturing; and consumers certainly pay all duties added to stock, or manufacturers must lose, if not paid by consumers.
14. I do not think, as a whole, it has increased, as we have had no material increase in population.
15. I cannot see any benefit resulting from it; we have various industries, such as existed prior to the imposition of the present Tariff, but no material advance in wages—not sufficient to prevent emigration to the United States, as under present Tariff; living much higher, consequently hundreds are leaving for Dakota and other parts of the Union, but few returning to Canada.
16. No increased tendency to invest capital in farm property; it has decreased in value here, but do not think the Tariff has anything to do with it; but principally owing to the monopoly and land speculation in the North-West Territory; the Tariff has certainly been no benefit.
17. Farmers' condition has improved much, as well as the labouring classes, owing to a kind Providence sending us the early and latter rain, which gave us good crops and good prices; as a result of poor crops in Europe in general, consequently a large demand for any produce, and not the good effects of the N.P.
18. Legislation that will allow or give the privilege to sell in the highest market and buy in the cheapest, taking advantage of times as they change and fluctuate, I believe would be to the interest of the agriculturist in general, and to very many of the manufacturers.

*General remarks* :—No Tariff should be imposed as to burden the masses, especially the laboring class, for the benefit of the few; and any industry that has to be sustained by a direct tax on the consumer, only such as was reasonable and necessary to meet the current expenses of a Government, is not worth calling an industry; it cannot be a sound or legitimate business, and farmers are beginning to investigate this matter for themselves, as well as mechanically.

G. B. SILLS,  
Farmer, Napanee, Co. Lennox.

1. It would make little difference as regards wheat, peas, or oats, but it would be to our interest to get Indian corn free for feeding stock.
2. The duty on Indian corn has not raised the price of other coarse grains, they are rather lower, except corn.
3. The price of our wheat is lower in comparison with American wheat than before the duties were imposed, and as long as we have a surplus to export, no duties can raise the price of our wheat. Flour is something higher in proportion to the price of wheat.
4. The price of these articles is good this season, but we paid as low a price as ever we had after the Tariff was raised.
5. Decidedly not; no foreigners ever bring horses to Canada for sale of any account; our market is in the United States and England, our home market is not much.
6. Yes, it pays very well if we raise the kind that suits the markets, rather better than other stock; our principal market for horses is the United States, they give better prices.
7. It would pay better to import American corn, it is about the best grain for fattening stock.

8. No. Butter, eggs and poultry have been low these few years past, they are better this year, but not so good a price as before the present Tariff came in.
9. Yes, it would be to the benefit of the Canadian farmer. I cannot answer the last part of this question as it depends on public opinion in the United States.
10. It has a very bad effect; wool is as low as ever it has been for several years.
11. We cultivate none of these things in our locality; cannot say what effect.
12. Increased and the quality of all of them no better. Ploughs are cheaper.
13. Yes, some of them greatly, especially those worn by the poorer classes or by the farmers and working people. Quality of some much inferior by competition.
14. No, it has not; the revival of trade in foreign countries has raised prices, and the home market had to raise also. The Tariff had nothing to do with it.
15. No, not in this locality, many are going to the States, &c., no new industry started; in fact the population of this township has decreased 267 since 1878 according to the last assessment roll.
16. No. Farm property has decreased in value since the present Tariff came in, the reason is the opening up of the North-West and the better chances in the United States, and increasing fiscal burdens in Canada. Every burden of taxation reduces the value of farm and other property.
17. No; almost everything we buy has been made higher by taxation, and prices are not any better than formerly except wheat this present year.
18. Make the Tariff a Revenue one; get Reciprocity; do not be robbing us to build railways in the North-West; let the land grabbers do it; and decrease the public debt instead of increasing it, and keep the cost of the Dominion Government within reasonable bounds.

*General Remarks* :—I have given above the general opinion of most of the people in this locality and what I believe to be the truth. Times of depression and prosperity succeed each other. No Tariff can relieve in some cases, it certainly cannot give a better foreign price, and it should not increase our burdens.

GEORGE BURROWS,  
Township Clerk, Sunnidale, Co. Simcoe.

1. Yes. Canada is no market for American farm produce, it would go through and benefit our railways and laborers.
2. Has done harm to us in regard to corn; we used to buy it, some people even for food—cannot see any effect on coarse grain; we need none from the United States.
3. Flour is made dearer by it; we feel it all the more because we have to buy the most of our flour in Muskoka. I cannot say in regard to spring and fall wheat—we have none for sale. 4. It makes it so much dearer to us.
5. I cannot say, we import as many (heavy horses for lumbering) as we sell. I believe the lumbermen have to pay for it.
6. Whatever horses are sold here are generally sold to Yankees.
7. There is not much fattened here, people are glad to get them through the winter in passable good order; corn would be used to some extent.
8. I do not think so; the manufacturers prosper whenever the farmer prospers, their business would have increased without the Tariff, and may be more.
9. Undoubtedly. I cannot see that the Tariff hurts the Americans, we have to pay it and they can do without us, having grand resources of their own.
10. None that I know of, whatever is imported seems to come in free.
11. I cannot tell. We raise none of it. Tobacco is dearer now, but I do not know why.
12. About the same, yet they would likely be cheaper, the prices were always extravagant; if they were increased they would not sell much.
13. Woolens and cottons are dearer. I have a large family and buy everything myself, therefore I know; fall clothes I used to get for 50 cents a yard is 75 cents now, and it seems inferior too; shirting formerly 14 cents is now 18 cents.

14. I do not think so; if manufacturers are increased in number it is on account of good crops and general prosperity of the country; good and bad times change it is a natural law and was always so.
  15. If there is more employment the above reasons will account for it. There are always people going to the States to better themselves in regard to climate and soil.
  16. The present Tariff cannot but decrease that tendency. Farm lands have decreased in value greatly, the sudden opening of the North-West is probably the strongest cause; it will depopulate Muskoka fast.
  17. Yes; but not by the Tariff. Laborers suffer most by it. They have everything to buy.
  18. Free Trade with all nations—if this cannot be done a return to the old Tariff, which was high enough by all means.
- General Remarks* :—I found that the Tariff gives every petty storekeeper a good excuse to add a Tariff of his own—the unreasonable retail prices keep farmers poor.

A. WIANERO,

Farmer and Reeve, Morrison, District of Muskoka.

1. No, our interest is to keep American produce out; they could sell oats and corn here for less money than we could.
2. It has given us a market for our oats and peas that we could not have if Indian corn was allowed free.
3. Cannot say as to fall wheat, but spring wheat has been a better price.
4. We have had a better price, and hogs to-day are hardly obtainable short of 7 cents per lb. live weight.
5. Most undoubtedly we can sell any kind of horses now for a good price, for Manitoba.
6. Breeding horses is the most profitable branch of our business. Some go to the United States, but the principal part to Manitoba.
7. We can raise profitably all the grain we want for fattening stock. Farmers here want no American corn.
8. Yes; there is a market here for vegetables we never had before; eggs and butter have also improved.
9. I believe we would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty; but I also believe you are in a better position to negotiate for it than if their produce came in free.
10. From 3 to 4 cents more than could be got in 1879.
11. Cannot say whether it is the Tariff, or what does it; but flax has been very profitable here these last few years. Tobacco and sugar-beet is not raised here.
12. No; they are not increased in price, but they are of a better quality. Reapers, mowers, horse rakes, forks, ploughs—in fact all are better than they used to be, and not as costly.
13. Can notice no increase on any of these articles.
14. The home market has been better, and we credit the Tariff for it by giving employment to mechanics and others that were half idle before.
15. It has given diversity of employment to various industries here, and the rush to the States is not now seen, that we had a few years ago.
16. There does not seem to be an increased tendency to invest in land here, owing to the rush for Manitoba.
17. Their condition is decidedly improved, whatever the cause; but the N. P. gets credit for it. 18. I have none; we are doing well as we are.

*General Remarks*.—That there is a decided change for the better among all classes, no sane man can deny, whatever the cause—N. P. or Providence. Perhaps both.

GEORGE FORSYTHE,

Reeve, Morris, Co. Huron.

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—Taken altogether I consider the present Tariff to the advantage of this country, and the policy of the present Government has in a great measure contributed to its prosperity.

JAMES R. CAMPBELL,  
Farmer, Cornwall, Co. Stormont.

1. Admit none free. 2. The duty on corn has had a good effect on corn, it has stimulated the farmers to raise more, and costs the consumers no more but hurts speculators; oats and rye bring a better price; on barley and peas their is not much difference.
3. I do not think it has made any difference, foreign demand rules our prices.
4. Pork, live hogs and lard are higher in price by 20 per cent.
5. Horses and cattle are 20 per cent. better.
6. I find it profitable to breed horses, the principal market is the United States; cows are the most profitable for the farmers to raise.
7. We can raise all the grain we want and have a surplus and make work for all our loose men, if the market is not glutted with American coarse grain to bring it so low as not to pay hired help. 8. Yes.
9. I cannot see how it would benefit the Canadian farmer to compete with the United States; they will not allow any of our produce or manufactured material to go over free, and why should we.
10. None in our locality. 11. We raise none in our locality.
12. All farm implements are decreased in value. Mowers, reapers, horse rakes, ploughs and cultivators are cheaper and the quality is better.
13. All those articles are cheaper.
14. It has, it leaves the home market to be supplied by our surplus produce, instead of being glutted by American corn and oats.
15. It has; there is no person that need be out of employment the last two years and at good wages.
16. There is four times the capital invested in farm property, and at 20 per cent. advance since 1878, the reason why there is money in the country—now at that time it was nill.
17. Yes, very much. 18. None of any moment.

JOHN J. ADAMS,  
Farmer, Wales, Co. Stormont.

1. Corn only. Corn can be grown cheaper in the States than Canada, the climate being better adapted for it, it is more profitable for Canadian farmers to buy.
2. No effect whatever. 3. It has had no effect. 4. No effect. 5. No.
6. Yes, profitable to raise horses, as much so at present prices as any other stock; Manitoba is the principal market.
7. It pays better to import American corn. 8. Yes.
9. Don't know that Reciprocity would benefit the Canadian farmer any. We are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty under the present Tariff.
10. Can't say. 11. None cultivated in this section.
12. It has not increased the price, and the quality has improved.
13. Woollens and hardware are not any higher; cotton a little higher, but with a little more competition will be as cheap as ever.
14. Yes. It has given us a better home market. 15. Yes.
16. No. In consequence of the emigration to Manitoba, real estate has decreased in value in this section.
17. Yes, very materially. 18. Unable to give an opinion.

RICHARD BLAKE,  
Reeve, Village of Newboro, Co. Leeds.

1. No. 2. It has stimulated home production.
3. It has protected the agriculturist and encouraged the Canadian farmer.
4. It should be a great saving to Canada to realize the saving of Tariff, and self-made packing establishments, &c.
5. I think on the whole it is a benefit. 6. More market field in Manitoba.
7. The country has abundance of facilities to raise all we need.
8. I don't think there is any damage, considering everything.
9. Can't say whether Reciprocity would benefit or not. But we are in a better position to negotiate than when no Tariff of account.
10. It cultivates wool growing. 11. I don't know.
12. Our manufacturers are busy to excel the former styles; and the farmer, I think, get them without much (if any) advance, and we have the money saved in the country.
13. Farmers, I think, realize and buy on as favorable terms, if not better, than before the Tariff.
14. Improved; *i.e.*, home consumption. 15. It has increased the demand for labor.
16. In some instances land has fallen, through influence of the great North-West.
17. Materially benefited.
18. It would take a wiser head than mine to improve by legislation.

ABEL YATES,  
Postmaster, Spring Valley, Co. Leeds.

1. No. 2. To enhance the price of all coarse grains.
3. Very little wheat raised in this section, but what little is raised, a decided benefit.
4. Farmers realized much better price for hogs, either dead or alive. 5. Yes.
6. Yes; favorably, and Manitoba.
7. Yes; mistake made in this section—farmers trying to raise wheat instead of coarse grains.
8. Yes; considerably. 9. I think so. Most decidedly.
10. I think the farmers ought to be protected by a small duty on foreign wools coming in.
11. None raised in this section. 12. Decreased. Fully better.
13. If anything, cheaper.
14. Yes. By duty on American corn, wheat and woollen goods. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. Yes; increased. More confidence and better prices for everything the farmer has to sell, since the N. P. 17. Yes; most decidedly.
18. Not prepared to answer question. Don't know of any change.

*General Remarks:*—This section of country is best adapted for cattle and sheep-raising in particular. I think Reciprocity would give us a better market for our lambs, which all go to the Yankee side.

ISAAC McKENYON,  
Reeve, North Burgess, Co. Lanark.

1. No. We raise a sufficient quantity for our own consumption.
2. Have experienced a corresponding rise in price on all coarse grains.
3. Spring wheat has increased 25 cents per bushel.
4. It has given a much better market for all hog products. 5. It has.
6. It is profitable to breed horses; the most profitable of any stock raised in this locality. Being situated on the province line, the most of our horses go to the United States market.
7. This locality can raise all the grain required to fatten their stock.
8. They are bringing a better price and must give the N.P. the praise of strengthening the market in those products as well as all others.

9. Yes. We are in a better condition to-day than we have been since the repeal of the Treaty.
10. Not increased in proportion to other products. 11. Not raised in this vicinity.
12. They are cheaper; the quality has improved.
13. There is a better demand, the manufactured articles have increased only in proportion to the raw material.
14. It has; by increasing the consumers. 15. Yes, it has.
16. Have increased; because the prices for the products have increased. 17. Yes.
18. If a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States could be formed on a equitable basis it would benefit the agriculturalists in this Province.

*General Remarks:*—We are in a very healthy state at present, the policy of the Government has given all the satisfaction all that could be.

NYE C. MARTIN,  
Mayor, Stanbridge, Upper Bedford, Co. Missisquoi.

1. No. 2. On oats, peas, barley, good. 3. Rather favorable. 4. Better prices.
5. Slightly. 6. Yes; home market. 7. Can raise all required.
8. Yes, 25 per cent. 9. Doubtful; with present Tariff. 10. Prices increased.
11. Do not know. 12. About 20 per cent. less; yes, all farm implements.
13. No. 14. Yes. 15. Yes, to a great extent, beyond all calculations.
16. Yes, about the same. 17. Yes, very much. 18. No answer.

JAS. ASHDOWN,  
Reeve, Humphrey, Ashdown, Co. Simcoe.

1. No. 2. It has improved the market for oats, rye, barley and peas.
3. Flour no change, and has encouraged farmers to raise wheat.
4. It has paid farmers to fatten pork, and improved the market.
5. By all means it has improved. 6. Yes, about the same; home market.
7. He can raise enough. No. 8. Yes.
9. No. We are, but would not do so by any means. 10. It has advanced.
11. No answer. 12. No. 13. Yes, cotton advanced.
14. Yes, by keeping out the American surplus.
15. Yes; it has encouraged them to return home.
16. Yes; increased by the advance of a home market. 17. Yes.
18. By keeping on the duty and putting a heavy duty on butterine.

*General Remarks:*—It would be the ruination of the farmers if the Tariff was taken off, for they are only recovering from the depression of hard times, and they may say what they will, but the farmer is the labourer. If the manufacturer receives benefit the farmer does also.

JOHN McDONALD,  
St. Andrews, Co. Stormont.

1. No; not for the farmers of Lambton at any rate.
2. I dare say it has raised the price somewhat, but it has given an encouragement to our farmers to raise more, which has greatly benefited the farmer. I speak of all except rye, which is not raised to any extent.
3. It has raised the price for home consumption, in both flour and wheat.
4. I think at least 10 or 15 per cent., and has shut out nearly entirely all American hams, bacon, &c., which are now manufactured here and the consumer gets a much preferable article.
5. Yes; it has given us a splendid market for Manitoba and the North-West to the very great advantage of the farmer.

6. Our farmers always had a pretty good market in the United States, but we command better prices now, as the North-West is secured to us here to a very great degree.
7. Yes; and we never raised such fine cattle as now. The National Policy made the farmer self-reliant, and has done wonders in this respect.
8. I do not think it made any difference, as we never imported these articles.
9. Reciprocity was very nice when we had it, but it is better the way it is, as too much money left the country which now remains in it, and is vastly improving the condition of our inhabitants; and I know what I am saying, and no one remains about here to disprove my assertion.
10. I do not think it makes any difference, as we never imported any in this part of Canada. 11. It neither affects us one way or the other.
12. No; we now get all of Canadian manufacture, and a better article at a lower figure, since our own people found out they could make them which they never seemed to realize before the National Policy gave them encouragement.
13. I do not think they are, except in a few articles, but in the aggregate every one knows they are cheaper and better. I cannot specify one single article which is dearer in consequence of the National Policy in these lines.
14. I cannot say it has to any extent, as we always consumed our own produce; but for fruit and vegetables it has made us produce what we consume, and given a great impetus to our gardeners.
15. The Tariff has done everything for us in this line. Men are scarce and every one is encouraged to develop our resources, the result of all being that every one must either give credit to the National Policy or keep very quiet.
16. Very few farmers are disposed to sell their farms now, unless at an advance of, I should think, 25 per cent. over the year 1878; wild lands throughout the county have been bought up, chiefly by farmers for their sons. Being a Land Agent I speak very positively on this clause.
17. Yes; neither Sir John, Tilley or Tupper imagined or spoke more strongly on this great question than has been realized in this the last place in Canada to be benefited by the National Policy on account of the opposition it received.
18. None unless you raise the Tariff on coarse grains and shut them out altogether, as then we should be further encouraged to raise all that could be consumed and to spare.

*General Remarks*:—All politicians here know the above to be correct, but would not of course, for party sake, admit publicly the facts, or they would be denounced and read out of their party, and many would be ruined in their business.

E. P. WATSON,  
Reeve, Sarnia, Co. Lambton.

1. On the contrary, I know of none which, by being admitted free, would not tend to affect the interest of farmers unfavorably, to a greater or less extent.
2. Corn has been increased in price to the full extent of the duty. Oats hold a better price; barley, rye and peas are not grown to any extent in this locality.
3. I am not sufficiently informed to answer clearly. My impression is the price is regulated by the yield.
4. It has given Canadian farmers the home market which was formerly divided with the Americans. 5. Yes.
6. There is profit in raising a good class of horses, but probably not more than cattle. Manitoba is our principal market.
7. He can raise all he requires, that is all he can profitably use.
8. The prices here do not seem to have been affected.
9. I think on the whole he would be benefited. Most certainly we are.
10. I think it has affected it very little.
11. Flax and sugar beet are not grown here to any extent. It does not seem to stimulate the growth of tobacco.

12. All articles purchased by me have been as cheap and the quality as good as before the Tariff was changed. 13. They are not increased in price.
14. Yes; Indian corn has been increased, the growth having been stimulated and price improved. Pork is affected as stated above. The demand for horses for Manitoba is steady and brisk. The price of oats is better and more uniform.
15. It has certainly widened the field of employments. I think its tendency will be more and more to keep our people at home.
16. Yes. Yes, farm lands are higher, partly from the security we feel that we will not be swamped by the farmers of the Western States. I think, and am in fact sure, that the demand for farm property here would be much greater but for the stream of emigration to Manitoba.
17. Very materially. 18. I think agriculture will flourish under the Tariff.

CHARLES. G. FOX,  
Farmer and Reeve, Gosfield, Co. Essex.

1. Do not know of any except corn, which we do not raise here.
2. Not appreciable here, as we could export oats, very few of the other grains raised here.
3. Not appreciable, except in some districts where exceptionable cheap freight can be had from Boston. In those places flour may be somewhat higher than if no duty were applied.
4. Nothing, as we can export hogs from these parts. 5. Not affected here.
6. It would be probable, but our people at present are not awake to the necessity of breeding good stock.
7. Yes, but as at first mentioned, it would be economical to import American corn, more particularly if we could sell them our oats.
8. It has made no difference with us as yet.
9. Yes, undoubtedly the Maritime Provinces farmer would, as we could sell profitably potatoes, oats, turnips, hay, &c., if no duties were on. I think the Tariff puts us in a better position as we have more offset.
10. Not appreciable here, our wool being all used at home. 11. None here.
12. I think these Canadian mowers, ploughs, &c., are as cheap and of as good quality as the American.
13. I think all goods are somewhat higher at present, and cannot well be otherwise until sufficient competition among our own factories; this, however, will soon work its own cure. 14. No difference here yet.
15. No effect in this locality as no manufactory has as yet started; this being a partly fishing district, the bounty to fishermen will greatly assist them.
16. Nothing in this regard, mostly stationary, a slight change for the better.
17. Yes, sensibly improved.
18. Nothing special in the way of change. In the fostering of our herring Fishing and Manufacturing industries must certainly improve the home market for the farmer. A Reciprocity Treaty giving us the American market for our minerals, timber, potatoes, oats, turnips, would undoubtedly be a great boon.

*General Remarks* :—This is partly a fishing community, agriculture is not in a very advanced state in this locality.

THOMAS MAY,  
County Councillor, Port Mulgrave, Co. Guysborough, N.S.

1. I think it would not be in the interest of the farmers to admit any produce free, because it would tend to lower the price of their own products.
2. It has the effect of keeping oats higher, as the lumbermen do not use meal as much as formerly.

3. In my opinion it does not affect the price of flour at present.
4. The duty on those articles (especially lard and hams) has a tendency to make the price higher, as the farmers do not produce enough to supply the demand.
5. I think the duties do not affect this Province much, as we export altogether and do not import except for breeding purposes.
6. The breeding of horses is a profitable business here when properly followed, should say not as profitable as meat stock; market, United States.
7. Can raise grain and roots cheaper; it would not pay to buy corn to fatten stock.
8. Does not affect the market for those articles.
9. I think a Reciprocity Treaty would be beneficial to the farmers. In my judgment we are in a better position with the present Tariff. 10. No material effect.
11. Do not know of any amount of those articles raised in this vicinity.
12. They are no higher than before the Tariff, in fact hardly as high, especially ploughs, mowing-machines, rakes and waggons, and the quality as good as usual.
13. I find woollens and cottons as cheap as before the Tariff was put on. Hardware, cutlery of all kinds cheaper than before. Locks, &c., for doors are dearer, not so much by the Tariff as by combination of manufacturers.
14. I think the Tariff does not affect the markets for produce here. 15. No doubt of it.
16. There has been very little change in real estate (Tariff does not affect it). I think there are more farms for sale on account of a good many people going to the North-West. 17. Most assuredly it has.
18. I know of no change in legislation which would have the desired effect. Farming is at present a profitable occupation when attended to industriously with contentment and economy.

*General Remarks*:—I think I am in a position to know about a good many of the questions asked, and the information given is by comparing the prices as they are now, and even before I have been in business about ten years as merchant and general dealer.

BENJAMIN CLOSE,  
Warden, Co. York, N.B.

1. Certainly not. 2. Good, especially on rye and corn, which has induced agriculturists to raise rye and corn more extensively, which will be an advantage to us in the future.
3. From the state of the market, the imposition has been a benefit, especially on fall wheat. Spring wheat is a decided failure in this part.
4. Good. 5. Yes, stock has increased in value since.
6. It has proved to be very profitable in this part. The principal market is the United States; but the prospect for horses is good in Manitoba in the future.
7. Cheaper to raise it by 20 per cent. 8. Yes. 9. No, never.
10. Reduction in price. 11. No answer.
12. Decreased on nearly all farming implements.
13. Decreased since the Tariff. 14. Yes, present prices tell it.
15. Yes, so much so that we wish the Government would take some steps to induce immigration to Ontario.
16. Owing to the excitement in the North-West, land has not increased in Ontario.
17. Yes, somewhat. 18. Hoping the Government will hold out inducements to immigrants and capitalists to settle in Ontario, as it would be more profitable than it now is on account of want of help.

*General Remarks*:—Look well to the boundary question. Hoping these answers will meet your approval, and that the Government will not allow too much monopoly in the North-West for the good of the country.

WILLIAM DELONG, J. P.,  
Ex-President of the Conservative Association,  
Ameliasburgh, Co. Prince Edward, Ontario.

1. In my opinion nothing but corn, because we, in this Province, cannot raise it as cheap as we get it freight paid, and it is an uncertain crop.
2. The effect of the duty on corn has been, here, that we have to feed out our oats, whereas it would be better to have the American corn to feed, and sell our oats to the Americans at a good price.
- 3 and 4. Ignoramus. 5. The price of horses has gone up these last few years.
6. United States. 7. Better to import American corn.
8. Yes; better if it were higher. 9. No; we are far better as we are developing our own resources, mechanical and agricultural. 10. Ignoramus.
11. The duty on American tobacco should be raised to encourage home culture.
12. All kinds of farm implements are now sold here manufactured in Canada equal to the best American ploughs, cultivators, harrows, seeders, mowers and reapers, and as soon as a new American invention is brought in they start a factory in Canada to save the duty.
- 13 and 14. No answer. 15. Yes; in this locality numbers have returned; most of those who leave are away only for a short time.
16. Increased more than double by the higher prices of grain, hay and root crops, as well as stock.
17. Yes; and we pay nearly three times as much for farm laborers as in 1878.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—I have cultivated tobacco for several years by a system peculiar of my own, in which I have succeeded in raising an article as good as any grown in the United States, and think that the excise should be put as low as possible for a few years and duty increased on the American, in order to develop our growth and to get over the prejudice against ours.

THOS. BARWIS,  
Prothonotary, Arthabaskaville, P.Q.

1. Yes; as regards Indian corn for feeding, and all kinds of seed grain the farmer wishes to buy where he considers it better for him to do so than raise the article at home. The farmer is just as much a manufacturer as any sugar refinery or cotton lord, and should be allowed to get his raw material as low as possible, and purchase in the market where he can do best.
2. As soon as the duty was put on American corn, it raised the price to the farmer here 10 cents per bushel—this is a fact. There is very little corn and rye raise in this section. The duty on corn has no effect on the price of barley and peas, so long as we are shipping so much of both out of the country. At present it has no effect on the price of oats, as oats were lately shipped from Paisley to Buffalo. These prices are regulated by the supply and demand, both at home and abroad.
3. Our best kinds of spring wheat have been a very uncertain and inferior crop for some years back. The Goose wheat did well in 1881—about thirty bushels to the acre. It sells to the millers for about 15 cents less than Clawson fall wheat. The duty may have benefited a few millers, as regards the price of flour, and given them a larger market in the Lower Provinces. The foreign demand is what has regulated the price of our wheat, one might almost say without exception since 1860.

4. Live hogs, hams and bacon have been in good demand, but I cannot say that this is owing to the duty, or the farmers turning their attention more to feeding cattle and sheep. The pea bug may have had some effect, for three years back by destroying on some farms as much as one-half of the crop. I for one gave up raising pork for sale for these reasons.
5. I am not aware of any horses or live stock having been shipped from here to the North-West. Milch cows and oxen are in good demand, and very likely that may be their destination; this trade is only in its infancy.
6. It will pay to raise at present prices, good sound draught horses, excepting fancy driving animals; lighter horses are a drug in the market. United States, Ottawa and Montreal was where most of the horses went to this winter.
7. This depends on the state of his farm and how many cattle he wishes to fatten. Some years it pays better to sell barley and buy corn—that all depends on the price of the two articles. If a farmer wishes to make up his farm, it will pay to import American corn and feed a lot of extra cattle, if he pays all expenses and has the manure for a profit.
8. Not in this section. Poultry, eggs and butter are shipped to the United States and England.
9. Most certainly. As to the position a great deal would depend on public opinion in the United States. A good example on our part might have a much better effect than a mere show of retaliation.
10. No effect. Market for wool could not be much worse.
11. None in this section. Not much flax or tobacco raised. Sugar-beets raised for cattle feed.
12. The manufacturer should be better able to answer this question. Certainly they have to pay the increased duty on iron and coal, in the first place, and in the long run the consumer has to pay it either directly or indirectly.
13. Cotton goods have been raised in price owing to the increased duty and rise in raw material. Canadian full cloth, boots and shoes and coal oil are very inferior in quality to what they were some years ago. This is my own experience and also that we have to pay the increased duty on all imported goods consumed by the family. 14. Not in this section.
15. Not in this section. During the dull times in the United States, a large number of Canadians came back, but as soon as the good times returned, emigration set in and has continued to this date—mostly to the United States, Manitoba and the North-West.
16. Money can be borrowed at a lower rate of interest—just the reverse as regards the purchasing. Farm lands have decreased from 15 per cent. to 25 per cent. The Tariff has very little to do with it. The Manitoba North-West and emigration fever throwing so many farms on the market is the principal cause.
17. Very little. The good crop of fall wheat in 1880 gave the farmers a great lift and enabled them to pay off back debts from previous years; also the good demand for export cattle. If you except the men along the railway, there is hardly such a class as the labouring left in the country—nearly all gone; that is in this district.
18. The reduction of taxation and return to a Revenue Tariff; the abolition of all class legislation and monopolies, either in trade, public lands or railways; the removal of all unnecessary restrictions from trade and commerce, thereby giving every facility for the moving of the produce of the country at as low freight as possible.

*General Remarks:*—It is quite impossible to give a definite answer to most of the foregoing questions, as the prices of nearly everything the farmer buys and sells are regulated by so many different circumstances over which no Tariff or Government can have the slightest control. As a hard working farmer and the father of a large young family, I honestly consider the present Tariff and N. P. nothing better than legalized robbery and a consummate fraud!

ROBERT B. FLEMING,  
Farmer, Clerk Tp. Saugeen, Co. Bruce.

1. It would not be in the interest of farmers to admit American produce free.
2. Increase of prices to the producer. 8. No answer. 4. An increase of prices.
5. In my opinion it has increased the price of stock.
6. Horses are purchased here for the United States and Manitoba.
7. Can raise all required to feed stock with profit without corn. 8. Cannot say.
9. I would favor Reciprocity, but if we cannot get it, then Protection.
- 10 and 11. Cannot say. 12. Competition regulates the price of farm implements, and I can buy as cheap as when we had no Protection.
13. None. 14. Much improved by the Tariff. 15. Certainly it has.
16. Increased in value. 17. Very much. 18. None.

JOHN McDERMOTT,  
Farmer, Palmerston, Co. Perth.

1. No. 2. Oats, higher prices and steadier market; rye, none grown—not grown as a crop; barley, no effect; peas, same as oats.
3. It has given Ontario millers the Lower Province markets, and thus enabled them to pay the farmer higher prices for his wheat. Hard spring wheat is now much higher.
4. Higher prices and good demand from Manitoba and North-West—and lumber trade—which demand would be supplied from Chicago if it were not for the duty now imposed.
5. Yes, as it has furnished us with a much enlarged market for all grades of horses.
6. Am not a farmer, but should think so, at the prices now paid by buyers from both the United States and Manitoba.
7. Yes, unless we have a failure of crop of all coarse grains. Then, if corn were cheap, and beef high, it would pay to import American corn. 8. Not affected here.
9. Yes. The present improves our position for securing a Reciprocity Treaty.
10. Have no definite knowledge. 11. Not grown in this locality.
12. Not increased in price. Competition keeps prices low and quality good.
13. Woollens and cottons not materially affected. Hardware—shelf goods—are a little higher under the present Tariff.
14. Yes. By the increased home demand. 15. Yes, most emphatically.
16. Yes, but counteracted by large numbers of our farmers selling out to go to Manitoba and the North-West. But the product of the farm sells for more money, thereby increasing the value of farm lands. 17. Yes, most decidedly.
18. A Reciprocity Treaty with the States in the products of the forest and field would benefit the farmer.

WM. RICHARDSON,  
Reeve, Walkerton, Co. Bruce.

1. By no means. 2. To raise the price of oats, rye, pease and corn.
3. It has kept our markets to our own farmers, and prices are better.
4. Pork and hogs are higher than for some years back. 5. Yes.
6. Mostly for United States. 7. Yes; at present prices. No. 8. Yes.
9. It would depend much on the extent and terms of the Reciprocity. In a much better position. 10. No answer.
11. Tobacco and sugar-beet not grown here, nor enough of flax to be affected.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased, the quality far better.
13. They are not increased by the Tariff. I can buy such goods cheaper. 14. Yes.
15. Yes. 16. Yes. Increased, and would have done much more but for the exodus to Manitoba.
17. Yes. 18. To make a larger home market.

GEORGE A. NORRIS, M.D.,  
Reeve, Omamee, Co. Victoria.

1. It would not.
2. It has raised the price of corn, oats, rye and barley.
3. It has raised the price of fall and spring wheat, also flour, by giving us our own market without competition.
4. To increase the value of all those articles, and benefit the farmer thereby.
5. It has, and encourages the farmer to go more largely to stock-raising.
6. We do, and there is no stock pays so well on the farm as the horse. We sell in our own market.
7. He can, and it is to his advantage to do so.
8. It is through the increased number of persons engaged in manufacturing.
9. It would not benefit the farmer, and we are in a better position to negotiate a treaty if required.
10. Very little as yet.
11. I cannot tell, as we do not grow those crops here.
12. The price of those articles are less and of better quality.
13. They are about the same price.
14. It has, by the increased number of people engaged in manufacturing, and by preventing the market being supplied by American produce.
15. It has prevented emigration to a great extent, and caused many to return.
16. Farm lands have increased in value by the improved condition of the farmer, and cheapness of money caused by the N.P.
17. Very much so.
18. The Government has done all that can be done by any Government for the farmer.

*General Remarks* :--The Tariff has benefited the farmer greatly in this section by giving him a market for his fruit and preventing the Americans glutting the market to keep the prices of fruit up in their own country, which had the effect of preventing the Canadian farmer going extensively into fruit-growing, as this section is so well adapted for.

JAMES HISCOTT,  
Reeve, Niagara, Co. Lincoln.

1. Not by any means.
2. It has raised the price per bushel and stimulated the price of corn and oats to a greater extent.
3. Could answer definitely if the demand was greater than the supply in the Dominion.
4. It has given the farmers of this country a clear gain of \$2 per 160 lbs. live weight.
5. The Manitoba market has raised the price of horses 30 per cent.
6. At present the profits are good. Manitoba takes everything worth owning in horses.
7. We can raise all kinds required here.
8. No answer.
9. If advisable I should think we are in far better position to dictate than we ever were before.
- 10 and 11. No answer.
12. Cost of farm implements has lately decreased in price, quality the same.
13. No answer.
14. It has. See Nos. 2, 4 and 5 of this report.
15. It has most decidedly.
16. Increased in value by getting larger profits on invested capital.
17. The condition of farmers has greatly improved. The labouring classes are getting 25 per cent. more wages now than in 1878.
18. Gives us facilities for sending across and receiving stock for breeding and other purposes either at Windsor or Amherstburg or both.

E. DUNSTAN,  
Reeve, Colchester North, Co. Essex.

1. No.
2. On corn, 15c. per bushel; oats, 10c.; other coarse grains, 15 per cent.
3. No spring wheat raised in this Township; price of flour no greater according to price of wheat; price of red wheat enhanced 10 per cent.
4. Pork of all kinds advanced at least 33½ per cent.
5. Yes.

6. It is decidedly profitable to raise horses, and profits compare favorably with other stock. Our principal market is Manitoba.
7. Farmers can raise all the grain they require. 8. Yes.
9. We do not think the farmer here would be benefited by Reciprocity; we are quite positive we would be in a better position to treat with the present Tariff.
10. None. 11. None raised in this Township.
12. Farm implements rather lower in price and better quality, such as all kinds of ploughs, reapers and mowers, forks, harrows, &c. 13. No increase in price.
14. Yes; by giving the farmers the benefit of their own market; it being better owing to the encouragements given to manufacturers, thereby giving employment to a large number of operatives. 15. Yes.
16. Farm lands appear to be in better demand than for many years, owing to lower rates of interest. 17. Yes. 18. No change at present necessary.

JOHN OSTRAND,

Reeve, Middleton, Co. Norfolk,

1. It would not unless we could export free in return.
2. The price of oats has been greatly benefited; rye about the same as before; corn and barley very materially benefited; peas not grown on account of the bugs.
3. Greatly benefited especially when to be used for home consumption, and have no doubt we will see the effect this coming summer.
4. The price of hogs, &c., is very high, but I think it is on account of foreign demand. 5. Yes.
6. The profits in breeding horses to a certain extent are about the same as other stock, but would advise mixed breeding in all kinds of stock. We find a market for our horses both in Manitoba and the United States, the better quality going to the States.
7. I am in favor of raising our own coarse grain for feed.
8. I think not.
9. Yes; I think we are in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff.
10. Cannot say. 11. Cannot say.
12. The cost of farm implements is about the same, but they are of a better quality; reapers, mowers, drills, &c.
13. We can buy articles in this class as cheap as we could before the Tariff.
14. Since the Tariff the products of the farm have brought a great deal better prices, whether it is on account of the Tariff or not I cannot say.
15. There would have been hundreds of men driven from Canada in search of employment if it had not been for the Tariff, and furthermore it has been the means of bringing Canadians back from the United States and a great many Americans as well.
11. There is. The price of farm lands have increased slightly, but a great deal more sought after I think on account of money bringing such a low rate of interest.
17. Yes; very materially in fact, farmers are getting independent as a general thing.
18. I have no doubt if we had the Free Trade with the United States we might have some branches of agriculture more profitable.

ANDREW N. CLINE,

Reeve, South Dorchester, Co. Elgin.

1. There is no market so good as a home market. By allowing the American agriculturalist our markets free, would compel us to procure a foreign market for a large amount of our produce, which would be injurious to our farmers, as well

- as unjust, as long as we are debarred from the American markets for our produce.
2. The duty on American corn and oats has the effect of raising the price of our oats and barley very much, on oats fully 10 cents per bushel; very few peas have been sown this last two years on account of the pea bug. Rye is not raised here.
  3. Our mills are capable of grinding and disposing of all the wheat in the Province for home consumption; if American wheat and flour were admitted free of duty it would displace our wheat and lower the price very materially.
  4. The effect has been very marked; a few years ago we could scarcely dispose of our hogs and pork, since the duty was imposed we can scarcely supply the demand at greatly advanced prices.
  5. Horses that were heretofore unsaleable are now bought readily at stiff prices for Manitoba and the North-West; the same can be said with regard to other live stock, large numbers being taken daily from this locality.
  6. Yes; I think breeding horses of late years compare very favourably with that of the United States; our market is Manitoba principally, superior horses go to the United States.
  7. Yes; pay much better than importing American corn. 8. No; not directly.
  9. Probably we would, but not to the same extent that we would a few years ago; we have other markets opened up equally as good as that of the United States for the greater part of our products. We are in a much better position to negotiate a Treaty with the United States than formerly, when they possessed our markets free of duty for their manufactures and products.
  10. Through the increased consumption of wool in our own factories the effect has been beneficial, and still likely to increase in time.
  11. I am not in a position to say, the sugar beet is only raised for table use; the cultivation of flax is very limited, and no tobacco raised whatever.
  12. All farm implements and machinery of every description are greatly improved in quality, and considerably decreased in price. I am unable to say whether the Tariff has been the means of producing such satisfactory results.
  13. By taking an average of the last five years, woollens, cottons, and hardware have not increased in price; some lines in hardware are much cheaper.
  14. Very much so, our farmers now supply the home market nearly altogether, and not as heretofore when the American farmer supplied it.
  15. All our people are fully employed, there are none going from this locality to the United States; we could give employment to an unlimited number of farm and other laborers at good wages.
  16. There has been quite a number of sales of farm property in this locality of late at increased prices. The reason for the increase is that money is more plentiful and cheaper.
  17. Yes, very much. 18. Our farmers are now well satisfied.

*General Remarks:*—We, the Municipal Council of the Township of Biddulph, fully concur in the foregoing answers:—S. R. Hodgins, Deputy Reeve; P. J. Dewar, William Turner, John Hodgins, Councillors; Hiram Hodgins, Clerk.

W. D. STANLEY,  
Reeve, Granton, Co. Middlesex.

1 to 18 no answers.

*General Remarks:*—You have thought me of sufficient consequence to address a number of queries, and calling for answers thereto; many of them I could answer intelligently, but am strongly suspicious that this schedule is issued at this crisis as a bid for partizan puffery in view of the forthcoming election. Be this as it may, in place of answering in detail they are disposed of simply by stating that I am opposed to "Tariffs" in all and every shape, and have no sympathy with State or Government that hath its stability based on heavy taxation, such as our Government now is. I

am a Free Trader, and the country, or the Government that cannot exist, as does our Mother Land, deserves not a name among the nations. I am barely entitled to be claimed as a partizan, yet think these questions are prompted as a feeler among the silly people, but which failing in the art of gerry-mandering, the heavy millions of surplus revenue in the public Treasury, extorted needlessly from the people, may have more potent effect, if needed, on the momentous occasion of an election coming off in the no far distance, it is not to be supposed, or hoped in, that the present Government, whether or not they be reinstated in power, will be at any great trouble, or concern themselves about the modification of the present tariff by the which they have begotten themselves entrenched behind a bulwark of great power, victualled with the sinews of war, powerful to the conviction of wavering minds to keep in power a Government who can boast of millions of surplus revenue, can, we are sorry to say, scarcely ever fail in retaining place and power. The foregoing few thoughts are, perhaps, not in such shape as you had cause or reason for expecting, and I dare say you will have, for many days, much amusement in reading the various thoughts of the many hundreds of men who will take the trouble of response, your patience and good nature will needs be heavily taxed before you reach the end; yet it would have been uncourteous in not noticing them in some shape, and I am of the thought that no great disappointment will be yours if no more direct answers than **what the present is come to hand**. I have above stated my reasons for thinking so.

JAMES RUSSELL,  
Russelldale, Co. Perth.

1. It would not be in the interest of the agriculturist to admit American farm produce free of duty.
2. The effect of the duty on American coarse grains has been to stimulate a larger growth of coarse grains here, and also to increase the price.
3. I consider the effect on the price of flour or wheat to be very little, as the English market, to a great extent, governs the market. Am in favor of the duty.
4. To increase the price. 5. I think it has.
6. The principal market is in Manitoba at present.
7. Yes, he can, in this section of the country. 8. No answer.
9. Yes, but we are in a much better position now than when American produce was admitted free.
10. No answer. 11. To stimulate a larger growth here.
12. Consider the quality to be improving. 13. No answer. 14. Yes. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. I can now sell lands, under the present prosperity of the country—which I believe, the present Tariff has helped to bring about—which could not be sold before.
17. It has. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—I am in favor of the present Tariff as long as the United States are not willing to give us a fair Reciprocity Treaty.

T. W. DOBBIE, ex-M.P.,  
Ex-Reeve, Tilsonburg, Co. Elgin.

1. I think so. Because we could feed stock cheaper, and consequently improve the land.
2. We have had to feed our oats, barley and pease, instead of feeding with cheaper American corn, and have less profit on beef cattle.
3. Our wheat and flour is regulated in price by the Liverpool market, and hence the duty has made no difference.
4. I believe the prices have been increased at the cost of the lumberer and city residents.

- 
5. No; our principal market for cheap horses now is Manitoba.
  6. Yes; our principal market for first-class horses is the United States.
  7. Cannot fatten stock profitably on American corn at the present rate.
  8. No. 9. Yes. No. 10. Wool at present prices is an unprofitable crop.
  11. None on flax. 12. Separators, reapers, mowers, ploughs, &c., are higher; quality about the same as formerly.
  13. All increased in value, but not prepared to say the exact amount. 14. No.
  15. No; emigration extensive to both the United States and Manitoba, and none returning.
  16. Farming lands are decreasing in value on the average, on account of the emigration causing less demand. 17. No.
  18. Free interchange of commodities with all countries subject to a Tariff for revenue purposes.

BENEDICT ROTH,  
Farmer, South Easthope, Co. Perth.

---

1. I do not think it would. 2. It has raised the prices of coarse grain in this county, which our neighbourhood is adapted for.
3. Such grain has raised in value here.
4. A much higher price, which, like grain, helps the farmers.
5. Horses and all like stock are higher in price now than ever I knew them to be.
6. It would pay well now for Canadian farmers to raise horses. 7. I cannot say.
8. We are rather far back for a good market. 9. I do not believe we would.
10. I do not see much difference.
11. I do not know; we don't grow flax in the County of Grey; I don't use tobacco.
12. Decreased, and a better quality; I believe it will be taken hold of by our mechanics and be successfully carried out on a cheaper scale.
13. No. 14. Increased largely.
15. Yes; it has given employment to our laboring class, and encouragement to immigration.
16. Increasing, but the Manitoba fever keeps our Ontario lands from increasing more in value. 17. Greatly improved.
18. The duty on iron is all I can see at present to be reduced.

JOSEPH McARDLE,  
Postmaster-General, Money Loaning Agent  
and Farmer, Hopeville, Co. Grey, Ont.

---

1. No, admit none free. 2. Good effect, it has increased the price on all our coarse grains in this section; just what we require.
3. It gives us a home market; or our own market for our produce
4. It pays us to raise hogs now as we have a market at home.
5. Yes. 6. Yes; we find it profitable to raise horses also other stock.
7. Yes; it pays him to raise all coarse grains to fatten stock. We don't need American corn.
8. Yes. 9. I do not think so. 10. No effect in this section.
11. We do not cultivate flax, tobacco or sugar beet in this section.
12. Waggons, buggies and all kinds of farm implements are cheaper.
13. I do not see any change.
14. Yes; more people in the country to consume our produce. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. Farms are about the same in this part; the cause is so many people going to the North-West.
17. Yes; farmers who were borrowing money have it to loan now. 18. No answer.

ELI CRAWFORD,  
Farmer, Brampton, Co. Peel.

1. It would be to their interest to admit certain kinds duty free, viz: Indian corn, wheat and flour.
2. It has caused Indian corn to be much higher, and prevented farmers from using much for fattening purposes. Corn should be free, all the other coarse grains are not much needed here.
3. It has caused flour to be from 25 to 30 per cent. dearer. Wheat No. 1 spring, 25 to 30 per cent. dearer; wheat No. 2 spring, 20 to 25 per cent. dearer; wheat, white winter, 15 to 20 per cent. dearer.
4. It has increased the price of these articles fully 50 per cent. 5. Not to be noticed.
6. In this section of the country we don't find it profitable to breed horses; horn cattle pay from 25 to 30 per cent. more than horses. The United States is our market. 7. He cannot. It would pay better to import American corn to make up the deficiency required.
8. If these articles were admitted free of duty to the American market it would improve our market here.
9. I believe he would. I think we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff. 10. I don't know of any.
11. It prevents many from cultivating the tobacco plant, it should be duty free; I don't know that it affects flax or sugar beet.
12. It is increased, quality not so good. Scythes, hay forks, axes, hoes.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are increased by the Tariff. Woollens, 25 to 20 per cent.; cottons 25 to 30 per cent.; scythes 18 to 20 per cent.; cut nails 20 to 25 per cent.; cutlery 50 per cent.
14. The market for farm produce is increased by the operation of the Tariff, by keeping American produce out.
15. It has given encouragement to our industrial classes and retarded emigration to the United States, it has encouraged some to return.
16. Yes, there is, and farms have increased since 1878 on account of the prosperous times. 17. Yes, considerably improved.
18. Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, encouragement of factories of all kinds to keep our people at home.

JOHN McARTY,

Farmer and Lumberer, Rawdon, Co. Montcalm.

1. No. 2. To raise its value. 3. Would say beneficial than otherwise.
4. To increase its value here. 5. Yes. 6. Do not breed many.
7. They can raise their own grain. 8. Yes. 9. We are in a better position now.
10. Beneficial. 11. Do not know. 12. All implements are as cheap, and as good.
13. All articles are as cheap if not cheaper.
14. There is a vast improvement in prices. 15. Yes.
16. Farming pays better; but owing to the emigration to Manitoba, land does not demand a high price. 17. Yes, vastly.
18. In this part of the country, the opening of the Trent Valley Canal would give us better markets, and direct water communication east. I think the large majority of the people are well pleased with the National Policy.

JOHN DANIEL,

Reeve, Fenelon, Co. Victoria.

1. No. Canada should produce its own coarse grain.
2. It has raised the price of coarse grain especially oats, rye, and pease 10 per cent.
3. About 20 per cent. on each kind.
4. It has increased the price about 25 per cent. on all.
5. They have materially improved the price.

6. Yes, as profitable as any other stock—our principal market being the United States.
7. Canadian farmers can raise their own coarse grain with more profit than by importing. 8. Yes, the market is rather better.
9. I think not, although the country is now in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty. 10. No effect, the price of wool remains unchanged.
11. We can procure linseed meal cheaper.
12. The price of mowers, reapers, ploughs and harrows is slightly increased by raise of wages, but the quality is quite as good. 13. The difference is very slight.
14. The market is much brisker by increase of factory labour causing more local consumption.
15. So great a diversity in the manufacturing line that farm labourers are very scarce.
16. The tendency for investment is somewhat increased by the low rate of interest and stir in trade. The price of lands has increased about 30 per cent.
17. Both farmers and labouring class are much improved. 18. No answer.

H. WILMOT,  
Farmer, Pittsburgh, Co. Frontenac.

1. It would not. 2. It has directly improved the price of Indian corn, and indirectly we think other coarse grains.
3. No answer. 4. Prices have materially improved.
5. Do not think prices affected by our Tariff; we export horses chiefly to the Eastern United States.
6. Yes; less so however than horned cattle; Eastern States is our principal market for horses.
7. They can. It would not. 8. Yes. 9. We think not.
10. Prices have improved under increased home consumption. 11. Not grown.
12. Prices have decreased, and quality has much improved. 13. They are not.
14. Yes, through increased industrial activity.
15. It has, and in consequence must inevitably tend at all events to keep our people at home. 16. There is, and a notable increase in values of farm lands.
17. Unquestionably yes. 18. A continuation of the present protective principle is all that need be done in a legislative way.

*General Remarks*:—This Protection or so called National Policy, has undoubtedly done much through its encouragement to manufactures in giving our agriculturalists that they most needed—a home market—the advantage of which must largely increase with a national determination to pursue this policy. Local interests and conveniences might be served by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, but it is difficult to see the general advantage to people whose products are almost identical and who are active competitors in the same markets.

JOHN W. HIGGINSON,  
Reeve, Hawkesbury, Co. Prescott.

1. In my opinion it would not. 2. No surplus of those grains in this locality, and none imported; so effect of duty is nil.
3. No wheat or flour exported, only flour imported. Duty does not seem to affect prices of flour. 4 and 5. No answer. 6. Only bred for home use.
7. Yes. It would not pay better to import corn.
8. The market has improved from some cause.
9. Yes; we are in a better position with the present Tariff than when American products were admitted free.
10. No trade in wool. 11. Flax increased. 12. No increase in same quality of goods.
13. In my opinion no perceptible increase in any of these goods, and a decrease in some. 14. I think it has by the increased general prosperity of the people.

15. Not in this locality for reasons specified under general remarks. 16. No change  
 17. No answer. 18. Such legislation as will tend to give a good home market, as  
 this will enable farmers to dispose of a class of produce that on account of its  
 perishable nature cannot be exported.

*General Remarks* :—A large majority of the inhabitants of this municipality are engaged in fishing and lumbering, and those engaged in farming do not depend on farming alone, but generally combine farming with some other occupation and consume in their own families all produced on the farm, so that all information gathered from such localities can throw very little light on the general question.

ROBERT A. SMITH,  
 Warden, Chester, Co. Lunenburg, N.S.

1. I think it would, provided the American Government would reciprocate:  
 2. It has raised the price of all the grains indicated. 3. No answer.  
 4. It has raised the price of our pork. 5. It has.  
 6. As profitable as any other stock we raise, provided attention is paid to the quality. In both United States and Manitoba, the latter increasing rapidly, and should be preserved for us unless in case of a Reciprocity Treaty.  
 7. To a large extent we can. When we want American corn let us pay the duty.  
 8. They are very much improved.  
 9. I believe a Reciprocity Treaty would be advantageous, our position to negotiate such a Treaty is undoubtedly much improved by the National Policy.  
 10. No answer. 11. No answer.  
 12. I do not perceive any increase in the price of farm implements, nor do I find the quality at all inferior. For instance, thrashing machines, seed sowers, mowers, reapers, horse rakes, &c. 13. I do not think so.  
 14. Very much improved indeed, on account of the large additional number of hands employed in manufactories, &c. 15. It has done both to a very marked extent.  
 16. The demand for farm property is very much increased. The price of land in this section has gone up at least 25 per cent. since said date.  
 17. They are both very much improved.  
 18. I decline answering this question. Would only suggest that Government assistance might be very profitably employed in the improvement of roads and in drainage, particularly thorough draining.

*General Remarks* :—I decidedly and emphatically approve of the National Policy, and believe it has been and will be of immense benefit to the country.

WILLIAM INGLIS, J.P.,  
 President Agricultural Society of the County of Two Mountains,  
 Grande Fresnière, Co. Two Mountains.

1. Decidedly not. 2. It has raised the price of corn slightly, as also oats. Rye not grown here nor much barley. Peas have risen about 20 per cent. since the Tariff came into operation, but they are mostly exported to Britain.  
 3. The price of spring wheat has raised about 15 per cent.; not much fall wheat grown.  
 4. All these articles have risen considerably, say from 15 to 20 per cent.  
 5. I do not know of any having gone from here to Manitoba.  
 6. We find it profitable to breed horses and the profits average more than other live stock. The horses sold in this section going mostly to the United States, some to Great Britain.  
 7. I see nothing to prevent our farmers raising all they require for their stock, and would not wish to import.

8. It is decidedly higher for poultry, eggs and butter; not many vegetables sold in this section.
9. He would be benefited if it was not a one-sided one, and we are certainly in a better position now. 10. It has risen about 5 cents per lb.
11. Flax not much cultivated. Tobacco only for the farmers' own use, not much sold. No sugar beet raised here for sale.
12. The cost has slightly decreased and the farmers say the articles, are better as the Canadian wood is superior to the American. Reaping and mowing machines, thrashing machines, ploughs, harrows—iron ones—are a better quality and much **cheap** r.
13. Woolleus slightly increased; cottons not much, but a better article; hardware not much if any.
14. It has been increased both by the operation of the Tariff and the exportation to Great Britain.
15. It has increased employment in many of the industries; the emigration is not so large, although not many are returning.
16. It has increased investment in farm property, and much property in this section has increased 20 per cent., partly on account of good markets and partly because the properties are improving, farmers having more means to improve and better able to invest, and also willing, as farming pays undoubtedly.
17. No answer. 18. The only change I would suggest would be to lower the duty on wheat, the farmers in this section generally, for many years, not having raised enough for their own families, and very few of them having any to sell.

*General Remarks*:—I have taken the opinion of farmers and others on the above matters, people of both sides in politics and of different nationalities, and give the opinion of the majority as well as my own.

JOHN MIDDLETON,  
Sec. Trea. of Municipality, Point Fortune, Co. Vaudreuil.

1. No. If for no other purpose, then to inculcate a spirit of independence and develop the resources of the country.
2. To raise the price of all the grains mentioned, and keep American corn out of this district.
3. The price of flour depends greatly upon the cost of freight and the capacity of the local dealers. Wheat is dear, owing to bush fires and last summer's frost.
4. To raise the price of these articles. Sucking pigs, six weeks old, formerly \$1.50, are now eagerly sought for at \$3.
5. There has been a "boom" lately in working oxen for the North-West, age and bulk apparently being the chief qualifications necessary; prices 30 per cent. in advance of high spring rates.
6. Horses are quietly merging into the places of oxen as the stumps disappear.
7. Yes, if he would only convert it into cash, through the channels of beef and mutton, and return the manure to the land. No; American corn cannot compare with Canadian in nutritive qualities; difference in price would not cover cost of freight, extra grinding, feeding and warehousing, &c.
8. Too far inland to be materially affected by the Tariff, but are in sympathy with the general firmness of the market.
9. Reciprocity, I take to mean equal advantages to both. It is only likely to develop low cunning between statesmen, and cause general murmuring throughout both countries. Better position as we are, and better to remain so.
- 10 to 13 inclusive. No answers. 14. Yes. By the exclusion of foreign manufactures and produce, protecting home industries, and a prevalent opinion that the Tariff will not be short-lived.
15. Yes. The United States is a world within itself, and ought not to be compared with a country whose climate is so general as Canada.

16. There has been—but the Manitoba fever. \* \* \* I cannot say more, as I am told it is contagious.
17. They are certainly more buoyant in spirits, but the question is too much like that asked by an assessor.
18. Relieve him (the bush farmer) from the yoke of the lumberman, and give him a deed devoid of a hole to slide the pines through.

*General Remarks:*—Although the cost of living has increased, wages have increased also, and the margin for thrift to work in is greater; thus every cent saved out of the 90 cents becomes double under the N.P., and increases the conceded bank account, so that when a rainy day comes, or the Free Trade policy rules, the time for a demonstration at Ottawa seeking work is further removed.

	Free Trade.	N.P.
Wages per diem .....	\$1 00	\$2 00
Expenses .....	\$ 90	\$1 80
Bank .....	10	20
	\$1 00	2 00
	1 00	2 00

ALBERT A. SMITH,

Reeve, <sup>25</sup>Monck, District of Muskoka.

1. I think so. It makes no difference in the Province of Quebec, except it makes us pay the Tariff difference on corn and wheat or flour.
2. To raise price of corn  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel. It has not changed price of oats, rye, barley or pease—except on corn, little being grown here.
3. It has raised price of hard wheat, or all wheats used in making strong flour, more in proportion than soft wheat, the latter being mostly grown in Canada.
4. I think a large proportion of the duty is paid by the consumer, as my impression is we import more than we export.
5. No, most decidedly, as our market is principally the United States.
6. There is about an average profit as compared with other stock. United States.
7. Not all. It pays better to import American corn. 8. No.
9. Yes. This is an open question.
10. Wool has been for sometime very low; whether the Tariff has any effect in raising prices on Canadian wool or not, I am not able to say.
11. On flax and tobacco, do not know. I look upon sugar beet culture as a failure.
12. I think they are increased. I think there is a gradual improvement in quality of manufacture. 13. Increased most decidedly along the whole line.
14. See no particular change in the home market, except as before mentioned, being governed altogether by the foreign demand.
15. It has caused the building of some factories, but has not as yet prevented a large outflow, over-emigration, of our population to the United States.
16. Not so far as the Tariff having any governing influence. Farm property has slightly increased, more from the improved condition of trade than the Tariff.
17. The condition of the farmer is not much improved on account of the great exodus of labourers to the United States; but those remaining get better wages on account of the scarcity.
18. Don't think any change can be made in the Tariff that will help our agricultural industry, as it is all controlled by foreign demand.

ANDREW KAY,

Mayor, Granby, Co. Shefford.

1. Yes, if we had Reciprocity, but not without. 2. None. 3. None in this section.
4. None on this section. The average price of those articles have not improved on account of change in Tariff. In the fall of 1878, farmers here received a lower price for pork than for upward of twenty years previous. Last fall prices were good. The price of American barrelled pork rules this section.
5. I think not, as Americans require to import such rather than export.
6. Has been unprofitable in the past, but at present prices will pay. There has been a large exportation of horses from this section during the past three years, entirely to the Manitoba markets. 7. Yes, in this section. 8. No.
9. Yes; this section would receive better prices for butter, poultry and lambs, &c., of which they export largely to the United States. Think we are in a better position at present.
10. Low prices for farmers, on account of no protection. 11. No effect in this section.
12. Axes, scythes, hoes, &c., about as formerly now and quality as good.
13. Grey cottons, ducks and denims are increased from one to three cents per yard.
14. No; I fail to see that the interests of the farmers have been consulted in the construction of the Tariff at all.
15. With the exception of the woollen manufacturers, I am not aware of any other class that have been benefited or of any new industries that have been started in this part as a result of the National Policy. I do not think it has retarded emigration or encouraged others to return.
16. No; lands in this section have decreased in value about 20 per cent., chiefly owing to the facilities for getting homesteads of better lands free in Manitoba and the United States.
17. Yes; we have had better crops and the lumbering industry has revived, which has been the chief cause of the improvement.
18. Would suggest if a Protective Tariff is kept in force, that farmers get some real protection in the matter of pork and wool. The duty on barrelled pork should be doubled at least, and a moderate duty put on the importation of foreign fine wools so as to encourage the consumption of a greater amount of Canadian grown wool.

*General Remarks:*—The writer is of the opinion that Reciprocity with the United States would be beneficial, not only to the farming community but to this country as a whole, and that our Government should embrace the first opportunity that offers of negotiating with the United States Government with a view of having such a Treaty established, and which I believe would be mutually beneficial.

A. R. McINTYRE,  
Reeve, Lanark, Middleville, Co. Lanark.

1. I do not consider it would be in the interests of the Canadian farmer to admit any American farm produce whatever free of duty.
2. On oats the effect has been to make a very much greater demand at higher prices. The price of rye, barley and pease has been immensely improved, while more has been cultivated. Corn is little used and little cultivated in this section.
3. The yield of wheat in this section has never been much, either above or below the demand.
4. Perhaps upon no articles have the farmers been worse benefited than upon these, by the imposition of the duties. 5. They certainly have.
6. As prices have ranged for the last few years, the profits on horses have been far in excess of that on other stock. A very large number from this section have gone to the United States, but I think the bulk of them to Manitoba.
7. Most assuredly he can. He can lose money quite readily by importing and feeding American corn.

8. Very much improved indeed, although the prices are somewhat better, yet we feel the improvement rather in the much greater demand since the National Policy came into force.
9. I believe the Canadian farmer would be benefited on some of his produce, but taking it as a whole, I do not think his condition would be much better than at present. There can be no two opinions as to our better position to negotiate such a Treaty now than we were before the N.P.
10. It is only within the last couple of years that wool has been grown in any quantity in this section. 11. None cultivated in this section.
12. From actual purchases both before and since the present Tariff, I can say the price of farm implements has decreased, while the quality is better.
13. They have not increased in price. Woollens and cottons are about the same. Nails are very much cheaper.
14. Very much increased, because there have been more to buy. Getting employment in the manufactories all over the country. 15. There can be no doubt but it has.
16. Farm property is now considered a very profitable investment, in 1878 it was one way to eke out an existence. A farm sold here for \$3,400 this spring, would not have brought \$2,000 in 1878; simply because the same amount of produce would not then give anything like the return it will now.
17. Vastly improved in every respect. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—My opinion is that looked at from every point of view, the farmers of the Dominion have been benefited incalculably by the National Policy. We have proved as a matter of fact, that since higher duties were imposed we have found a ready market for all our produce at remunerative prices, while at the same time we do not pay higher prices for clothing or farm implements. Let who will impute the change to chance, there are many who look for its cause in a wise policy and find it there.

WILLIAM B. ARMSTRONG,  
Farmer, Township Councillor, Shawville, Co. Pontiac.

1. I don't think it desirable to admit any kind of American farm produce free of duty.
2. Increase. Oats in 1878 brought 35 cents per bushel; in 1881 and 1882, brought 55 cents per bushel. Rye in 1878 brought 65 cents per bushel; 1881 and 1882, brought 85 cents per bushel. Corn in 1878, 50 cents; 1881 and 1882, 60 cents. Barley, none raised here. Pease in 1878, 65 cents; 1881 and 1882, 90 cents.
3. Wheat not raised here for sale. Flour here in 1878 brought \$2.75; in 1881 and 1882, \$3.25.
4. Live hogs increase value 20 per cent.; increase on hams, bacon and lard 4 cents per pound.
5. Can't say as we have raised no horses in this township for sale yet.
6. No answer. 7. I should say the farmer who cannot profitably raise grain to fatten his stock, has not much of a farm.
8. The market for these productions has certainly been improved.
9. First, I am not certain that we would be benefited. Second, I should say the Government are in a much better position now than before.
10. Wool in this vicinity was lower than usual this year, but we don't suppose the Tariff did it. 11. Not raised here consequently can't say.
12. We don't notice any difference in the price of farm implements, and the quality just as good. 13. My opinion is that hardware is cheaper; woollen goods about the same; cottons cheaper.
14. It has been increased and improved. As to how, there are more public works going on, and lumbering has been more extensive, and consequently a better demand.

15. The present Tariff has done all you claim for it in this question ; this is no here-say, I have seen it and know it to be so.  
 16. There is an increased tendency to invest in land. Why? Money is more plentiful, and speculators can no longer get 20 or even 10 per cent. for their money, and seek other investment. 17. Yes, certainly. 18. No. answer.

*General Remarks:*—I have been well pleased with the present Government's administration of the affairs of the country, and can endorse their policy as being what the country has most stood in need.

P. W. MILLER,  
 Farmer and Builder, Kaladar, Co. Addington.

1. None. Canada for the Canadians. 2. It has a tendency to raise the price of all kinds of grain, which we consider a great benefit.  
 3. We consider it has raised the price of these articles. 4. It has raised the price.  
 5. Yes. 6. Yes, profits compare very favorably. Manitoba.  
 7. Yes, he can raise all the grain required. 8. Yes. 9. We never had better times than at present. 10. Cannot see any. 11. None cultivated here.  
 12. Not increased any. Yes. 13. Not increased any.  
 14. It has been increased by increased employment to the working class. 15. It has.  
 16. There is. Farm lands have not increased in value owing to the large emigration to Manitoba. 17. By all means. 18. A change of Government at Toronto.

R. J. JELLY,  
 Reeve, Elizabethtown, Co. Leeds.

1. I think it not favorable in the interests of agriculturalists to admit them free of duty.  
 2. Increased as follows :—Oats 20 cents per bushel ; rye no less than 20 cents ; corn 10 cents ; barley not much raised here ; peas 25 cents.  
 3. Wheat not raised here for sale. Flour, in 1878, brought \$2.75, in 1881-2 it brought \$3.75.  
 4. Live weight on hogs increased 20 per cent., our home bacon and lard increase of price about 4 cents per pound.  
 5. Horses not raised here for sale, other live stock a great improvement in price.  
 6. No answer. 7. Any farmer that is obliged to buy American corn for his stock must surely, or soon will be, on the mortgage registry.  
 8. They have greatly improved. 9. I think both the Government and the country stand in a far better position than ever before.  
 10. Wool has been at a very low price, the Tariff cannot have affected it.  
 11. No. Answer. 12. I do not think farm implements have increased in price and I think they are just as good. Ploughs are about the same, axes are cheaper, from one dollar down to sixty-five cents, scythes no difference.  
 13. I have sold full-cloth before at 80 cents per yard which I can scarcely sell now at 60 cents. Cottons are cheaper and hardware I don't think is any higher.  
 14. Greatly improved and increased by greater activity in public business, lumbering especially. 15. It has done that indeed.  
 16. As there is plenty of money and interest is lower. I should think investments in real estate would be on the increase.  
 17. Greatly improved. Labourers I have heard say can make \$5 to \$1 before.  
 18. My humble opinion is that the Tariff should, at least, not be lowered.

*General Remarks:*—The surplus which the Government has now in hand (instead of having to borrow from England) and the great improvement of the country in general, requires that the present condition be maintained as it is under the present, rule.

O. M. ROLAPS,  
 Township Clerk, Kaladar, Co. Addington.

1. It would be a great disadvantage to admit American farm produce free.
2. Since the duty was put on coarse grain it has advanced in price considerably, oats are fully 15 cents, rye 20 cents, barley 30 cents and peas 25 cents higher per bushel than before the duty was put on.
3. Wheat has increased in price fully 25 cents per bushel and flour from \$1 to \$1.25 per barrel.
4. Both hogs and the meat thereof have greatly increased in price here, from \$7 to \$8 per barrel. 5. The price of horses has materially increased.
6. It pays well to breed horses and there is a greater profit in comparison as regards other stock.
7. Farmers can raise more grain than they require to feed, and it would be to their disadvantage to admit corn free as it would materially lower the price of coarse grain. 8. Yes, materially.
9. It is a question whether he would or not, but we are certainly in a better position to negotiate as at present with a duty on.
10. Wool is about the same price as it was in 1878.
11. I am unable to say as none is grown in this section.
12. The price of farm implements has not increased, and they are materially better in quality. Ploughs are lower and much better than in 1878.
13. The price of cotton and woollen goods is no higher, but in many instances lower and of a considerable better quality.
14. Certainly by the increased improvement and demand for labour, and the higher wages paid and the duty on American produce. 15. Yes, considerably.
16. There has been an increased tendency to invest in land, and had it not been for North-West emigration it would have been more so. The price has materially increased.
17. Both materially and wonderfully improved, particularly that of the labourer. Wages in this section have doubled to what they were in 1878.
18. I am not aware of any. The farmers were never better off than at the present time. "Let well alone."

*General Remarks:*—Any person that argues in favor of a return to Free Trade or one sided trade is not doing so for the benefit of his country but from self-interest. The present policy is the right one.

JAMES GOLBORNE,

Miller, Farmer and Reev., Burleigh, Co. Peterboro'.

1. It would not be advantageous to Canadian farmers to admit American agricultural products free of duty.
2. Would consider the result of the duty on American coarse grains has been to enhance the price of Canadian grown oats, corn and rye; as to barley and peas do not think it has had any effect, as none are imported for Canadian consumption.
3. The effect of the duty on wheat and flour has been beneficial, inasmuch as it has secured to Canadians the control of the markets of the Eastern Provinces which were previously in the hands of the Americans, but as to grain and flour for export I do not think it has had any effect.
4. The duty on live hogs and their products has raised the price thereof, and has thereby been beneficial to the Canadian farmer.
5. As the Americans buy great numbers of horses in Canada and few, if any, are imported into Canada, with the exception of animals for the improvement of the breed, I do not think any benefit has accrued from increased duties.
6. It is profitable to raise heavy horses and good roadsters in Canada; our principal markets are in the United States.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain he requires to fatten his stock, and it will pay to do so, as he will thereby not only benefit his land by rotation of

- crops, but it will also have the effect of keeping the money in the country, which would otherwise have to be sent out of Canada for the purchase thereof.
8. The home market for butter, eggs and vegetables is unquestionably benefited by the Tariff, as the extra number of hands employed in the various manufacturing industries have to be fed, and local markets are established which did not previously exist.
  9. Consider that an equitable Reciprocity Treaty would be beneficial to Canadians, and unhesitatingly say that we are in a much better position for negotiating such a Treaty than when the Americans had the entry to our markets with their products free of duty.
  10. Not being conversant with the subject, am not prepared to give an opinion.
  11. As no tobacco, flax or sugar beet are grown in this locality, I am not prepared to answer this question.
  12. I do not consider the price of any variety of agricultural implements is increased in price. In fact, I know that many implements used by farmers are now sold for less money than at any time in the history of Canada, and the quality is quite equal to any made on the Continent of America.
  13. The price of woollen goods has not increased in consequence of the Tariff, but there is at the present time a small increase in the price of cottons, which I think will be regulated so soon as the manufactories now building are in operation, when extra competition will reduce the price on a par if not lower than prices in the United States.
  14. The markets for farm produce have on the whole been improved by the operation of the Tariff.
  15. Unquestionably all the labouring and artisan classes have been much benefited by the present Tariff; and although many persons are going from this vicinity to Manitoba and the Canadian North-West, I hear of none emigrating to the United States.
  16. Not in this locality, as prices of good well managed farms are now so high that it would not pay as an investment, it being impossible to purchase such farms at less than one hundred dollars and upwards per acre.
  17. Unquestionably.
  18. Am not prepared to suggest any alteration.

*General Remarks.*—I trust I have not made any unnecessary delay in answering the foregoing questions, but I did not wish to depend altogether on my own opinion so waited to consult with a number of the leading agriculturists in the neighbourhood which I have done, and they all agree in the answers sent.

JOHN J. ROBSON,  
Reeve, Newcastle, Co. Durham.

1. I think not.
2. It has made an improvement in the price of all kinds of coarse grains.
3. I cannot say what the effect has been, except that it has stood at a good price all this year, which it did not in previous years.
4. It has improved them greatly in price.
5. It has greatly improved the prices of horses and cattle especially, as I never saw them at a better price.
6. It is profitable to breed horses; they compare fully better; the principal market is at home this year, as the buyers come to the yard, and a horse that would bring \$100 in previous years, will bring \$150 this year.
7. He can easily raise grain enough to fatten his stock without bringing corn from a foreign market.
8. I believe it has improved it very much.
9. I cannot say; I think the present Tariff is a good one, and a great benefit to the Canadian Farmer.
10. I don't think it is any disadvantage to the price of wool.
11. I cannot tell, as I do not deal in any of the articles mentioned.

12. I don't think the cost is increased, and I think the quality is just as good, as far as I know.
13. I don't think there is any increase on any of these articles to damage the Canadian farmer.
14. It has; in the price of grain and all other articles that the farmer has to dispose of.
15. I can hardly tell, but at present the wages are higher this year than in previous years.
16. I think farm lands are decreased in value, but it is on account of the free grant lands of Manitoba. 17. It has improved greatly.
18. I don't think there is any need of any changes from the present Tariff.

WILLIAM FAWCETT,  
Councillor, Heathcote, Co. Grey.

1. I think it would be in the general interest of agriculturalists to admit all kinds free, because it would not materially affect the price, and it would largely increase the carrying trade which would incidentally benefit the farmers.
2. The effect of the duty on corn has been to raise the price of corn to the extent of the duty; on the other grains named the duty has had no perceptible effect, because we produce more than we require for home consumption, and the foreign markets determine the price.
3. I cannot see that the price of wheat has been increased by the duty; the duty on flour may have benefited the large miller, but the farmer has failed to receive any material benefit; whenever we have a surplus, the Liverpool market fixes the price.
4. Our average prices for these products are not greater than the American prices; therefore, the increased duties have not had the effect of protecting the farmer, by increasing his price.
5. Our chief purchasers of horses and other live stock are England and the United States, and the prices that they can give us determine ours; the people of Manitoba (were it not for the duty) would purchase more cheaply perhaps in the Western States, but freights from here to there (Manitoba), are so high that our prices are not increased by the increase of duty.
6. It has not been as profitable to breed horses as cattle and sheep; our principal market for horses is the United States.
7. It would pay the Canadian farmer in thousands of instances better to import American corn, if he could do so free of duty; as a result, cattle feeding would be more largely engaged in, and the fertility of our farms thereby greatly increased.
8. The prices of these articles have improved in consequence of the greater foreign demand, and not as the effect of the Tariff; the price of potatoes is increased owing to the failure of the crops and the great demand in the United States.
9. Undoubtedly he would; I fail to see that we are in any better position to negotiate one now, than we were when we admitted their produce free. We have nothing to gain by a Tariff war with the Americans.
10. The effect has not been to increase the price. The price is lower than before the present Tariff.
11. None of these products are grown in this section of country.
12. The cost is increased and the quality is not so good; forks, rakes, and other small tools.
13. They are increased in price by the amount of increase of duty; if a lower Tariff were in force we would be able to buy all of those articles more cheaply than we do now. 14. Not to any appreciable extent.
15. It may have had the effect of drawing persons from agricultural to mechanical pursuits, but I am not aware that it has retarded emigration to the United States, nor that Canadians are returning to this country.

16. There is not ; farm lands have undoubtedly decreased in value, the principal reason for the decrease being the great emigration of farmers and farmers' sons to Dakota and Manitoba.
17. The general condition of farmers and laborers has improved ; in the case of farmers from the increased crops, and in the case of the labouring classes from the great demand for labour all over this continent, but particularly in the United States.
18. A change from a Protective to a Revenue Tariff.

*General Remarks* :—Agriculture forms the very basis of the prosperity of this country ; it is by far the most important industry. As we have a surplus of nearly all agricultural products to export, the price that we can get in foreign markets determines the value ; that being the case, no legislative action on the part of our Government can, to any appreciable extent, protect us by increasing our selling prices ; therefore, we ought not to be restricted in our right to purchase what goods we require, in the cheapest markets of the world, any further than is consistent with raising a sufficient amount of revenue to carry on the affairs of this country.

GEO. D. HAWLEY,  
M.P.P., Bath, Co. Lennox and Addington.

1. In my opinion it would not. 2. The duty has increased the price of all these grains, particularly corn, oats and rye.
3. In respect to wheat and flour I am not quite sure ; however, I think the prices of these are raised. 4. The effect on these is undoubtedly a large increase.
5. The prices of live stock here are higher than ever known before, owing to the amount of shipping to the North-West of both horses and beef.
6. Most decidedly I consider it profitable. Manitoba is at present the best market.
7. We can raise all coarse grains profitably, but with Reciprocity it would pay to import corn. 8. I believe it is.
9. I think we would. We are decidedly in a better position for negotiation as the Tariff now stands. 10. The price of wool is about the same.
11. Am not in a position to judge, none of those products are cultivated in this section of the country.
12. Implements are cheaper and the quality is improving all the time.
13. The proprietors of our woollen factory here are selling woollen goods cheaper by ten cents per yard than before the Tariff.
14. Undoubtedly it has been increased, simply because first it stops American importations, and second has increased the number of employés in our towns and villages. 15. It has, in my opinion, done both.
16. Yes ; lands have increased in value because farmers are more prosperous in this section than they have been for years.
17. Largely improved for various reasons, both classes are happy and contented rates of interest are low, and wages have advanced from 30 to 40 per cent., which speaks well for the latter.
18. Keep up the fence until the Yankees take theirs down and we will be all right. We dare ask for no better times.

*General Remarks* :—Under the last question I might add that the influence of the Government on sugar beet cultivation would be of great value to the agriculturalist.

WM. STAFFORD,  
Ex-Warden Leeds and Grenville, Lyn, Co. Leeds.

1. No. 2. It has had the effect of raising the price of oats, rye, corn and peas, but I do not think it has had any effect on barley.
3. The Tariff has certainly raised the price of spring wheat very much, and flour as well, but the effect on fall wheat has not been so perceptible.

4. The effect on hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard has been very perceptible, and we have a steadier market, with prices much better than under the old Tariff.
5. I do not think that the Tariff has made any difference in the price of horses, as the Americans do not buy the same class of horses that we send to Manitoba.
6. We do find it profitable to breed the heavy draught horses, as the Americans buy of that class very freely, so that we find a better market with them than in Manitoba, as that market only commands second-class horses.
7. We can raise all we want profitably for feeding purposes without American corn.
8. The market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter is very much improved under the present Tariff.
9. I do not think that we should be any more benefited by Reciprocity than under the present Tariff, and we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty than under the Free Trade system, as we can partly dictate our own terms.
10. The Tariff has had no effect on long wool, but has caused more demand for South Down and fine wools at better prices.
11. I cannot speak much of these articles, as we do not raise any in this neighbourhood.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased under the present Tariff, as reapers, mowers, drills and ploughs and harrows can be bought for less than in the years 1876-77 or '78, and the quality is better.
13. Woollen goods are no dearer nor cottons either, than under the Free Trade Tariff, and the quality is about the same.
14. The home market for farm produce has been very much increased, as, under the operation of the present Tariff, the Americans cannot flood this market with their produce.
15. The Tariff has given diversity of employment, better wages and steadier work, it has retarded emigration to the United States and in some instances caused Canadians to return to their native land.
16. There is an increased tendency to invest in farm property, and farms have certainly increased in value on account of the confidence that farmers have in their business now.
17. Yes, very much indeed.
18. I cannot suggest any changes at the present time as the farmers are contented, and by proper habits of industry, judgment and perseverance cannot fail to make their occupation both desirable and profitable.

WM. J. SMITHSON,  
Farmer, Weston, Co. York.

1. It would not. 2. Increased prices generally. 3. Increased prices.
4. Increased prices in proportion to duties. 5. Yes.
6. Yes, it is profitable in these counties. The exportation to Manitoba and the United States is about equal. 7. He can. No. 8. No answer.
9. Yes, decidedly in a much better position. 10, 11. No answers.
12. If anything, on the decline generally. 13. No increase. 14. It has. 15. It has.
16. Yes. Farm lands have increased. 17. Yes, very much. 18. No answer.

B. C. LLOYD, Reeve,  
FLETCHER SWITZER, 2nd Dep. Reeve,  
STEPHEN WEES, } Councillors,  
JAMES REID, }  
JOHN S. MILLER, Clerk,  
Camden East, Lennox and Addington.

1. It would not affect this section of the country to admit grain free of duty.
2. None whatever. 3. Has not affected this part.
4. None, although pork is higher now than it has been for some years.

5. There has been more demand for horses in this section, and better prices for Manitoba, but cannot say it is owing to the increased duties.
  6. It is, at the prices now going. Horses exported to Manitoba just now.
  7. It would be profitable to farmers to raise grain to fatten their stock, better than import American corn.
  8. The prices are much better, but cannot attribute it to the Tariff.
  9. Yes. Cannot say. 10. Made wool cheaper. 11. None raised in this section.
  12. Yes—gang ploughs, reaping machines. The quality is better.
  13. Woollens are higher. Cottons no higher.
  14. Prices have gone up, but not through the operation of the Tariff. 15. Not here.
  16. None, farms have decreased. 17. They are improved.
  18. Turn lawyers, doctors and jobbers out of Parliament, and put in honest farmers.
- General Remarks* :—These questions were answered at a meeting of Council which was composed of Grits.

JAMES LINDSAY,

Reeve, Loch Pinnoch, Co. Renfrew.

1. Yes. The admitting free does not affect us. When we do not raise enough for home consumption, a duty would make the price of imported farm produce the amount of the duty higher. Therefore, I say, no duty.
2. Nothing with the price of oats, rye, corn, barley or pease, as these grains are very little, if any, in advance, except rye, which is higher on account of foreign demand. Barley, on the other hand, is lower.
3. Price of flour is higher. Can't specify different classes. Think Tariff on wheat and flour not proportionate.
4. Not competent to express an intelligent opinion.
5. No, no, no. Have always held the home market.
6. Yes, good horses. Equal. Market in United States. A very few horses for Manitoba markets, and they a very, very inferior class.
7. Yes, unless in year of poor crops; then the American corn has to be imported; and I have known one farmer alone, in two different years, bought over 500 bushels, each year, to get through the winter.
8. No. Our market for these articles is in United States; some butter is sent to England. 9. Yes. No better.
10. Wool is undoubtedly lower; the Tariff certainly has to do with it.
11. None grown in this section. 12. Can't say exactly. Formerly we used combined reapers and mowers; latterly these are distinct. Other implements about same price, but are made of lighter material.
13. Are certainly increased. 14. No, no, no.
15. No. Young men going all the time to California and Michigan. Servant girls going across to New York State to service.
16. No. Have decreased; too much land in North-West, and labour scarce.
17. Yes, the good crops of 1879, 1880 and 1881, have bettered the condition of farmers and emigration, together with demand for labour by lumbering firms and farmers, has had the effect of bettering the condition of the labouring class.
18. Knock off the duty.

GEORGE MANSON,

Farmer, Petworth, Co. Addington.

1. It would be in the interest of agriculturalists. Wheat, barley and rye would not be affected, their value being based on foreign demand; corn is required by farmers for feeding.
2. None. Indian corn is not raised to any extent. Peas for some years past could not be raised for bugs; oats are not raised for market; barley, our main crop, is sent to the United States.

3. It is in the interests of the millers to have wheat free, also the labouring classes.
4. Cannot say. 5. No. All the horses sold here are chiefly sold to Americans at higher prices than for Manitoba or the North-West.
6. Yes; compares favorably; the principal market is the United States.
7. No, it pays to import American corn.
8. No; our eggs go to the United States, also poultry, and butter is higher in consequence of cheese making.
9. Yes. Cannot say. 10. It injuriously affects the farmer, it is one of the greatest grievances.
11. Cannot say; none raised. 12. Prices much about the same.
13. Largely increased. 14. No. 15. Not unless in manufacturing centres. In the rural districts labour is scarce and labourers going to the United States daily.
16. No. Value of farming property is at least 20 per cent. less than in 1878, chiefly on account of people leaving for the United States and the West.
17. Yes; the crops have been good and the prices of wheat and barley have been high.
18. Cheap goods of all kinds and Reciprocity with the United States.

JOHN D. OSTERHEAT,  
Miller and Farmer, Rosehall, Co. Prince Edward.

1. No, none. 2. It has raised the price of oats, barley and peas from 25 to 40 per cent.; little rye or corn grown in this district.
3. It has had the effect of raising the price of both fall and spring wheat and flour from 75 to 100 per cent.
4. It has doubled the price of live hogs, dried hams and bacon and raised the price of lard 35 per cent. 5. Yes.
6. We find horse raising very profitable more so than any other stock. We were always glad to see the Yankee buyers, but this year several buyers have come from the North-West and given better prices than the Yankee buyers.
7. Yes, we can profitably raise all grain and roots to fatten our stock. We never could feed American corn profitably. 8. Most unquestionably.
9. I think so, now that we are independent of the Americans we may have the terms of such a treaty pretty much to our own advantage, which was not the case before the Tariff was in force.
10. Better prices and brisker demand. 11. I don't know of either grown in this district.
12. We can buy farm implements such as reapers, mowers, sulky rakes, waggons, harrows, ploughs, &c., fully as cheap now and of superior quality.
13. We can buy woollens, cottons, hardware, tea, sugar, and all store goods as cheap and of better quality than formerly.
14. Greatly increased. Formerly the labouring class, mechanics, &c., had not the money nor spirit to buy, now since their position is so much improved they buy liberally. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. Farm property is rather on the look up and would undoubtedly be more so if it were not for the great rush to the North-West. A neighbour of mine has just sold his farm of 150 acres at \$7,800 which was held at \$7,000 for three years. 17. Greatly improved.
18. None whatever, hold on where you are we are all happy and contented.

*General Remarks* :—The Tariff has undoubtedly saved this great Canada of ours. During the *regime* of Alexander Mackenzie (honest man), we could never scarcely own a dollar and were always in debt, now we are thriving and prosperous. I came from Scotland in 1872 and was happy until Mr. Mackenzie got into power, then it was a dead beat. I had made up my mind if the election had been lost in 1878 to sell out and return to my native land but thank God our great country was saved. God save the Queen and Sir John A. Macdonald.

JOHN LENNOX,  
Farmer, Churchill, Co. Simcoe.

1 to 18. No answers.

*General Remarks*:—In my opinion it would be better to have Free Trade, but would keep on duties on manufactured articles until we could secure Free Trade. I do not think the good times we now enjoy are owing altogether to the National Policy, but to the prosperous times in other countries. Mostly in my opinion the American protective duty and their over manufacturing was the cause of those hard times which very much affected us; they encourage manufacturers, so that they can pay higher wages than their farmers can, the consequence is they kill the farmer. When you kill the farmer you kill the manufacturers; farmers should be able to pay as high wages as the manufacturers in a farming country, and if we are not very careful we shall fall into the same evil, if you do not encourage the manufacturers so as to enable them to pay higher wages than the farmer. The farmer will prosper, and can raise their own grain for fattening their own cattle. I would recommend all farmers to raise cattle instead of horses as a rule; it is well enough to raise some horses, say enough for our own use. If the Americans would encourage the farmer more, and not the manufacturer so much, they would not want to buy so many horses and cattle. Don't let us run into the same evil.

JAMES HAYES,  
Farmer, Shefford, Co. Shefford.

1. Corn should be free of duty. 2. In consequence of a duty being imposed on corn our farmers find it difficult to compete in fattening stock.
3. Have felt the want of spring wheat, as we cannot grow the same to advantage.
4. I am not in a position to state correctly an answer to this.
5. It may in the North-West but not here.. 6. Find it very profitable. United States is the chief market.
7. It would pay far better to import corn, as pease cannot profitably be grown.
8. No. 9. Reciprocity would be profitable. The present Tariff may have a tendency to bring them to terms.
10. None. 11. None to my knowledge. 12. Think about the same.
13. Cannot give a definite answer to this. 14. Not any. 15. Only in few instances, but not in general.
16. Has not increased the value. 17. Yes, owing to good crops.
18. Several changes might be made; will leave that to your judgment.

*General Remarks*:—In my opinion coal should come in free of duty, as it is an article used by all classes of people, and with regard to coal oil, we pay an indirect taxation of 15 cents per gallon—and poor quality at that.

JOHN MOFFAT,  
Produce Merchant, Berlin, Co. Waterloo.

1. It would not be to the interests of the agriculturalists. It would depreciate the market price of the produce we have for sale.
2. It increases the prices. Oats about the same; rye increased in price; corn increased in price; barley increased in price.
3. Consider that we can raise a sufficient supply of wheat for home consumption, and a surplus for export. Not much effect.
4. It has been the means of encouraging farmers here to go more extensively in raising swine, and the farmers are perfectly satisfied for this increased duty.
5. Yes, yes. 6. Find it profitable to breed horses, principal market is Manitoba.
7. Yes. No. 8. Not much difference. 9. No. Yes.
10. A benefit to the raisers of wool in the long wool, by increasing the home consumption. 11. None raised in this section. 12. Decreased. 13. Not increased.

14. Yes, yes. 15. Yes, yes  
 16. Yes, and property which changes hands is better than in 1878, yet a large amount of people having the Manitoba fever craze, sell their lands freely. Increased in value since 1878. 17. Yes, yes, yes.  
 18. The farmers around here are apparently well satisfied with the present condition of the country.

J. C. STEVENS,  
 President, N. L. Agrl. Society, Ramsay, Co. Lanar

1. No. 2. Coarse grains of all kinds are dearer than before adoption of Tariff.  
 3. Barley is the staple crop of this section. Only grow enough wheat for own use. 4. It has made them dearer. 5. Yes.  
 6. Horses have increased in value very much this last two years. Far best mark is Manitoba, formerly the United States.  
 7. Yes; it might pay better under some circumstances to import American corn.  
 8. Yes. 9. No. 10. Wool ranges from 23 to 28 cents, which is considered cheap.  
 11. None raised here.  
 12. Cost decreased; quality much improved. All kinds of agricultural implements, notably, reapers and mowers. 13. I believe those articles are cheaper.  
 14. It has. I believe the true cause is that labor is employed and money is easier and more plentiful.  
 15. Yes; many Canadians are returning to their homes in this country—and still labour is scarce.  
 16. I cannot say that there is. As long as the excitement continues in the North-West, land will not increase much in value in Ontario in my opinion.  
 17. Very much. 18. I do not know of any.

*General Remarks* :—The outlook for the farmers of Ontario under the present Tariff is very bright indeed. To those who have gone into the raising of stock will find a good market in the North-West for some time to come.

ALLEN CAVEN,  
 Reeve, Picton, Co. Prince Edward.

1. Certainly not, as it would be the means of lessening the price of our own produce  
 2. It has given us a better price for oats, rye, corn and barley; as to peas, there none of any account raised in our municipality.  
 3. Better price for fall wheat. No spring wheat raised in this municipality.  
 4. Better for home market. 5. Yes.  
 6. Yes; more going to Manitoba than there are to the United States.  
 7. Yes, profitably all the grain required. 8. No difference. 9. No. 10. None  
 11. None of any account.  
 12. All farm implements decreased in price under the present Tariff, reapers and mowers, scythes, axes, hoes, &c. 13. Woollens and cottons a trifle cheaper.  
 14. Yes, by prohibiting American competition. 15. Yes.  
 16. No appreciable difference. 17. Yes, by all means. 18. No answer.

DANIEL DICKHAUT,  
 Reeve, Stromness, Co. Haldimand

1. No; because they place duty on all our products, and we have better times since a duty was put on theirs.  
 2. Better for those that sell oats, rye, barley and peas.

3. A better market at home for our flour, as our wheat, both spring and fall, is better than the most of United States wheat.
4. A very good effect, as the prices paid for these articles to farmers, during the past two years, no more than paid (there ought to be a higher duty put on these articles coming from United States).
5. I think so.
6. I think Manitoba will be now the best market.
7. I think he can; I don't think any farmer, except a man of great wealth, would be paid to import corn to feed stock.
8. Yes.
9. I think so, particularly Ontario; we are in a better position now than before the present Tariff to negotiate a Treaty.
10. I don't think it affects the price of wool much.
11. I don't know.
12. The cost has not increased, but rather decreased, I think, for farm implements of all kinds, waggons, ploughs and reapers, mowers, &c., are better and cheaper.
13. I don't think they are increased, on the contrary, I think every article I bought during the past two years is cheaper than before that period.
14. I think so!
15. I think it has done both.
16. In some localities land is cheaper, but capitalists are very glad to put their money in land. The opening up of the North-West may be the cause of land being cheaper. I think it is.
17. They are very much improved.
18. Put more duty on the American pork and cattle, and whatever they charge us on all farm products that we have to sell, a similar duty should, I think, be put on theirs.

JAMES CROSS, J.P.,  
President West Wellington A. S., Winfield, Co. Wellington.

1. Decidedly not.
2. Rye, oats and peas, and especially rye, are in better demand and at advanced prices since the National Policy.
3. We have had a better price for wheat and flour since the National Policy.
4. Increased demand and at advanced prices.
5. Never in better demand, and prices higher.
6. Compare favorably with other stock. Some United States, but principally Manitoba.
7. He can raise all required in this section.
8. Yes.
9. Yes, because we have something to offer in return.
10. Home demand better.
11. Not cultivated here.
12. Decreased in price; quality better for all farmers implements.
13. Cotton, slight increase; other articles, not.
14. Yes, by preventing produce from other countries coming in.
15. Yes, decidedly.
16. Yes, increased; better prices for produce and money so plentiful.
17. Yes, improved greatly.
18. Cannot recommend any change.

M. GASH.  
Pres. Eastern Branch A. S., Dunnville, Co. Monck.

1. In my opinion it would not be to the interests of agriculturalists
2. It had the effect of raising the price of oats from 35 cents to 45 cents; peas from 50 cents to 70 cents. Rye and corn none raised in this vicinity.
3. This question I am not in a position to answer.
4. The effect of the duty on pork and live hogs has been to raise the price of those articles to our farmers very materially, as we could bring pork much cheaper here now were it not for the duty.
5. Those are facts that cannot be denied.
6. Breeding horses now pay better if the proper class is bred, than any other stocks; the States are the principal market for the best horses.
7. It would be better to raise the grain for fattening purposes in most parts of this country.
8. Yes.

9. Would not be benefited by Reciprocity, but if so, we are in a better position to get Reciprocity with the present Tariff than when American produce was free.
- 10: None that I can discover.
11. Cannot say as none of those articles are produced here.
12. Decreased in almost every article and of a better quality.
13. They are not increased in price, the opposite has been the effect.
14. The home market has been improved by the Tariff, by the keeping out of corn and other grains and giving our own market to our own people.
15. Such in my opinion are facts.
16. They are increased in value since 1878, and the increase would have been more noticeable but for the emigration to the North-West.
17. They are materially improved since 1878.
18. In this part of the country such legislation as would allow parties buying land to use the timber for the purpose of enabling them to improve.

*General Remarks*:—The reason I give the above is as follows: the Saugeen, Indian Peninsula, is Indian lands, large limits have been sold to Cook & Co., that is pine, others by the order of the Department have taken a license for the cedar. Now the Department rules that Cook's license cover all the timber on the land covered by their license; if so, a number of the settlers believing Cook only had the pine, purchased the land, and now by this ruling that they by their license own all the timber of every description, the settlers must naturally rise and leave their land. I hope you will examine into this matter and have it adjusted.

D. DENSMORE,  
Reeve, Wiarton, Co. Bruce.

1. No; it would not be to the interest of the agriculturalist.
2. The duty on American corn has been beneficial to the farmers in this section. No oats, rye, barley, peas, imported here.
3. I do not think it has had any effect on wheat, as scarcely any wheat is brought from the States here.
4. It has had a tendency to increase the price of dried hams.
5. The price of horses is higher owing to the demand in Manitoba.
6. Breeding good horses pays better than any other stock. Manitoba is the chief market for horses here.
7. It would pay farmers better in this section to raise their own grain.
8. No; I do not think the Tariff improved the market.
9. I believe a Reciprocity Treaty would be beneficial. I think the present is a better position.
10. Wool is cheaper than it was some years ago. 11. Not any effect.
12. The cost of farm implements in many things just the same price, the quality equally as good.
13. There has not been much change in price. Nails are cheaper.
14. I do not think the markets has improved any under the present Tariff.
15. In some instances there may be more employment. The Tariff has had no effect in bringing Canadians back from the States.
16. I think there is increased demand in this section; property have increased in value.
17. The condition of the farmers has improved; the labouring classes have not improved. 18. Not any; the farmers as a class are getting rich.

*General Remarks*:—I have to pay 75 cents per ton more for coal which amounts to \$50 per year more under the present Tariff; iron has also increased in price since 1878 a reduction of Tariff on the raw material would be beneficial.

W. GRAY, Chatham, Ont.

1. No. So long as the American Government imposes a duty on our produce, we must decidedly put a duty upon their importations as an off-set to ours; we should then have something to offer if Reciprocity was introduced.
2. To increase the price on all our coarse grains excepting barley, which is not affected by the duty.
3. If the duty on American spring wheat was honestly and faithfully imposed and collected, it would increase the price of Canadian wheat, from information I have ascertained, about 10 cents per bushel. This question ought to be answered by the merchants.
4. All kinds of meat mentioned are dear this year, there not being sufficient pork in Canada to supply the demand.
5. Particularly horses, which are in great demand, for the home and United States market.
6. I am not a breeder of horses. If the agriculturalist were to breed more, the profits are larger than for cattle. (Section 5 explains.)
7. In the western part of Canada, where the bug destroys the pea, American corn is used. It is profitable to import American corn. 8. Yes.
9. Most decidedly, yes. Reciprocity would benefit Canada, as we should have fifty millions more to supply than our own. By having a duty imposed on our produce, we could offer to release our duty, if the United States would do the same; at present we cannot offer anything but our duty.
10. The effect is not perceivable. 11. Am not sufficiently interested to answer correctly. 12. Have not purchased since the Tariff has been enforced.
13. Very slight increase, if any. 14. Yes.
15. Labour is in great demand. The Government can ascertain the number of emigrants from the different Ports of Entry.
16. Owing to the opening of the North-West the price of land has decreased in Ontario.
17. The farmers and labourers are greatly improved since 1881 and 1882.
18. To encourage immigration, as labour is in great demand, and it is difficult to find sufficient hands to perform the work at enhanced wages.

*General Remarks* :—By all means keep the duty as high as the United States imposes the duty on us, and should an opportunity offer we can give up our duty if the United States will theirs, and establish Reciprocity.

WILLIAM MILLS,

Retired Agriculturalist, Peterborough, Co. Peterborough.

1. I do not think it would be in the interest of the Canadian farmer to admit any American farm produce free of duty.
2. I believe it has increased the price of oats, rye and pease; barley, it does not come so much in competition with, and therefore does not affect the price. No corn grown here for profit.
3. Have not given the subject sufficient consideration to answer intelligently.
4. It has created a better home market, less fluctuation in the trade, increased demand, and higher prices.
5. In cattle, I believe the duty has increased the price. I do not think the price of horses is affected, as the United States is our chief market.
6. The breeding of heavy draught horses I consider profitable at present prices—more so than other farm stock. Our principal market is the United States.
7. In ordinary years I believe the Canadian farmer can profitably raise all the grain he requires for feeding; in exceptional years it may pay better to import corn.
8. I believe the present Tariff has a tendency to increase the price of such articles.
9. In my opinion, reciprocal trade with the United States would be of much benefit to the Canadian farmer, and that we are in a better position to obtain such than before the present Tariff was in operation.

10. I do not think the price of wool is much affected by the Tariff, as the greater part of the imported article does not come into competition with the class of wool grown here.
11. Neither flax, tobacco, nor sugar beet, are grown here for profit.
12. I believe that all kinds of farm implements are fully as cheap, and the quality as good, if not better, than before the present Tariff, the increased competition in the trade regulating both price and quality.
13. From my personal knowledge I could not say that they are affected either way by the present Tariff.
14. I believe it has, by the duty imposed on foreign produce and the protection of our own market to that extent, the fostering of the industries of the country, thereby creating a consuming population in manufacturing centres.
15. I believe it has.
16. It is my opinion that the tendency for investing in farm property has increased since 1878, and that farming lands have increased in value since that date. I attribute it to good crops, fairly remunerative prices, a good home market, and increasing confidence in the future prosperity of the country.
17. Yes, the general condition of the farmers and labouring classes is very much improved since that date. 18. I decline answering the question.

MATTHEW SWEETMAN,  
Reeve, Guelph, Co. Wellington.

1. It would be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit American corn free of duty, as it is a great drawback on feeding cattle—the want of corn.
2. Pease have been higher, as they are used for fattening cattle; little or no corn being raised in this section.
3. Not being posted in these matters I cannot say. 4. No answer.
5. I do not think it has done any good. 6. Breeding heavy draught horses pays very well. Our principal market is the United States.
7. It would pay much better to import American corn if free. 8. I cannot say.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would be a benefit to the farmers. As to the last part cannot say. 10. Wool is remarkably low at present. 11. No answer.
12. Agricultural implements are as cheap now as at any former time and just as good. 13. The price of cottons have been increased by the Tariff.
14. I think not. 15. No answer.
16. Lands have decreased materially in value since 1878. On account of the exodus to the North-West and Dakota.
17. They are in a better condition, as a great many of our young men have gone West.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—The Government should do all in their power to foster the importation of all kinds of farm stock from Great Britain.

JAMES HACKNEY,  
Councillor, Farquhar, Co. Huron.

1. I am not aware that it would affect us to any great extent, since the European market rules our prices, and we are exporters.
2. American Indian corn is not used to any great extent in this locality, so that the effect, if any, has never been felt here.
3. Fail to see in what way such duty could possibly affect the price of grain in any direction. No effect on price of flour. 4. Cannot say, not a consumer.
5. Not to any appreciable extent. 6. Yes, farmers can scarcely engage in anything that pays better. The bulk of the horses brought here go to Manitoba and the North-West.

7. Yes, if we cannot purchase for less than 40 cents per bushel.  
 8. We find a ready market for all we can produce since the imposition of the Tariff.  
 9. Yes. Can't say. 10 Can't say.  
 11. The tobacco and sugar beet industries have been fostered thereby.  
 12. Decreased about 10 per cent. Quality better than before. Reapers and mowers, waggons, ploughs, &c. 13. On the whole about as cheap as before.  
 14. No answer. 15. No answer. 16. Yes. Farm lands have decreased in price 20 per cent, caused principally by emigration to the North-West.  
 17. Yes, to a very great extent. 18. Not in a position to say.

WILLIAM BAUMBACH,

Ex-Reeve, Rostock, Co. Perth.

1. No ; as wheat, barley, oats and peas are our principal export products, corn should be admitted free, as our climate and soil is not adapted for raising it ; and it being much required to fatten beef and pork.  
 2. It has had the effect of raising the price of corn beyond the profits of the consumer ; but no effect on barley, oats and peas, as these grains are now higher in the American market than they are in Canada.  
 3. As for flour I cannot answer, but no effect whatever on wheat, as the American wheat is inferior to ours ; yet their wheat commands a higher price in their market than our wheat does in our market.  
 4. It has increased the price on all those articles as we import largely, except hogs, but the rise has injured the consuming class more than it has benefited the producing class, as it does not pay to raise hogs for pork, bacon, &c., while there is a duty on corn.  
 5. None whatever in this locality. It is a rare thing to find a horse imported from the United States for sale here ; our trade is export.  
 6. Quite profitable, but not so profitable as cattle. Our principal market is the United States.  
 7. No ; there is no grain raised equal to corn to fatten beef and pork. It pays better to import corn at a reasonable price than to raise it for such purposes.  
 8. No, not in my estimation. 9. Yes, materially. When their produce is admitted free then there will be no obstacle in the way on our part.  
 10. No effect. The price of wool has not varied any this past four years.  
 11. None cultivated in this locality. 12. Increased by preventing competition. Quality never was so good or cheap as when competing against the United States.  
 13. Neither increased or decreased for the past four or five years.  
 14. Yes, slightly on oats and peas, caused by the duty on corn.  
 15. It has stimulated the various industrial classes, increased the cost of living on the labouring classes ; hence the exodus from this section of the country is now greater than at any time this past ten years.  
 16 No. Farm lands have decreased 20 per cent. the past five years in this locality ; no demand. 17. No, not in this locality.  
 18. Elect more farmers and less lawyers, or, in other words, send more representatives from the country and less from the cities and towns.

*General Remarks :—*The foregoing remarks are speaking for the interests of the agricultural community which widely differ from the interests of manufacturers and various branches in cities and towns. The interest of the one is not always identified with the other.

M. SPOOR,

Wolfe Island, Co. Frontenac.

1. Most decidedly not. It would have a tendency to flood our markets and reduce the price.
2. It has raised the price of oats and peas, and encourage farmers to raise these cereals more abundantly.
3. My opinion is that our markets are not affected by the duty, as they are controlled by European markets.
4. It has benefited the farming community, and has had a tendency to raise the price.
5. Very little affected by the duty as few horses come from the United States to Canada.
6. It is highly profitable to breed the right class of horses (heavy draught) which find a ready sale in the American market. The profits derived from this class of stock are equally remunerative as on cattle and sheep.
7. He can raise all that is necessary to fatten his stock. Indian corn doing well in this locality. 8. I am of opinion that it is very slightly affected.
9. I am decidedly in favour of Reciprocity with our neighbours, but as they will not grant it, the best thing we can do under the circumstances is to retaliate, which has been wisely done by our able Finance Minister, Sir L. Tilley.
10. The duty on cotton has a tendency to raise the price of wool.
11. These are improved under the National Policy. 12. They are decidedly cheaper, increased competition must necessarily give us a better article and cheaper.
13. Very little change in woollens, hardware or cottons.
14. Home markets very much benefited by the present Tariff.
15. It has, and encourages emigration to Canada.
16. There is, as money is cheap and abundant. Farm lands have not increased very materially as there is so much free grant land in the Great North-West.
17. Decidedly improved, people seem generally prosperous and happy under Sir John's Government.
18. In my opinion Sir John has done all that can be done for the agricultural community.

JOHN PHIN,  
Farmer, Director of Guelph and O. I. and S. Society,  
Haspeler, Co. Waterloo

1. Certainly not judging by this township.
2. All coarse grains have been higher, rye and barley more particularly.
3. Wheat has always been subject to such quick changes in prices that I cannot give any satisfactory answer.
4. Pork in all forms has been much higher.
5. Horses for some reason have gone up from 60 to 75 per cent.
6. Horses will pay well for raising at present prices.
7. We never used American corn for feed in this township. 8. I think they are.
9. We cannot reasonably expect to do better with any change.
10. Wool is at a poor price. 11. None of these grown in this township.
12. No perceptible difference. 13. We do not know any change. 14. It has.
15. Yes. 16. There is; they have on account of the good times.
17. It has. 18. None.

THOMAS RORK,  
Reeve, Norwood, Co. Peterborough.

1. It would be in their interest to let all in free; stopping oats shut some of our oatmeal mills, one in Seaforth; the export of flour from Canada has been greatly reduced, consequently less bran and higher in price—a loss to the farmer; can sell barley and buy corn to feed profitably if no duty. The export of flour to Britain in 1880, was valued at £403,313, and, in 1881, it was valued £205,000; making a reduction in value of wheat of £198,313.

2. The average price of oats in Toronto in August and September, 1878, was 10 cents more than in Chicago, but in 1881, in November and December, they sold as high in Chicago as Toronto, if not the National Policy what is it that caused the change. Rye, we raise almost none; corn, raise some, but pay a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents more for corn than we ought; barley, cannot sell so easily; if no duty can sell 48 pounds of barley and get 56 pounds of corn in exchange, but we lose  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents per 56 pounds of corn; peas not much raised on account of bug.
3. Our wheat is lower when compared with the markets in the United States than under a system of free exchange of farm produce; cannot specify as to different varieties of wheat.
4. No effect that I know of. 5. Not that I am aware of; all our best fat animals go to the English markets, and all our best horses to the United States.
6. Breeding horses pay better than breeding common stock of any kind, but there is more risk and fewer are successful in breeding horses than cattle; sell all the most valuable horses to the United States, especially the Eastern States.
7. No; It would often pay to buy corn; the Canadian farmer is most successful that feeds all his own coarse grain and as much as he can profitably buy, in order to retain the fertility of the soil.
8. Not improved; the numbers who have left during the last three years is thinning the population, causing less demand for vegetables; our butter and eggs find a foreign market.
9. Yes; we are not in a better position to negotiate; the Canadian Tariff is said to be retaliatory with the United States; retaliation seldom brings friendly negotiation.
10. The wool mostly in use by our manufacturers is admitted duty free; while we get only 3 cents per pound upon our long wools, we have to pay on goods  $7\frac{1}{2}$  and 10 cents per pound on all manufactured goods, inducing manufacturers to use the wool upon which no duty is imposed and leave the wool we raise a drug on the market. 11. None that I know of.
12. The actual cost is not so much increased, as the machines are much lighter and not so durable, the 10 per cent. on raw material is causing this; reapers and mowers lighter; waggons a little higher duty 30 per cent.
13. Woollens are dearer; blankets, woollen shawls, knitted shirts and drawers, heavy tweeds and towelled cloth, 17 per cent.; cotton goods, cotton shirts, drawers, bags, Canton flannel, bed ticking, denims, gingham, from 17 to 20 per cent. increase. Hardware, nails 24 per cent., stoves 12 per cent., hoes, forks, scythes, are all higher under the Tariff.
14. Not that I am aware of.
15. Has not given employment, but more are leaving for the United States, especially the State of Dakota, than ever before, on account of the Tariff and land policy in the North-West.
16. More farms for sale than I ever knew; lower 20 per cent. since 1878 on account of emigration.
17. The condition of the farmer improved on account of having had good crops, but the condition of the labourer not much improved; although the wages are a little better, the money has not the same purchasing power.
18. Remove all restrictions on trade, as far as possible, to secure a revenue, and give us a fair field and no favour.

*General Remarks:*—The farmers surplus produce having to find a foreign market it is only robbing him to make him pay 30 or 40 per cent. for the goods he gets in exchange for his produce, without giving him an equal increase in the price of cattle, horses and grain, which is impossible without giving a premium on all he raises for sale.

JOHN McMILLAN,  
Reeve, Hullett, Co. Huron.

1. Yes; all products that can be raised in Canada.
2. No effect in increasing the price of coarse grains grown here, but increases the price of corn and prevents us feeding cattle to the extent we would have done otherwise.
3. Prices of wheat higher in United States than here, do not know whether caused by N.P. or not.
4. Prices of hogs higher, a smaller number being fed, probably owing to the failure of our pea crop and the high price of corn. 5. Certainly not.
6. Profitable, but not more so than other stocks. Everything good in horse flesh goes to the United States, everything bad to the North-West and Dakota.
7. While peas could be grown successfully, we raised a large proportion of our own feed. Always a considerable quantity of corn imported here when price was moderate 8. No. 9. Yes very much; we think not.
10. Wool never was so low in price as the last two or three years, 20 to 23 cents per lb.
11. Flax industry revived, these articles enumerated, not grown in this district.
12. Increased in price by a deterioration in quality.
13. All increased in price, now 10 to 25 per cent. 14. No, rather decreased.
15. No, neither diversity nor encouragement, but has accelerated the tide of emigration. 16. No, decreased in value and more difficult to sell.
17. The good crops of the last three years has somewhat improved the condition of farmers. Condition of labouring classes not improved.
18. An economical Government has made a law to prevent railway companies discriminating against local freights.

DAVID WALKER,

Reeve, Brucefield, Co. Huron.

1. I think not. 2. The duty has advanced the price of corn just to the amount of duty imposed. It has slightly stimulated the growth of corn here. The other grains are not affected in this section.
3. I do not think it has had any effect upon the prices of wheat.
4. I think it has considerably enhanced the value of all the articles under this head.
5. There have certainly been a great number of horses taken from this section of the country to Manitoba, which had it not been for the duty, probably would have been bought in the Western States, and therefore must have increased the price.
6. Breeding horses pays well, profits compare favourably. In this section I would say that for the last three years the trade is about equally divided between the United States and Manitoba.
7. I have asked this question of a number of farmers, and they say corn raising for feeding purposes pays well and should be encouraged.
8. It has not affected the prices of those articles here.
9. I think he would be benefited, we are in a better position now.
10. I don't think it has affected the price of our long wool. 11. None here.
12. I see no change in prices, quality equally good. 13. No increase.
14. Can see no great change. 15. In our Riding there are no manufactories, so I cannot speak from personal observation.
16. I see no very increased tendency here at present, owing I think to the unlimited quantity of cheap lands in the North West. Price of land has increased since 1878. There appears to be increased confidence. 17. Yes, materially.
18. I do not know of any.

H. GILCHRIST,

Ailsa Craig, Co. Middlesex, N. R.

1. No.
2. To raise the price of corn and rye too far East to affect oats.
3. To raise the price of both spring and fall wheat by securing our own market, especially in the Lower Provinces.
4. Hogs and pork are both higher than under the old Tariff.
5. Horses have largely increased in price, I should say owing to the increased prosperity of both this country and the United States.
6. At present prices it will be profitable to breed horses, and I think more so than other stock; the principal market is the U. S.
7. We can certainly grow profitably all our own coarse grain for fattening stock, and do not consider it advisable to take the duty off corn.
8. At present I should say the improved state of the market is owing to increased consumption.
9. Yes; and yes, certainly we have now something to offer in exchange; we need expect nothing for nothing from our friends across the line.
10. None. The wools grown here are Leicester and Cotswold—too coarse it is said for our manufacturers.
11. Cannot say; none grown here.
12. Quality is improved and cost not increased. All agricultural implements.
13. No increase in price so far as I can see.
14. All farm produce is in active demand; increased employment in manufacturing does, and must increase consumption of all farm products.
15. Certainly.
16. A reaction in prices is taking place, although the cheap lands of Manitoba and the Northwest, and also the number of farms forced on the market by mortgages of lands mortgaged during the time of depression and high rates of interest, tend to keep prices down.
17. Decidedly, farmers are prospering and wages of farm labourers were never so high as now.
18. No answer.

GILBERT BELFORD,

Reeve, Seymour, and Warden, U. Cs. Northumberland and Durham.

1. I think not.
2. A better market for our own coarse grain, of which oats and peas are the principal in this locality.
3. 4 and 5. No answer.
6. Yes; compare favorably with United States.
7. I think so; this would depend upon the price of corn; most of the corn that used to be consumed here was by the lumbermen, when they could buy it cheaper than oats, and not by farmers for fattening cattle.
8. I notice no difference here.
9. We seem to be doing as well as when we had Reciprocity, trade having found other channels; better with the present Tariff.
10. No answer.
11. No answer.
12. Have not found any advance in prices.
13. Do not notice any difference in the price.
14. I think so. All branches of industry more prosperous, therefore more money circulating.
15. Yes.
16. Rather decreased, because of the vast area of cheap lands obtainable in the North-West, and also on account of the great number of farms just put upon the market by persons wishing to sell out and go there.
17. More especially the latter.
18. Less taxes; our governmental machinery, both municipal and legislative, is too expensive; less railway amalgamation and lower rates for local freight.

*General Remarks*:—Regarding question 7: If we could fatten our stock with American corn, and thereby enrich our farms with manure off U.S. soil, it would be a fine thing, but the question remains—would it pay?

JOHN DARBY,

Farmer, Crown Hill, Co. Simcoe.

1. No. We can produce our own grain. 2. We do not import any.
3. It does not affect us much. 4. Our prices have advanced.
5. Our prices have advanced.
6. I do not breed horses. So far as my knowledge goes, unless the horses are of an improved breed, they do not pay so well as beef cattle, sheep and hogs.
7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. Better with the present Tariff. 10. Increased.
11. Tobacco increased. The other articles not much grown.
12. Have no experience. 13. Decreased.
14. Yes, because we have a home market caused by the increase of manufactures.
15. Yes. 16. Yes. Yes. 17. Yes.
18. I do not think we require any more legislation on this subject at present.

*General Remarks* :—If it could be possible, by some system of education, or say influence of the curés of the different parishes, to get the farmers of Quebec to see their own interest in a better system of cultivation of their lands, the breeding and raising a greater number and a superior class of animals, especially sheep, for which a large portion of the Province is so admirably adapted, it would do more, in my opinion, to increase the wealth and prosperity of the Province than anything else.

DAVID AIKMAN,  
Contractor, Montmagny, Co. Montmagny.

1. The American markets are ample for all their produce, and takes off all our surplus, besides paying high rates and Tariff as well. We don't require American farm produce, nor do they wish to send us any.
2. The duty has increased the price of corn here, and decreased as a general thing the price of oats, pease and barley. Rye I don't know.
3. Wheat and flour has advanced steadily in price since the Tariff duty was imposed, especially on fall wheat.
4. It has raised the prices for farmers, but consumers and the working class have to pay dear for the whistle. 5. No.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, and compares favorably with that of other stock. Our principal market for horses is the American market. 7. Yes. No.
8. I think not. 9. Reciprocity would certainly benefit the farmers, if it could be effected upon a proper basis. No better. 10. I cannot state.
11. The effect on flax and tobacco is very trifling, if any. Sugar beet yet to be tried.
12. I should say decreased. Quality not improved.
13. Increased in price by the Tariff. Too numerous to mention. 14. I think not.
15. It has, to some extent, but forces them to buy dear almost every article of consumption. It may have retarded some, but in my opinion more farmers have left the country since the Tariff than before.
16. None. Farm lands have decreased in value. 17. I fail to see it.
18. Reciprocity, or a partial free trade, with all foreign markets.

*General Remarks* :—On the whole, I would be in favour of Reciprocity with the United States, if it could be effected on a good sound basis, without affecting any of the industries of the Dominion. With our small population of 4,000,000, unless we have channels of outlet, our markets will soon become glutted, manufactures stagnant, if not closed, and our labouring classes out of employment eventually. This is what I foresee in the Tariff duty.

WM. BURNS,  
Farmer and Merchant, Rawdon, Co. Montcalm.

1. No, none. 2. Tariff has excludcd corn from this section of the country and encouraged the growth of coarse grains.
3. Has given a more steady market without raising the price of flour to the consumer.

4. Average price has been materially increased. 5. Yes, certainly.
6. Profitable to breed horses for the English, United States and Manitoba markets.
7. Can raise it. Better keep the money in the country.
8. Wherever manufactories exist it is. 9. The farmer would not. In a better position now.
10. General improvements all round. 11. None cultivated here.
12. Cost decreased. Quality better. Farm implements of all kinds, carriages, wagons, &c.
13. Not increased. 14. Yes. By giving steady employment and remunerative wages to large numbers of operatives thereby increasing their purchasing power.
15. Yes. 16. No change in this section. 17. Very decidedly yes.
18. Increase the Tariff so as to more largely encourage home manufactories and keep our money at home.

THOMAS SWINARTON,  
Reeve, Albion, Coventry, Co. Peel

1. No. 2. Has raised the price of corn, oats and rye. Very little peas and barley raised in this section.
3. Don't think it affects the price of wheat and flour much in this locality.
4. Has encouraged farmers to raise more pork. 5. As very few horses are brought here from the United States, it does not affect the market much only as far as the demand for Manitoba is concerned.
6. At present prices it is profitable to raise horses both for Manitoba and United States markets. I think there are more sent to Manitoba.
7. Farmers can raise what coarse grain is required, but cannot compete with Western corn growers without protection.
8. I think there is not much difference. 9. Reciprocity with the United States would be advantageous to some localities. I think our position is better for a favourable Treaty. The labouring classes are getting more work and better wages, and their condition is improving.
10. Not much wool grown here, what is is mostly of coarse quality.
11. Cannot say, none raised in this section for market.
12. Farming implements have improved in quality, and in most cases are lower in price.
13. Woollens lower and better. Cotton better article, about the same price. Hardware very little difference.
14. I think the home market has been improved on most of the products of the farm by the Tariff.
15. A large number of our men have returned from Michigan who went there for employment.
16. There is more enquiry for farms and more men buying farms than for some years past, a great number of farms changing hands. 17. Yes.
18. Don't know of any.

*General Remarks:*—Before filling up the enclosed I submitted the answers to the other four members of our council, who are all farmers, and have no other occupation, and they fully agreed with me. I own and manage a farm, but am also engaged in lumbering and a general store.

DANIEL A. McCALL,  
Reeve, St. Williams, Co. Norfolk.

1. Yes it would. Because Canada exports all kinds except corn, and it would benefit our grain merchants and railway men to have all the trade they could from the United States.
2. Has had no good effect in our section as we have not grown a great quantity of oats; rye, none sown; corn none raised; barley finds ready sale for the United States markets; peas go to Great Britain.

3. The price of wheat is entirely controlled by the English markets who use all our surplus. Could never see any good effects from the present Tariff in the raising of the price of wheats.
4. This is not a pork raising county, and cannot speak so intelligently on the matter, but as far as I can judge the Tariff has not raised the prices.
5. No, as the Americans are our principal buyers and have been for a long time, except this last twelve months; when buyers come in from Manitoba and purchase a good many animals.
6. No; they are not as profitable as raising cattle and sheep, except at the present time their prices having been increased owing to the great immigration to Manitoba. The permanent market has been the United States.
7. No; this is not a corn country. This is a matter I feel strongly on—it is an injustice to the Canadian farmer to put a duty on American corn. 8. No.
9. Yes; farmers of Canada were never as prosperous as they were under the old Reciprocity Treaty, and they would welcome the renewal of the same. I do not see that we are in any better position to treat with them.
10. Wool has never been so low in my experience of 30 years farming as it has been the last three years.
11. None of these things raised to any extent in our section; could not give an intelligent answer.
12. The price of farm implements has increased—quality not so good as heretofore; reapers, mowers, horse rakes.
13. Increased in price as all articles get under a high Tariff; cottons and woollen goods commonly used among farmers.
14. Not in our experience as a great number of our people have left and gone to Michigan, Dakota and Manitoba.
15. No; the reverse is the case in our experience—any number of Canadians going away, but none returning.
16. No; farm lands in this section at present cannot be sold at a reduction of 40 per cent less than what they would readily sell at three years ago.
17. There is better prices this year owing to foreign demand which the Tariff has no control over.
18. Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, American corn admitted free of duty, duty off teas and sugar. No amalgamation of the different railway companies allowed by Act of Parliament.

*General Remarks.*—Reduce our Tariff to a proper Revenue one, and legislate against the great monopolies building up at the expense of the farmers and artisans.

JOHN DOUGLAS,

Reeve, Tara, Co. Bruce.

1. None should be admitted free; if we can pay duty they can also.
2. Oats raised at the beginning 10 cents a bushel, since it is not dearer that I could find out here or in the States. I believe if we have oats to export it will have no effect whatever on the price.
3. I do not know any difference; stands about as near to Buffalo prices as before.
4. Very little; depends on foreign market.
5. I do not believe any difference; because if the States do not want our horses they do not buy them, and the home market we always had free. Of Manitoba I am not posted whatever. 6. In the States.
7. He can raise all he wants and more too, but cannot raise as much wheat, and the way cattle is selling I believe fully nothing can pay better than raising his own stock and feed for them. 8. I don't know.
9. If you could make up the money to defray the expenses of the country in another way by taxes on property, and other countries the same, I believe Free Trade would be the best for the whole world.

10. Wool is lower than before, but do not know the cause. 11. I don't know.  
 12. I believe implements can be bought as cheap as before and some cheaper, but quality does not last as long, and it is not right to blame manufacturers but farmers themselves, because they want them very light to run easy.  
 13. Did not find anything out worth mentioning; iron raised a little. 14. No answer.  
 15. As far as work and life in the country is concerned, I believe it the best thing that could be done; there are always inquiries about hands instead of having tramps.  
 16. Farm lands made an increase, but will have a decrease before long on account of Manitoba, but the decrease will hardly reach \$10 to the acre.  
 17. Yes; it is to a great extent, and if it should improve more the consequences may not be good especially to the working class; who will not know what to ask for their wages.  
 18. Under the circumstances I cannot see our country could be any better than it is. Farmers are doing well and labourers too, and whosoever are not content when they have plenty to eat, drink, and whatever is necessary for human life, Parliament and no legislation can make them content.

*General Remarks*:—I believe the present Government does very well in the management of our country's affairs, and will do their best in the future, especially should a government raise every year as much money, or a little more, to defray their expenses and not running in the eyes of the people a cheap machine, and the country be bankrupt.

EDWARD HALTER,  
 J. P., New Germany, Co. Waterloo, Ont.

1. It would not do to admit oats, rye and barley. 2. To make the price better.  
 3. Can't say. 4. Prices are better. 5. For the poor classes of horses it has.  
 6. I do. The United States is the best market for superior horses.  
 7. I can't satisfactorily answer this question. 8. I don't think it is.  
 9. I think he would, and I think we are in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff. 10. It is injurious. 11. I can't say.  
 10. I can buy a better article at the same price, such as reapers, ploughs, rakes, &c.  
 13. I don't think there has been any increase in price by the Tariff.  
 14. It has in price. 15. I can't say. 16. There is not; the value is about the same.  
 17. I think it is. 18. I can't say.

*General Remarks*:—I find that it would require a good deal of study and time to give anything like satisfactory or reliable answers to most of the above questions.

WILLIAM BIGGAR,  
 Reeve, Brantford, Mohawk, Co. Brant.

1. No; it would not be in their interest.  
 2. The effect of the imposition has given to 'this' county good markets and great demands and higher prices.  
 3. Farmers are raising wheat only within the last three years in this township, and only for their own use.  
 4. The effect has given farmers a great advantage in fattening hogs; pork is selling dearer than ever before.  
 5. The increased duties imposed on horses has given Canadian home markets an increased price of 40 per cent.  
 6. Yes, our principal markets are both in the United States and Manitoba.  
 7. Canadian farmers raise all the grain required to fatten their stocks.  
 8. Yes, an increase of about 25 per cent.  
 9. We are in a better position with the present Tariff than we were when American produce was admitted free.

10. No trade for wool in this township. 11. No flax nor sugar beet cultivated, but tobacco is raised by farmers for their own use only.
12. A decrease of about 25 per cent, and the quality just as good.
13. About the same. 14. By the operation of the Tariff, home market for farm produce has increased at least forty per cent.
15. Since the operation of the present Tariff Canadians are coming back in large numbers to this country.
16. There is an increased tendency for the investment of capital in farm property—and farm lands have increased nearly double the value they were in 1878.
17. A great improvement in the condition of farmers and labouring classes since 1878.
18. No change is required in legislation to make agriculture a more desirable and profitable occupation—only that the 4 cents a lb. duty on tobacco should be taken off; I think that farmers should have the same right to raise their own tobacco as other kind of grain or produce.

GIDEON MINARD,  
Township Clerk, Clarence Creek, Co. Russell.

---

1. Do not admit any kind of American produce free, better as it is.
2. American corn is not higher in price here, more oats and barley and pease raised and better demand for them.
3. There is nearly 50 per cent. of wheat more raised by the farmers here since 1878, and it gives them a better market at all times.
4. Fifty per cent more hogs raised here and better price for them.
5. Improved, prices about 25 per cent.
6. Horses are less profitable, cattle and sheep are more profitable to raise, sell the horses principally to the coal mine owners.
7. Most undoubtedly it pays the farmer better, and is much cheaper to raise grain and roots than to import American corn.
8. Yes, about 30 per cent. better; in fact, previous to 1878 we could hardly sell either.
9. In my opinion, think this country could not prosper better under any treaty or Tariff than it does at present.
10. We have abundance of wool in this country, and by putting duty on foreign wool it gives us a better market and prices.
11. Don't know, there is none raised in this county.
12. Ploughs are cheaper, waggons are cheaper, mowing machines cheaper and fully better articles. 13. They are much cheaper.
14. Yes, through the putting on duty on foreign goods, which gives us room to sell our own produce.
15. Every one has a fair way of making a living since 1878, and don't hear any one say, I cannot get a day's work, as they often had to express previous to 1878.
16. Increased investment and increase in value; young people that were away in the United States have come home and are fast taking up farms.
17. Yes, more than 50 per cent.
18. No change necessary, the most necessary change I see is the production of good cattle and sheep, and good grain seeds, and root seeds.

*General Remarks:*—We cannot hardly expect a better change in the Tariff for the good of the country than the present one.

NEIL McNEIL, Merchant,  
East Bay, Co. Cape Breton, N.S.

---

- 1: It would be a direct disadvantage to the Canadian farmer.
2. Much larger quantities of oats, rye, barley and pease are now grown here, easily sold at much better prices than in 1878. Corn is little grown and little used here.

3. American wheat and flour has never been imported to any extent, into this section.
4. Very beneficial, it has in reality given us our own market and a very remunerative one it is. 5. Without doubt they have.
6. Since the inauguration of the N.P. the profits on horses have been in advance of that on any other stock. A large number of horses have gone from this section to Manitoba.
7. He can. If he does not raise his own grain, he loses money to buy it for fattening stock.
8. The demand is immeasurably ahead of what it was in 1878 and prices are better.
9. There can be no doubt but that we are in a better position now than before the N.P. to negotiate such a treaty.
10. Wool was sold here in 1878, best quality fleece wool, at 26 cents, it will now bring 30 cents. 11. None cultivated here.
12. Ploughs, a better article as cheap; reapers and mowers cheaper and much better article; hoes and scythes no change in price.
13. Woollens and cottons are somewhat reduced in price. Nails, &c., very much cheaper.
14. It has. I can only account for it by saying, there are more people employed, and therefore, able to pay for such produce.
15. It certainly has; as evidence, compare prices of farm labour now with that in 1878.
16. Investments in farms are now considered paying. Very much increased.
17. The general condition of the farmer is immensely improved.
18. Leave well enough alone.

*General Remarks*:—There is more farm produce grown. The demand is still in advance of the production, hence prices are good. Clothing, teas and sugars are not increased in price. Farm implements are of a vastly superior quality and are cheaper. The N.P. is a boon to the farming community.

GEORGE KILGOUR,  
Mayor and Farmer, Shawville, Co. Pontiac.

1. It would be in the interest of Canadian agriculturalists to admit Indian corn and other coarse grains free of duty, because they are not raised in sufficient quantities for feeding purposes.
2. It has had the effect of increasing the price of such grains, and acts injuriously as regards coarse grains; but increased duty is desirable on oats, rye, barley and pease.
3. The effect has been to add nearly \$1 per bbl. to the value of flour, and about 15 cents per bushel to spring, and about 20 cents per bushel to fall wheat. On the whole it is thought the present Tariff is about all that can be desired.
4. The increased duties on these articles have had a most beneficial effect, and it is felt that an increased duty on pork and beef is much needed at the present time.
5. The increased duties have considerably enhanced the value of horses, as well as other live stock, as they protect the home market.
6. Of late, breeding horses has become a profitable business, and breeding other stock comparatively so; the United States has been the best market, but Manitoba and the North-West are rapidly superseding the United States market.
7. As a rule, the farmers here do not, and generally cannot raise profitably all the grain required to fatten their stock, and it would be much better to import American corn, &c., for feeding purposes.
8. The market for these commodities is much improved through the operation of the present Tariff, and it seems that if there is to be a change, it should be further increased.
9. There can be no doubt that a Reciprocal Treaty with the United States would be beneficial to the farming community, and it must be conceded that better

- terms could be obtained now than when American produce was admitted free.
10. The general opinion seems to be that there should be an increased duty on wool.
  11. But little flax or sugar beet is cultivated; and it would be well to remove most of the duty off Canadian tobacco.
  12. The cost of farm implements has been slightly increased by the present Tariff; but the quality appears to be better. Mowers and reaping machines and most farming implements (dutiable) are considered to be taxed a little too much.
  13. Cottons have increased in price about 10 per cent., but every one seems satisfied.
  14. On the whole, the home market has had a marked increase, especially in those articles protected by a reasonable Tariff.
  15. The present Tariff has done much for the industrial classes, by providing employment at home, by keeping many from going to the United States, and by inducing many Canadians who had gone there to return.
  16. There is certainly a growing tendency to invest capital in farm property, notably during the past two years, and is every way increasing. Farm lands have increased in value fully 25 per cent. since 1878, principally through the beneficial effects of the N.P., and the feeling of confidence it has restored in the country.
  17. The general condition of both the farmers and labouring classes has much improved since 1878, and no one, no matter of what shade of politics, can be found to-day but must candidly admit that fact. A feeling of security reigns all around.
  18. Protection is beneficial to the agriculturist, and with the exception of the few changes enumerated above, the general legislation on the Tariff appears to be all that the people desire.

*General Remarks* :—It seems to be the desire to increase the duty on oats, rye, barley, pease, wool, beef and pork, and to remove or lessen the duty on farming implements, Indian corn, &c., and to leave wheat and flour, &c., as at present.

P. J. MULLAN,  
School Teacher, &c., Vinton, Co. Pontiac.

1. I think it would not. Consider it better to have them pay duty on all produce sent into Canada by them.
2. The imposing of a duty on American coarse grains increases the price for the Canadian farmer's produce.
3. It has probably increased those articles in Canada in equal value of duty imposed on them.
4. I think it has increased the value of live hogs about \$2 per 100 lbs., and those other articles in proportion.
5. I think the increased duty on horses has improved the price in the Canadian market, and ought to benefit the Manitoba market.
6. I do find it profitable to raise horses, and the breeding of them compares favourably with other stock raising. Make sale of them principally at home.
7. I think it pays the Canadian farmer better to raise grain and fatten his stock than to import American grain. 8. I think it is.
9. I think not. Think it advisable to negotiate with the present Tariff than have American produce admitted free.
10. It increases the price on the Canadian manufacturer.
11. It would, I think, reduce the price on the Canadian cultivator.
12. I think they may have increased in price a little under the present Tariff. The quality is as good on general farm implements.
13. I think they are increased in price some. Nearly all the articles mentioned here.
14. I think it has by compelling the Americans to pay the present Tariff.

15. I think it has, and has retarded emigration to the United States and encouraged Canadians to return to Canada.

16. I think there is; and farm property has increased in value since 1878, owing to prosperity in the country. 17. They are very much so. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:* - I think the imposing of duty on all American goods and produce raised by American farmers would enable our Canadians to keep all Canadian industries going on, and by so doing give employment to the labouring classes, and keep them in the country, and consequently leave the money of those industries amongst our Canadian inhabitants.

MICHAEL HUGHES,  
Postmaster and Farmer, Colfield, Co. Pontiac.

1. Yes; because we raise more than we consume, and must sell at the world's market prices.
2. It has interfered with those engaged in raising improved stock, or in preparing cattle for the British markets; but I cannot say that it has raised the price of coarse grains, except corn, which was a short crop last year.
3. As compared with the American markets, our prices are lower since the imposition of the duty. No spring wheat raised here.
4. Cannot say; do not remember that live hogs from the United States ever came into competition with ours.
5. Think not; but the horses taken by our farmers to the United States and the North-West have materially reduced the number of horses in this part of the country.
6. Not very. Not equal to that on cattle. The United States, until lately, when a few were shipped to Manitoba.
7. Until the duty was imposed our farmers preferred to supplement their own grain with American corn.
8. Cannot say, as we raise very little vegetables, except potatoes, which are dearer in the United States than here. We never import butter or eggs.
9. Yes. Possibly, but I fear the Americans can stand it longer than we can.
10. Neither the Tariff nor anything else can make the market much worse than it is now. 11. None here.
12. Increased. Reapers, mowers, &c. Quality about the same, but lighter.
13. Woollens and cottons are higher in proportion to the English and American markets in all the coarser grades. In hardware, stoves have increased most.
14. If it has, I cannot say how.
15. We never had so much emigration to the United States as during the last two years. 16. No; though money is much cheaper, farms are lower.
17. Farmers are better off, owing to good crops, but labourers are not.
18. Such changes as will enable the farmer to both buy and sell in the best markets.

THOS. NORTHCOTT,  
Farmer, Caradoc, Co. Middlesex.

1. No. 2. Oats, rye, barley and peas have been a better price since Protection.
3. All kinds of spring and fall wheat, also flour, have increased in value.
4. Those articles have been some 10 and 20 per cent. higher; in some cases even higher. 5. Yes.
6. We have a ready sale for horses and all kinds of live stock. Large quantities are going to Manitoba, more than to the United States. Cattle and horses are going every day to Manitoba.
7. Yes; all kinds can be raised here to fatten stock. 8. Yes.
9. I doubt if we would be benefited by Reciprocity. We are most certainly in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the United States.

10. In this article I notice very little difference. 11. I could not say.  
 12. Articles all cheaper and fully as good if not better, as manufacturers are in a better position, have larger sales, and can do with less profits.  
 13. No. Most decidedly not. I think, from my experience, cheaper:  
 14. It certainly has. We now have ready sale for all our products, which we did not have before the N.P. Tariff. 15. Yes.  
 16. I do not think farm property has increased much in value. I think the reason of this is on account of the immense emigration to Manitoba.  
 17. Yes, decidedly.  
 18. From my experience I could not advise anything more than to continue our present Tariff.

*General Remarks* :—Having recently travelled through some twelve States, I find there is more talk among Americans for a Reciprocity Treaty since our Tariff has been raised. I own and farm some 500 acres, and I know that farmers are much benefited by our Protective Tariff.

C. R. SING,  
 Warden, Meaford, Co. Grey.

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—This is in the Muskoka Free Grant District, and not yet developed; as to agriculture we are fully aware of the increased cost of living being fully up to the advance in wages.

WM. H. BROWN,  
 Reeve, McLean, Muskoka.

1. No. 2. Better prices. 3. Very little difference.  
 4. The prices have greatly increased. 5. Improved prices.  
 6. Not many horses raised for sale. 7. Can raise it cheaper. 8. Yes:  
 9. Yes. With the Tariff. 10. Prices about the same. 11. Not grown here.  
 12. Decreased; Quality as good or better.  
 13. Cotton and woollen goods cheaper; hardware 25 per cent less. 14. It has.  
 15. Yes. 16. Yes; increased. 17. Considerable; one half better.  
 18. Greater advantages to the settler; protection against the lumbermen.

*General Remarks* :—The people in this section are suffering on account of the lumbering interest, which being allowed to take all the timber, prevents the farmer putting up buildings, and their lands are in many places under water, on account of the rivers and streams being dammed back for lumbering purposes.

JAMES WILLIAM,  
 Reeve, Kennebec, Co. Frontenac.

1. No. 2. Price of oats and peas increased; scarcely any rye grown here; no corn grown here.  
 3. The price of wheat is better on account of not having so great competition with inferior American wheat, and the same may be said of flour.  
 4. The price of these products has increased to the amount of the duty.  
 5. Prices increased fully to amount of duty. 6. Horses here not so profitable as other stock, but our chief market is Manitoba.  
 7. Can raise all grains for feeding except corn; of course a reduction of duty on corn would make it cheaper for the feeder.  
 8. Very much improved, as we have a ready home market for everything.  
 9. Cannot say whether Reciprocity would be a good thing, but we are in a better position now, than under Free Trade, to negotiate for Reciprocity.

10. We are not interested much in wool here. 11. None cultivated here.  
 12. Prices lower and implements better. 13. Hardware cheaper; woollens and cottons much the same.  
 14. Much improved in every line, by increase in price. 15. Undoubtedly it has.  
 16. Tendency to invest increased, but value decreased on account of Manitoba lands being so easily obtained. 17. Very much indeed.  
 18. The appointment of Railway Commissioners as per McCarthy's Bill, and the passing of a prohibitory liquor law.

*General Remarks* :—Of course, it is essentially necessary that John A. should be at the head of the State, in order that prosperity should continue, for we find that so soon as any other statesman rules, depression follows.

WILLIAM SWITZER,  
 Deputy Reeve, New Lowell, Co. Simcoe.

1. It would not be to the interest of Canada to admit American farm produce free of duty.
2. The duty on American Indian corn and other coarse grains has had the effect to raise the price of oats, rye, corn, barley and pease.
3. The duties imposed on wheat and flour from the United States, has had the effect to raise the price of fall and spring wheat here.
4. It has raised the price of pork in the Canadian market, hams, bacon and lard.
5. It has increased our market for horses and other live stock in Manitoba and the North-West.
6. Horses pay well to raise here, the smaller size for the American market and the larger size for Manitoba, and as profitable as other stock.
7. Yes; Canadian farmers can profitably raise all the grain required to fatten stock.
8. Improved through the effects of the present Tariff.
9. Better as we are. We are in as good a position to negotiate such a Treaty as when American produce was admitted free. 10. Do not know.
11. Do not know. 12. No; the price is not increased and the quality is better in mowing and reaping machines, ploughs, &c., under the present Tariff.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware have changed scarcely anything in comparison with what would be lost to the revenue by admitting them free.
14. Increased and improved by the Tariff. We are not now met in our own market by American free grain.
15. The present Tariff has encouraged the industrial classes, retarded emigration to the United States, and caused Canadians to return to this country.
16. There is an increased tendency for investment under the present Tariff in Manitoba and the North-West since 1878. So many want to sell here just now and go to the North-West.
17. Yes; improved since 1878. 18. None.

*General Remarks* :—I am decidedly of opinion that the present Tariff has been the great cause of the prosperity everywhere manifest in Canada.

JOHN RUTLEDGE, Reeve,  
 Loughborough, Co. Frontenac.

1. It would make no difference with the exception of corn, because all kinds of produce are dearer on the American side.
2. Had no effect but on corn which is a loss to the farmers, as much corn is bought to fatten stock. 3. No effect. 4. Cannot say, very few hogs raised here.
5. No; the most of the heavy horses are bought by Americans for the Michigan lumbering woods and our stock is shipped to Britain.
6. Heavy horses go to the United States, light ones principally go to Manitoba.

7. As peas have been a failure for some years it does pay to buy corn and sell our barley. 8. No. 9. Yes. Cannot say.  
 10. Wool cheaper last summer than ever before. 11. None raised here.  
 12. Increased. Stoves particularly. 13. Increased. All kinds of cotton goods.  
 14. Has had no effect on the home market, the foreign market regulates the price.  
 15. None here; more emigration to the States and Manitoba than ever before.  
 16. There is, owing to the rate of interest being so low. 17. Cannot see any difference  
 18. Reciprocity with the United States would help, and trade opened up with foreign countries.

JOHN McFARLANE,  
 Reeve, Sarnia, Co. Lambton.

1. No. 2. Encouraged farmers to grow more coarse grains.  
 3. Increased the price of spring wheat and flour. 4. Has benefited the farmers.  
 5. Yes. 6. Yes. Equally as good as any other stock. In both places.  
 7. Yes. 8. No change. 9. Reciprocal trade is advantageous. In a better position under the present Tariff.  
 10. None. 11. None raised in this part of the Province.  
 12. Cheaper and of a better quality. 13. No change.  
 14. Yes. By the Tariff on American pork and spring wheat. 15. It has very much.  
 16. Yes. They have decreased in value owing to emigration to Manitoba and the North-West. 17. Yes, very materially.  
 18. I cannot recommend any as the Government have faithfully fulfilled all their pledges to the farmers.

DAVID DUNN,  
 Reeve, Essa, Co. Simcoe.

1. No, it would not be in the interest of agriculture to admit all kinds of American produce free.  
 2. An increased price generally as to oats have obtained a better price than for years previous, rye and corn do not grow there; barley, a better price; pease, better price  
 3. So far as my observation goes, the best varieties of Canadian wheat have secured increased prices both fall in and spring.  
 4. The effect has very much increased prices on the home grown articles of this class.  
 5. Yes; we are now obtaining better prices for our Canadian bred horses than we have for years previous.  
 6. It is profitable, and compares fairly well with other stock when we can so control the market as to be able to get for ourselves the full value of our animals.  
 7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock without importing any foreign grain.  
 8. It is sensibly improved, and I would assign the improvement to the effect of the Tariff.  
 9. Reciprocity would be a benefit—and we are more likely to obtain it with our present Tariff. If American produce were admitted free they would have nothing to gain by Reciprocity.  
 10. An increased price for long wool. 11. Have not grown these articles so far.  
 12. The cost is not increased, and as far as I have an opportunity to judge, the quality compares favourably for the Canadian manufacturer.  
 13. My observation not sufficient to answer.  
 14. It has by the demand for the same caused by increased manufacturing industries, and by retaining our markets for ourselves. 15. It has undoubtedly.

16. If any decrease is to be observed in any instance it can be accounted for by the opening of the North-West Territory for settlement. 17. It is.  
 18. The object of legislation with regard to agriculture should tend towards protecting our markets from being filled with foreign grown produce, Canada being naturally the highway or outlet to markets for the produce of a large part of the Northern States, renders it liable to have its markets flooded with the produce of those States.

N. A. MALLOY,  
 Justice of the Peace, Laskay, Co. York.

1. No ; not without the Americans did the same. 2. Do not know. 3. Do not know.  
 4. It has increased the value of hogs and hog products by keeping the American meats out. The same as they keep Canadian meats out. There is still an injustice in allowing mess pork to come in at the old low duty while hogs have been increased from 10 to 20 per cent. 5 to 13. No answer.  
 14. Yes, by the employment of more people in consequence of the Tariff.  
 15. Yes. 16. No answer. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—The Government should allow heavy hogs suitable for mess pork to come in at 10 per cent or else put mess pork at 2 cents per lb. the same as all other meats.

F. W. FEARMAN,  
 Pork Curer and Merchant, Hamilton, Ont.

1. No kind whatever. 2. Better prices. 3. Very little difference.  
 4. Increase of price. 5. Improved prices. 6. Not many raised for sale.  
 7. Can raise it cheaper. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. Certainly with the Tariff.  
 10. About the same. 11. Not grown here.  
 12. The cost is decreased and articles made of better material.  
 13. Hardware 25 per cent cheaper. Woollens and cottons also cheaper.  
 14. It has. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Increased. 17. Yes, considerable, one half better.  
 18. From the Provincial Government greater advantages to the settler, and some protection from the lumberman licensees, as there is none. The lumbermen take all the timber from a stick of firewood to a stick of square pine, leaving no timber to build with, and flooding the low lands so they cannot be cultivated. Lumbermen take all the fencing as well.

WILLIAM PATTERSON,  
 Township Clerk, Kennebec, Co. Frontenc.

1. It would not be to the interest of Canadian agriculture to admit any produce of the American farms free.  
 2. The price has been increased on oats, rye, corn, barley and peas, about the same as amount of duty.  
 3. The prices have been increased on wheat and flour, and on spring and fall wheat in relative proportion.  
 4. The price has been increased to about the amount of duty.  
 5. They are now bringing a better price than before the duty ; the greater portion being for the Manitoba market.  
 6. I have found it not profitable to breed horses for the American market ; Manitoba market is the best.  
 7. With the prices he gets for his stock when fattened it will pay him well, and better than import American corn. 8. I think they have.

9. I think we would be better with Reciprocity Treaty (if it could be got) on equal footing. I am positive we are in a much better position to get this Treaty under the present Tariff, or nearer the Tariff of the United States.
10. Have found but little change in price.
11. Has had the tendency to more extensively cultivate.
12. They are about the same price and equally as good.
13. Think there is no perceptible change in the retail prices of those articles.
14. Yes; the home market has increased, by encouraging buyers to come here to buy.
15. Yes; plenty of work and good wages, many who have been living in the United States, moving back here.
16. Yes I think so; and farm property has increased in value since 1878, by the protection given farm production. 17. Yes.
18. Would be well to bring the Tariff up to the same as the United States, upon each article.

*General Remarks* :—Have lived upon the boundary line here for 50 years, and we find no inconvenience in the increase of Tariff—it only makes us raise or manufacture what we would have to import and buy—makes us more self independent.

JOHN D. McDONALD,

Reeve, Sombra, Port Lambton, Co. Lambton.

1. Not unless they grant us like privilege, otherwise it would be prejudicial to the interests of farmers of the Dominion.
2. It has had the effect of increasing the price of oats from 5 to 7 cents per bushel, rye and corn not much grown here; on barley there is not much change; peas have increased considerably in price.
3. Fall wheat not extensively raised. White Russian and Lost Nation spring wheat are the kinds generally grown. Sometimes we get as much as 10 cents per bushel more than we can realize for fall wheat. Those kinds of spring wheat make an excellent article of flour, and we having now a good home market, realizing very remunerative prices.
4. It has increased the price of live hogs; on hams and bacon we get from \$1.75 to \$2 per 100 lbs. more than we got three years ago. We can now afford to feed pork and have a profit, besides we supply a much better article of food than that imported from the American side.
5. The horses that four years ago were slow of sale at \$100 will now bring \$150 readily, this is greatly owing to the demand for horses in Manitoba and the North-West, as we have not been raising a class of horses much sought for on the American side.
6. A few years back it did not pay to raise horses as well as it did to raise other kinds of stock. But raising horses now pays well and is likely to pay for many years to come. The principal market at present is Manitoba.
7. The farmers can raise all the grain required for fattening stock. It would not by any means pay better to import corn. 8. Certainly, improved very much.
9. Reciprocity on a fair basis would, no doubt, be all right; but we are in a much better position now to negotiate such Treaty than when American produce was admitted free, we have now got something to offer.
10. The price of wool is not affected much, if any, but a great good has resulted in this, that industrial establishments have been put into operation throughout the country for the manufacture of woollen goods, thereby giving employment to farmers' sons and others who no doubt would have sought homes in other climes. Besides, a good substantial article of clothing is supplied which is now taking the place of that abominable shoddy supplied by our American neighbors and which was so long a curse to this part of the country.
11. Nothing of importance done in this class; have no experience.

12. The cost of all kinds of farm implements is certainly less than they were four years ago, whilst year after year, as is seen at our agricultural exhibitions throughout the country, an improvement in quality, design and finish is quite evident.
13. Woollens and cottons, in my opinion, have not been affected much by the Tariff. Hardware of all kinds much lower.
14. We certainly think the home markets increased and improved by putting a duty on American farm produce, thereby preventing Americans from glutting our markets.
15. We never remember seeing so general a demand for all classes of mechanics and labourers at very remunerative wages. Men who have been working in the States, and who have come back here, say they would much rather live here. But there are so many of the labouring class going to Manitoba and the North West, that labourers in Ontario will be scarce unless there be a supply of immigrants from the British Isles.
16. Since 1878 farm property has most certainly increased in value especially good farms. The reason I assign is the following, viz. :—We realize a great deal more for our farm produce, and owing to the great amount of capital put into circulation by the building of the Pacific railroad, money is plentiful throughout the Dominion, and in summing up I would just say Legislation, I mean Dominion Legislation, has been, for the last four years, in favor of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. 17. That is not denied by any class or party here.
18. Encourage emigration to Ontario from the British Isles. Let the farmers and farmers' sons of the older Provinces of the Dominion, who wish to go to Manitoba or the North-West, have every opportunity afforded them of securing good homes on the most reasonable terms. And further, be sure you put a duty of 20 per cent. on each Chinese man and woman imported into the Dominion of Canada.

*General Remarks:*—I might say, in conclusion, that after consulting other leading farmers in the Riding I have answered your questions truthfully according to my experience in the matter set forth, and this without prejudice to any.

THOMAS KELLS,

President of Electoral District Agricultural Society of East Grey.  
Vandeleur, Co. Grey.

1. It would not be to the interest of farmers to admit American farm produce free of duty unless the United States use us the same; for example, if they were to admit, duty free, our barley we might do so with their corn.
2. I think the imposition of a duty on American produce has helped our market.
3. The duty on wheat and flour has not sensibly increased the price here as we raise more than we consume. To admit these articles free would, however, injure our home market. Wheat and flour appear to differ from other produce in this respect. 4. I think we get a better price for our pork.
5. There is no doubt whatever but that the imposition of an additional duty upon American horses has given the Canadian farmers the control of the Manitoba market.
6. At present prices horses are profitable. Have sold three within the last twelve months, all going to Prince Arthur's Landing.
7. We can raise, I think, all the grain we require to fatten our stock, and I do not think the duty should be taken off American corn.
8. The market for butter, eggs, &c., has decidedly improved which is partly owing to the present Tariff.
9. Reciprocity would benefit the Canadian farmer, and we never will get it from the United States if we admit all or a large part of their produce free or nearly free. 10. The Tariff has increased the price of wool.

11. These are not cultivated to any extent in Lambton.
12. No, the quality is equally good. 13. There has not been any increase in price from the Tariff.
14. It has. I raise a considerable quantity of fruit, such as apples, and they would be unsaleable but for the Tariff, as the facility for shipping from Detroit and other places into Lambton would destroy our market for home grown fruit.
15. I think it must have had that effect. 16. Farm lands are going up steady in value.
17. Greatly improved since 1878. 18. Agriculture is now a desirable and profitable occupation. Reciprocity would make it more so if that could be obtained on fair terms from the Government of the United States.

*General Remarks*.—The National Policy has done much to advance the interests of the agriculturalists and manufacturers, and must greatly aid Canadian enterprise.

ROBERT FLECK,  
Reeve, Moore, Logierait, Co. Lambton.

1. No; better for the farmer. 2. Rough grains increased in value 25 per cent. since the N.P. has taken effect. Consumers claim they can pay 50 per cent. more now for farm produce than before this. Good demand for rye.
3. We get better prices and can pay higher wages and realize more at the end of the year. 4. Increased demand and advanced prices.
5. Never better demand or higher prices.
6. Compare rather better than with other stock. Manitoba principal market; still some to the United States.
7. He can easily raise all he requires without any aid from the States.
8. Yes; wonderfully. 9. Yes. Yes, for we have something to offer in return.
10. Home demand better. 11. Not cultivated in this section.
12. Price decreased, and better quality in all farm implements.
13. Cottons increased; all other articles the same as before.
14. Yes; owing to produce from other countries not coming in.
15. Yes, without any doubt.
16. Yes; good demand. All farms offered in my neighborhood for sale, find buyers at better prices by 25 per cent. 17. Yes, greatly improved.
18. No change of legislation.

*General Remarks*.—Times are better since 1878 than they have been for years before. Tramps all find occupation.

ELIAS FARRY,  
Farmer, Reeve, South Cayuga, Co. Haldimand.

1. Yes, corn, because we could sell our barley pease and oats to the Americans, and purchase corn at a profit.
2. No effect whatever, except corn, which is dearer.
3. Our wheat and flour are lower in proportion when compared with the world's markets. 4. Pork is dearer to the amount of the additional duty.
5. No; because the Americans give better prices than can be obtained by selling to Manitoba.
6. Good horses are profitable to breed for the United States market. Runts are beginning to go to Manitoba.
7. Pay better to sell barley and buy corn, if it was admitted free.
8. No; simply because these things are exported to the United States.
9. Yes; but we are in no better position to negotiate, as the Americans do not care anything about our market for farm produce.
10. Coarse wool is lower than it ever was since 1860. 11. None raised around here.

12. Not much difference. 13. Cottons and hardware are. Cottons of all kinds, especially factory and cheese cottons. All kinds of hardware are dearer, especially nails and stoves.
14. No; our surplus potatoes have this year all been shipped to the United States.
15. Not in this part of the country. Many Canadians go, but none return except on a visit, and they usually take more with them.
16. No; those who have money go where they can get cheap lands. If there is any difference land is cheaper now than in 1878.
17. Yes; because we have had better crops and better prices for export to England.
18. Give us free access to the world's markets and we have the best country under the sun.

W. COLE, J. P.,

Sarnia, Co. Lambton.

1. The agriculturalists of Canada are benefited largely by the present duty on American farm produce.
2. The effect of a duty on American Indian corn and coarse grains has given us better prices for our oats, peas, barley and rye, and to increase the demand for these coarse grains.
3. A little over three years ago wheat was a drug on the market, except the best samples; but now, even impure samples are bought up keenly, and at just as good, if not better prices.
4. The effect of increased duties on hogs, hams, bacon and lard coming from United States has raised dressed hogs in our market, from \$6 to \$9 per hundred weight.
5. Whatever may have been the cause, horses, cattle and sheep have not only been in better demand, but have increased very much in price.
6. As Muskoka is a new country there has not been much done in this way.
7. I am satisfied that the farmer of Ontario will suffer no loss for the want of American corn for fattening purposes, as the country is well adapted for coarse grains, and it is always better and cheaper to raise their own feed than to buy it. 8. It is a fact that under the present Tariff the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter has improved both in price and demand.
9. Reciprocity worked well some years ago; it is hard to say how it would work now, the present Tariff works well; either is better than a one sided Tariff.
10. Some attention ought to be paid to this matter, I think; the duties on wool are not sufficient. If farmers were properly protected it would cause more sheep to be kept, and could supply our own people with our own wool.
11. Has not come under my notice, as I have not dealt or been near any of those industries.
12. I see no difference in price; I have thought quality a little better.
13. I know of no difference in any dry goods, except canton flannels a little increase in price.
14. There is a very marked improvement in our markets for farm produce, and I have always supposed that was chiefly brought about by the good effect the present Tariff has on the industries of the country.
15. There is no one out of employment; if they wish to work they can have it every day I know of no emigration to any foreign country from these parts.
16. I cannot say much; as Muskoka is a free grant district there is not much sale of lands.
17. The circumstances of farmers and labouring classes have very much improved since the date referred to.
18. I know of no legislation except higher duties on foreign wool and a good lift to give us railway facilities through Muskoka.

*General Remarks:*—Whatever may be thought of the answers I have made to questions asked, they are the true sentiments of my mind, and do say I remember of no one act of legislation that has ever brought so much prosperity to the country as the National Policy,

JAMES TOOKEY,  
Farmer, Bracebridge, Muskoka.

1. No ; it would bring us into competition with the American agriculturalist, while they would not give us the benefit of their markets ; better have our own home market.
2. The effect of the duty on Indian corn has been a means of not only giving us our own market, but giving us better prices for all our coarse grains.
3. The effect produced by the duties on the prices of wheats, especially on spring wheat, has given it prominence above all other kinds, and has given us better prices throughout, a market at home, has prevented fluctuation, prices more regular, and has given us a market in the Maritime Provinces, which we could not have had without the present Tariff.
4. The effect of the duty on live hogs and dried meats has given us the increase of the duties at home, but believe the farmers would be more benefited by adding more duty on live hogs, as they affect our beef market.
5. The increased duties imposed on horses and other live stock have not increased the prices here, with the exception of what goes to Manitoba and the North-West.
6. Yes ; do find it profitable to breed horses ; comparing profits with other stock the horses to-day would have the advantage ; our principal market is the United States.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required for fattening stock ; cannot see why it is necessary to import American corn for that purpose or anything else.
8. Cannot see the present Tariff has had any effect in raising the price of vegetables here. As to poultry, eggs and butter, it would be an advantage to have the duty taken off, but so long as the Americans retain the duty on such articles going into their markets, I think we should meet them with an equal amount of duty.
9. I believe the Canadian farmer would not be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, as we are in a much better position now than when we had Reciprocity, and without doubt the Government is in a much stronger position to negotiate for a treaty with the present Tariff than without it.
10. Don't exactly know. 11. Don't know.
12. The cost of farming implements has not increased in price under the present Tariff, besides we are getting a much better article than we used to get.
13. The woollen goods chiefly used among the farmers have not increased in price since the Tariff came into operation, but are about 10 or 12 per cent. lower ; hardware about the same ; cotton goods about 4 or 5 per cent. higher.
14. The home market for farm products has been increased by the Tariff very materially indeed, by giving us a very much better market, which otherwise would be filled up with foreign products.
15. The present Tariff has given increased employment to labourers of all classes, and also increased wages to about 25 or 30 per cent., and plenty of work for all ; don't know much about emigration ; all the emigration from here of late has been chiefly to Manitoba or the North-West Territories.
16. There is an increased tendency now for the investment of capital in farm property, more especially among farmers, and an undeniable increase in value since 1878. 17. It undoubtedly is since 1878.
18. In my opinion, if any legislative change should take place for the benefit of the farmer, it should be in an increased protection, and in keeping money easy as

only thereby can improvements take place that otherwise cannot be obtainable when money is stringent; I believe it would strengthen any Government that would pass a usury law.

DAVID RAE,  
Farmer, Cass Bridge, Co. Dundas.

- 
1. No; I think not. 2. They all have been in increased demand and higher in prices.
  3. This is a fall wheat section for home consumption; now fall wheat is worth from five to ten cents over exporting prices.
  4. The market for these articles has been much increased, and the market about 2 cents per pound higher.
  5. It has. 6. It is profitable to breed horses, but not so profitable as to breed cattle or hogs.
  7. Farmers in this section can raise all the grain they require to fatten stock.
  8. It is, on the whole. 9. I think we are in a better position to negotiate for a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States; but I think we can do very well without such a treaty.
  10. I don't think the Tariff has affected the price of wool. 11. None raised here.
  12. On the whole the price is not higher. 13. On the whole, they are about the same. 14. It has. 15. It has. 16. About the same. 17. Very much improved. 18. I don't think there are any.

CHAS. DICKINSON,  
Reeve, Clear Creek, Co. Norfolk.

- 
1. No. 2. We can grow all the coarse grain we want. 3. Prices better than before the N.P.
  4. The duty has given the Canadian farmer better prices and better markets.
  5. Yes. 6. Yes; a great many horses leaving here for Manitoba. 7. We don't want American corn. We can grow plenty of pease and oats.
  8. Very little change. 9. I think we are in a far better position than we were in 1878.
  10. Duty on cotton should raise the price of wool. 11. None grown here.
  12. Farm implements have not increased in price, and the quality is better.
  13. Cottons increased a little. 14. Yes, a great deal of farm produce is going to Manitoba.
  15. Plenty of work for all classes here at good wages. 16. Farm property on the increase, on account of good prices.
  17. Yes. 18. I am not able to name anything better than we have at present.

ROBERT VANCE,  
Farmer, Ida, Co. Durham.

- 
1. No. Their overplus is sent here in competition, and lowers prices.
  2. It has materially advanced the prices of all kinds of coarse grain—oats 20 per cent., rye mill, corn 15 per cent., barley 10 per cent., peas 20 per cent.
  3. We have a better and steadier market since the N.P. Millers rule the market for home consumption, and exporters are ruled by the millers, giving us more competition, keener and better prices. Both classes of wheat are benefited by it.
  4. It gives us farmers a better market and higher prices for all products of the hog.
  5. Yes; Manitoba is the best and only market for a medium class of horses, such as the States would not accept. This would be supplied by the States if the duties were removed.

6. Yes; it pays better than any other stock. We find Manitoba the best market since the N.P., except in a first class article, when we sometimes sell for the States, buyers coming here for horses.
7. Yes; every kind required. We do not want the American corn to come in free, unless we had Reciprocity.
8. Yes; cannot get enough to supply the demand at from 15 to 25 per cent. advance in prices, since the N.P.
9. Yes; if on equal terms; not otherwise. Yes; by all means; by the N.P. is the only way to bring them to a Treaty.
10. Do not notice much change yet, but think the market on the whole better.
11. Do not raise any in this section of Ontario—Co. Haldimand.
12. All farming implements are better in quality and convenience, and at less price since the N.P. than before; from 10 to 20 per cent.
13. Every article that we send off is less under the N.P., and sugars are as cheap and of better quality. No increase in anything.
14. Yes; by a good home market for everything produced. 15. Yes; our young men can get employment at home, and many are returning from the United States. Farmers can now afford to employ more help on the farm and get good returns. Before the N.P. we could not afford to employ help, as everything we had to sell was so very low; now it is the reverse.
16. Before the Tariff we could not sell farm property. It has increased in value, and ready sales can now be made at an advance of from 10 to 20 per cent. since 1878, on account of the ready cash sale at good remunerative prices for everything a farmer has for sale or can produce.
17. Yes; no man need be idle now; it is difficult to get men to hire on the farm at present; prices of wages have advanced from 15 to 25 per cent.
18. Keep on the present Protective Tariff, unless the United States give us reciprocity pure and simple, on all natural products of the soil and mines.

EDWARD BOWMAN,  
Reeve, Walpole, Hagersville, Co. Haldimand.

1. No. 2. To increase the price. Oats 7 cents per bushel, rye 40 cents, peas 10 cents. No corn grown for sale here; barley too dear to use for feeding.
3. To produce a good steady market unaffected by the grain gamblers of the United States. Increase of price about 15 cents all around.
4. About 10 per cent. increase on all except lard, and about 20 per cent. on it.
5. Yes. 6. Find it profitable, but not so much so as the raising of cattle for beef. The United States is the best market for extra heavy draught horses, but for common stock, Manitoba is better.
7. Yes. No; as the coarser grains can be grown on poor land. 8. Vegetables have improved in price, also poultry; butter and eggs not improved.
9. No. Don't want any such Treaty. 10. Wool sold the last year before the duty was increased at 20 cents per pound, now for 27 cents. Either price is too low for profitable production.
11. None grown here. 12. Not increased. Waggon, ploughs, reapers, mower and drills can be bought cheaper than before.
13. No; we can buy cottons, both factory and bleached, in Toronto from 7 to 10 cents per yard retail. Have just bought a tweed suit made to order, from Walker & Son (Golden Lion) for \$14; never got the same quality of goods any cheaper.
14. Yes; especially produce other than grain, such as fruit, vegetables, &c., with which the Yankees formerly glutted our markets when they had good crops.
15. Yes. Don't know a single person who has left here to seek employment in the United States during the last year.

16. Yes; there are no farms for sale here at present; one or two have changed hands at \$100 per acre.
17. Yes. Farm labourers are in great demand here; could take one hundred emigrants in this township just now.
18. This section produces largely fruit and vegetables, the duty on which should be increased, especially apples, grapes, tomatoes, melons, &c., as the season being later than in the United States, they get the benefit of our early market when prices are extra high. This would not raise the price to the consumers, but merely make them wait ten days longer for their first supply, and would be a great advantage to the producer.

J. D. EVANS, J. P.,

Deputy Reeve, Etobicoke, Co. York.

1. No. I would consider such a course fatal to the agricultural interests of Canada. The importation of American corn would operate against our coarse grains, which we could not send into the Eastern States through the high duty which is exacted by the American Tariff.
2. Pease and oats have been at least 10 cents per bushel; better since the present Tariff came in force, this cannot be disputed. No rye or corn of any account grown here. Barley has been an excellent price these last two years.
3. Formerly fall wheat was worth 10 cents per bushel more than spring; now it is the reverse, spring being the dearest, no doubt owing to the duty upon wheat from the States which supplied all our merchant millers formerly.
3. Hogs have never been in as great demand; in fact, I never heard of a sale of live hogs here until the change in the Tariff.
5. If I were to judge by the continuous enquiries which are being made for horses, cattle and sheep, I could not place the credit to any other source than the duty placed upon such stock by the existing Tariff; for certainly such active enquiries did not exist prior to 1879.
6. It is profitable to breed horses now, large numbers are being bought up here for Manitoba, and quite a number go to Montreal.
7. Yes; much more profitably than he could wheat, which we had to raise before it became profitable to raise coarse grains. Now, we can raise coarse grains with profit if we wish to sell, or with a larger profit if we feed to stock.
8. Butter is decidedly better.
9. I am not in a position to say that we would be any better by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States; although certainly, if such were the case, our position would be very much better. Had we not Protection now, what inducement would we have to offer Americans? He is a traitor to Canadian interests who would throw open the gates which have been closed against the Americans by the Tariff; and I think all men who value Canada more than Party will concede this.
10. Not in a position to state. 11. Cannot say. 12. Never were as cheap as now.
13. No; never had anything specified in this question cheaper than it has been this last year.
14. Most certainly a good demand for everything we can raise on the farm, which a few years ago, with the exception of wheat, was a drug on our hands.
15. This is not a manufacturing district.
16. Yes. I look upon the reduced rates of interest as the greatest boon we have received. Capitalists have confidence in the future of Canada under the present policy, and are eagerly watching for opportunities to invest. Farm lands I cannot say have increased, owing to the opening of the North-West which will affect the price of land here for some years.
17. This cannot be successfully denied.

18. All Canadian farmers require in this respect is an honest practical Government such as we have at present, which will observe the wants and requirements of all classes, and who will follow their observation by practical legislation. "No flies on the wheel."

*General Remarks* :—The Conservative farmers of this part are thoroughly satisfied with the Tariff, and all they want is its continuance; and there is no desire on their part to return to the former Tariff. Of course the Grits here abused it, not from any reasonable cause, but from natural instinct. However, they have a Parliamentary record of five years which will be in Canadian interests not to extend.

HENRY T. POTTS,  
Reeve, Arran, Dumblane, Co. Bruce.

1. No. 2. We realize a much higher price on oats, peas, barley. Rye and corn not grown to any extent.
3. I am not in a position to answer this question intelligently.
4. Very satisfactorily; we realize a much higher price.
5. Yes, very materially. We ship large numbers of horses and cattle to Manitoba and also to Thunder Bay, and find good prices and ready sale.
6. Heavy draught horses pay well. Other stock pays better, especially Durhams; United States.
7. In this section we can raise sufficient coarse grain to fatten our stock with profit.
8. Yes. 9. Yes. We are in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff.
10. Not any effect as far as I know. 11. Not in a position to answer intelligently.
12. We can purchase reapers, mowers, seed drills, horse rakes, wagons, &c, cheaper under the present Tariff, and equally as good if not better.
13. We can buy them cheaper since the Tariff. 14. I think so, especially on peas and oats, on account of duty on corn. 15. Decidedly it has.
16. Yes. As a general rule farm lands have increased, but as a great many are going to Manitoba, there have been some sales made under value. 17. Very much so.
18. As a general rule we are well satisfied with the present legislation, but I am of opinion that if there was a yearly tax on stallions and bulls that are kept for public service it would have a great tendency of improving our stock.

*General Remarks* :—The National Policy has been a great benefit to the country and it would be a great mistake to take off the Tariff.

JAMES BOWES, Jun.,  
Councillor, St. Vincent, Strathnairn, Co. Grey.

1. In my opinion it would not as prices are better, and we can raise all we need.
2. The price of corn has gone up from 45 cents to 65 and 70 cents since; oats from 25 cents to 35 and 40 cents since; rye from 45 cents to \$1; barley from 55 cents to 75 cents; peas from 60 cents to 80 cents.
3. Wheat has gone up from 80 cents in 1878 to \$1.25 in 1881; flour from \$2.50 to \$3.25; spring wheat none raised in this section.
4. Pork from 8 cents to 12 cents dried; live hogs from 4 cents to 7 cents.
5. The price of horses has improved some by shipments to England, but is about 40 per cent higher since the Manitoba market opened than they were in 1878.
6. It is more profitable than it was, but I believe cattle is more so just now; horses for Manitoba and cattle for England.
7. In this section we can raise all we require. 8. Prices have improved, but I have given little attention to them as there is a local market for all but eggs.
9. They would not. That we are not in as good a position before as now is self evident.
10. I have had no observation on that point. 11. None raised for sale about here.

12. Have bought none, but I believe they are cheaper and better, except mowers and reapers, which are made cheaper, but too light for durability.
13. There is no increase that I have observed; woollens and cottons are better.
14. It has improved by giving us the home market.
15. There has been less emigration to the States but more to Manitoba; there is work for all that will work in all the different branches of labour.
16. There is; and land is increased in price because it pays better to farm now than it did.
17. It is; and hope seems to inspire, all classes since the fly on the wheel policy passed away.
18. To prevent extortion by money lenders, and to introduce a national currency.

*General Remarks* :—Honorable gentlemen of the committee I have the honor to submit the foregoing as my observations on the subjects mentioned, although not as thoroughly posted as I could wish, I have done a duty honestly.

A. C. HUTCHISON,  
Farmer, Port Rowan, Co. Norfolk.

1. Not unless it would give the Canadians the same privilege.
2. It has raised the price of Indian corn, but not on oats, rye, barley or peas.
3. Do not think it has raised the price on either kind, as the Lower Provinces are still in a great measure supplied with American flour.
4. It has increased the prices some.
5. Our principal market for horses is the States, other live stock is but sparingly purchased here for Manitoba or the North-West.
6. Consider it more profitable to breed a good class of horses. In the United States.
7. He can raise all the grain required to fatten his stock, but it would pay better to import American—free of duty—for the sections of the country where they cannot raise corn as they can sell peas, barley and oats to better advantage.
8. Do not think it is, as we never imported any from the States.
9. Yes. Think we are in a better position with the present Tariff.
10. Could not say. 11. None raised in this section.
12. Think the price is somewhat increased on almost all classes of farm implements.
13. Yes; but principally cottons. 14. Do not think it has.
15. Do not think it has retarded emigration nor encouraged Canadians to return to this country.
16. No; probably increased in value on account of higher prices, on account of good crops, and good foreign demand. 17. Yes; for causes in answer to question 16.
18. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

JOHN LAURIE,  
Warden, Port Dalhousie, Co. Lincoln.

1. No, it would not. 2. Duty on Indian corn has improved the price of oats, rye and corn; barley and peas are not grown here as a market crop.
3. The duty imposed on wheat and flour has given us a better grade of flour, and a better price for wheat.
4. It has given a home market and stimulated the production of pork in our own country.
5. Yes, decidedly. 6. Quite a difference of opinion exists in regard to profits of breeding horses, when compared to other stock; at present more horses are sold to go to Manitoba than the United States.
7. I know of no Canadian farmer who cannot profitably grow grain to fatten his stock, which is preferable to buying American corn.

8. Yes, particularly vegetables. 9. At present I do not think he would; but the position to negotiate for such a Treaty I consider decidedly better with the present Tariff.
10. I am not prepared to answer fully, but believe the Tariff a benefit to Canadian wool growers. 11. I am not acquainted with any of those industries.
12. I do not think the price of farm implements has increased, owing to competition with Canadian manufactures; quality as good; I include all farm implements.
13. I cannot answer this question from actual knowledge, but my impressions are, (if there is an increase in any of them it would be in cottons and carpets, which would be attributed to a lack of manufacturing capacity.
14. I think so, decidedly, by protecting farmers in their home market.
15. It has. 16. There is; farm lands have increased in value, owing, I believe, to the protection given to the farmer. 17. Yes, materially.
18. The changes I would recommend to make agriculture more desirable, would be to have the law so changed, as to require agricultural chemistry taught in our Common Schools, in order to prepare the farmers' sons to meet the necessities and requirements science demands.

*General Remarks:*—The duty imposed on fruit of all kinds shipped from the United States, is much appreciated through this part of the country.

S. W. HILL,

Past Master Dominion Grange Association, Ridgeville, Co. Monck.

1. Indian corn should be admitted free, as we need it to fatten stock for the European market; but the duty should be kept on live stock.
2. On Indian corn is injurious; on oats it sometimes is a benefit; on the others it has no effect as we do not import. 3. No effect at all.
4. I believe it has raised the price, and has a further good effect in preventing packers importing American hogs and exporting them to Europe as Canadian pork. 5. Yes.
6. At present prices it pays to breed horses better than any other stock, if you have good luck, but there is more risk; our market for export has been England until this winter, now Manitoba takes all we can spare.
7. We can use profitably more than we can raise; it paid well to get American corn until you put on the duty.
8. As far as London market is concerned it has made no difference.
9. Except for barley the Treaty would be no use to us; the Americans have a surplus of all other kinds of farm produce, as well as ourselves, and send it to the same market; so that their average prices cannot be higher than ours, except they get lower freights, as there is more competition in the American ports than from the St. Lawrence. 10. I do not know.
11. We cultivate neither tobacco nor sugar beet, and but little flax.
12. We find no difference. 13. Woollens are dearer; as to other things we get them at about the same price.
14. There is a better market on account of better times generally; I do not know that the Tariff helped it.
15. There is double the number at least of persons emigrating from Western Ontario this year than has gone hitherto; principally to Manitoba and the Western States.
16. Crops had been good and there was a good demand for farms at increased prices until about one year ago; since then such numbers are selling their land to go to the North-West that the market is glutted and prices are coming down.
17. Yes. 18. Take off the duty on corn, and put a curb on the railroads, so that we may only pay a reasonable rate of freight according to distance, and not let them carry western produce at low rates and charge enough extra on Canadians to make all their profit.

*General Remarks:*—I speak only for the County of Middlesex; and I have submitted these questions to the Township Council of Westminster, who fully endorse the above replies.

HENRY ANDERSON, J.P.,  
Tp. Clerk, Westminster, Wilton Grove, Co. Middlesex.

1. It would not; it would not give the home market to the Canadian farmer.
2. The effect of increasing the price to the producer. Oats 25 per cent.; corn, 50 per cent.; barley, 30 per cent.; peas, 35 per cent. Rye don't grow.
3. It has increased the price of wheat 20 per cent.
4. They have increased from 25 to 40 per cent. 5. It has.
6. I do; favourably; in Manitoba. 7. He can, and to spare; it would not.
8. They have. 9. He would; we are. 10 and 11. Don't know.
12. Not increased; quality better. Not increased. 14. It has; by increase of population. 15. It has.
16. There is; they have increased; money is more plentiful. 17. They have.
18. None at all.

WILLIAM SHAVER,  
Ancaster, Co. Wentworth.

1. No; because we can raise more than we can consume.
2. It has raised the price of corn, oats, peas and barley—of rye, I don't know what effect it has, as there is none grown in this section.
3. It has tended to raise the price of both kinds of wheat and flour.
4. It has raised the price of all those articles by keeping out American hogs, hams, bacon and lard.
5. It has made no difference, because instead of sending horses into Canada, we send horses into the American market.
6. Yes, the larger part of them go to Manitoba, the Yankees buying only young sound horses, for which they pay a large price.
7. Yes, it does not pay to import American corn. 8. Yes.
9. We are in a better position to negotiate than when American produce came in free.
10. No answer. 11. It has tended to increase the cultivation of flax, tobacco and sugar beet—there is none grown in this vicinity.
12. Farming implements are as cheap, and the quality quite as good.
13. The price of these articles are not increased.
14. Yes, by fostering our industries and keeping out American produce. 15. Yes.
16. There is a marked tendency to invest capital in farm lands under the present tariff; the value of farm lands has increased but slightly, owing to the large emigration to the free grant lands of Manitoba.
17. Yes, very much. 18. No answer.

J. H. BROADFOOT,  
Reeve, Fergus, Co. Wellington.

1. Yes. Having duty on corn is a damage. It does not affect the price of other produce as we have more than we want, a retaliatory Tariff has an effect to postpone Reciprocity.
2. It has made corn dearer. Corn free is the cheapest feed to fatten cattle; on other coarse grain no difference; as coarse grain is dearer in the United States than here.
3. Cannot see any as we export largely. 4. Not any, as pork and hogs are as dear in the United States as here. 5. No; the United States buyers are the best.

- 
6. Cannot say which is the most profitable ; the United States is the best market.
  7. Would pay better to get American corn duty free. 8. Cannot see it.
  9. Yes, very much ; better with the old Tariff. 10. None. 11. None.
  12. Increased according to quality. 13. Yes ; nearly all, especially hardware.
  14. No. Short crops in other countries. 15. To a very few proprietors.
  16. Decreased very much. 17. Yes, in 1881, through good crops and scarcity in Europe. 18. A Revenue Tariff.

*General Remarks* :—It costs more for the necessaries of life under the present Tariff, the farmers have to give the money to make a few manufacturers rich.

RICHARD MOTHERSILL,  
Reeve, East Whitby, Co. Ontario.

---

1. Yes admit all—European markets govern—give us carrying trade of the continent, if possible, it benefits farmers to secure this trade for the carriers. And admitting American farm produce free wont injure. 2. The key of all hopes of success in farming here is in feeding cattle cheaply. The duty on corn is destructive. 3 and 4. No answer. 5. I do not think it has ; only our poorest horses go to Manitoba.
6. All good stock pays well ; the Americans buy our best horses.
7. It would pay better to import American corn if the duty were off. 8. No answer.
9. Yes ; Reciprocity with the United States would be a great benefit to the Canadian farmers.
10. to 13. No answers. 14. I do not think so. 15. to 17. No answers.
18. That the politicians keep there hands off and allow us to take care of the country without there dictation.

JAMES CRERAR,  
Farmer, Shakespeare, Co. Perth.

---

1. No. 2. We get better prices for oats, peas and barley ; don't grow rye or corn.
3. The price of wheat is higher, both spring and fall, but cannot give the exact amount.
4. All are a much better price ; it did not pay to fatten hogs always before, but it does now.
5. Price of horses is much better, about 50 per cent. ; there is a large demand for them for Manitoba.
6. Yes, it is profitable ; heavy horses are in good demand for the United States, and light horses for Manitoba.
7. Yes, much better than importing American corn. 8. Very much better prices for all.
9. Cannot well say, but think we are a little better off as we are ; we were never better off than now.
10. We do not raise the class of wool most required in this country, if the Tariff was higher we might do so, as it is we are no worse off than before.
11. Cannot say ; we do not cultivate any of these.
12. The Tariff has reduced the price of reapers and mowers slightly.
13. Canadian goods of this class are about the same price as before, but of a better quality. 14. Very much improved, and better prices at our doors.
15. Farm labourers are in better demand, with better pay ; emigration to the States from this part of Canada is very light. The carpet factory has re-opened, giving employment to a number of both English and American workmen.
16. Yes ; farm land is steadily increasing in price, and there is a good demand for farms.
17. Yes, decidedly. 18. None that I know of.

HUGH ROBERTS,  
Ex-Reeve and Yeoman, Elora, Co. Wellington.

1. Would not injure it, because we raise a surplus and the foreign market regulates the price. 2. No effect.
3. Wheat is lowered in price and does not respond to the speculative rise in prices in the Chicago market; flour is increased in price.
4. No effect, as we raise a surplus. 5. No; we could hold the Manitoba market with a lower Tariff.
6. As a rule it is more profitable to raise other kinds of stock; both. 7. No; yes.
8. No. 9. Yes. No; the present Tariff only tends to irritate. 10. No effect.
11. Don't know. 12. Increased; no; machines.
13. Yes; cottons and hardware especially. 14. No.
15. No, it has encouraged Canadians to emigrate to the United States.
16. No; decreased chiefly on account of settlement in North-West.
17. Yes; through better crops. 18. Remove trade restrictions as much as possible, and allow him to sell in the dearest market and buy in the cheapest.

JAMES RUSSELL,  
Reeve, Binbrook, Co. Wentworth.

1. Not by any means; we want to clear up and improve and work more of our own lands.
  2. More of a demand for our coarse grains, and better prices. We have a surplus of oats and corn from our own farms to supply our local wants, and of a better and harder quality than most American corn, which is softer.
  3. Better prices and demand; millers and dealers looking more closely after our own wheat and grain.
  4. Firmer market, with more local demand; can sell more by the quarter at an advance than by the whole or not cut up.
  5. Very much, say 40 per cent. 6. Fully as good; Manitoba and North-West now paying good prices.
  7. Yes; can and should do so; no, not as good a quality and a softer grain.
  8. Gives us a better market, by being more local and enquired after, and consumed closer to our own farms.
  9. I think not. Very well satisfied now; in a better position now; do not want Reciprocity with the United States. 10. A better price for our long wools.
  11. Very little grown here. 12. Not increased; a better quality (cause better workmen); the manufacturer gets or makes more cash sales now, consequently he sells cheaper; not so many had debts, to place to profit and loss.
  13. Think not; we now have a greater variety of Canadian goods to choose from to suit the rich and the poor.
  14. Yes; by having a larger and many more local markets to supply every factory, is so much the better for the Canadian farmer, gardner, dairyman and labourer.
  15. Yes. 16. Yes; not so much now, as the North-West and Canadian Pacific Railway boom appear to be a bonanza.
  17. Very much. 18. Gives good satisfaction as it is, but do not go back to the old jug-handle policy, that is, to be met by a Tariff at the lines when we have something to sell, and our own markets open to the world, or the U.S., free.
- General Remarks* :—As a general thing, American corn is softer than our Canadian corn, and not as good as our own coarse grains.

G. K. LANGFORD,  
Reeve, Campden, Kent Bridge, Co. Kent.

1. Yes. 2. Oats unaffected; rye and peas not much grown; barley goes as before.
3. Nothing; spring wheat uncultivated. 4. Raised the price. 5. No; the Americans get them still.
6. Yes; somewhat better than cattle or other stock; United States.

7. Import corn. 8. None whatever. 9. Yes ; four millions of people cannot rule fifty millions. 10. Cheaper than ever. 11. None grown here.  
 12. Increased ; quality about the same. 13. Increased ; 20 per cent. on unbleached cottons. 14. None whatever. 15. Emigration to United States has increased.  
 16. About the same. 17. Not much difference.  
 18. National Policy needs to be abolished and Free Trade established.

JAMES POLE,  
 Reeve, Ekfrid, Co. Middlesex.

1. All the grown surplus of both countries find a foreign market.
2. Corn about the old price ; rye very little grown ; barley about an average ; oats the same, I have sold for 50 cents and I have bought them for 20 cents.
2. Fall wheat about average price ; spring wheat not grown.
4. It wants cheap corn to make cheap pork. The National Policy seems to have driven the swine out of the country.
5. Good horses go to England and the United States ; plug horses go to Manitoba.
6. England and the States good horses ; Manitoba cheap poor horses.
7. Canadian farmers don't like to feed grain to hogs. Grain market, October ; hog market, December and January.
8. The market for eggs, butter and poultry improved by railways and steamships.
9. Nothing like free trade. The Yankee's can build walls as high as the Canuck's.
10. Very bad ; wool very low from same cause. 11. We don't grow any.
12. The most of farm implements are cheaper, the quality as good or better.
13. Woollens higher, a suit of tweed that cost \$14, old Tariff, costs \$18 to \$20 ; so sometimes higher sometimes lower.
14. Too many have left for the good of home consumption. How can consumption increase when the population decreases ?
15. A woollen mill converted into a knitting mill. People going to the States, especially the young with education, they can do better. A good many to Manitoba.
16. Farm property has been raising slowly for forty years. I don't think it is in as good demand as a year or two ago.
17. Farmers are well off, those that know how to farm. Labouring classes have a poor time of it. Wages are not in comparison with the cost of living.
18. Free Trade in stock, coal, grain and shipping.

*General Remarks* :—Coal should be free, a good many farmers burn it for the reason that wood is all gone, and poor men would do the same if it was cheap.

T. L. GILLIES,  
 Reeve, Port Dover, Co. Norfolk.

1. It would be in the interest of farmers to admit all kinds of produce free, because we always have a surplus to export.
2. The duty on American corn has injured cattle-feeding and has not helped us any other way.
3. We are exporters of wheat so that the duty on grain does not benefit the farmer and it injures our milling industries.
4. It has not helped the farmer in any way.
5. It may be an advantage to Ontario in inferior horses but a great loss to Manitoba.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, that is the best kind of heavy horses, but not more profitable than other stock ; our best market is the United States for all our best horses.
7. The Canadian farmer cannot raise coarse grain cheap so as to feed cattle, American corn is cheaper.

8. Not a bit. 9. The farmers and all the country would be better of a Treaty with the States. I don't think the present Tariff would help to bring about a Treaty.
10. Wool was never as cheap as now, so if the Tariff has any effect on it, it is to lower the price. 11. I cannot say.
12. All farm implements cost more under the present Tariff, the quality is no better whilst the cost is 20 to 30 per cent higher.
13. It is well known that all woollen goods are higher under the Tariff as at present, and wool cheaper. Hardware is also considerable higher.
14. I don't think that it has. 15. I think that the working classes are no better off. And at no time in our history did people leave this Province in such great numbers.
16. There are very few that will invest in lands in Ontario, and farm property is lower at present than for many years past.
17. The good crops that we had last year helped the farmers considerably but the present Tariff had nothing to do with it.
18. An honest administration of the affairs of our country, letting contracts to the lowest good tenders and not to be fostering monopolies and giving our public lands to speculators which impose burdens on the people and thereby retard the settling of our public lands by farmers.

MAGNUS HENDERSON,  
Township Clerk, Peel, Co. Wellington.

1. Oats and Indian corn should be admitted free, as it is more profitable for farmers here to produce wheat and barley than oats and corn.
2. The duty has raised the price of Indian corn and oats, but no other kinds of grain and it still pays the farmer better to raise wheat and barley.
3. I am not aware of any being imported in this locality, and hence no effect produced. 4. I cannot discover any effect.
5. Not in this section to any appreciable extent, our principal market for horses has always been to the United States, we have scarcely ever imported horses or other live stock from the United States; we do not send much live stock to the North-West.
6. Breeding horses is not so profitable as other live stock; we have found the United States our best market.
7. No; it would pay much better to import American corn. 8. Not in the least.
9. Yes; but we would be in a better position to negotiate a treaty by admitting American produce free.
10. It has declined under the present Tariff. 11. None.
12. The present Tariff has prevented prices coming down to their real value and the quality is inferior, as the implements are constructed of lighter materials.
13. Yes; cottons and hardware very much; grey cottons, stoves, patent arms for lumber waggons, glass and hardware generally.
14. Only for oats and Indian corn, which we cannot produce to advantage.
15. Not in this locality. 16. No increase perceptible, but the reverse.
17. The good crops have improved the condition of the farmers; the condition of the working classes has not improved.
18. Take the duty off farm produce, especially oats and corn and lower it on imported manufactures.

*General Remarks*:—The present Tariff increases the price of all that the farmer consumes, and does not increase the price of farm produce.

ROBERT RAE,  
Reeve, Bosanquet, Thedford, Co. Lambton.

1. No.
2. All kinds of coarse grains are dearer since the imposition of a duty.
3. It has improved the home market both for millers and farmers; millers being glad to pay from 5 to 10 cents a bushel more for good red winter wheat for making flour, the American wheat being shut out; there is very little spring wheat grown in this section, red winter wheat taking the place of spring wheat.
4. From 2 to 3 cents per lb. more on live hogs, and the other things in like proportion.
5. The markets have improved since shipping to Manitoba and the North-West.
6. I do not breed horses; in this section they sell both to the United States and Manitoba.
7. It pays better to raise our own grain than import American corn.
8. Yes.
9. I think we are better as we are, but if the Americans wish Reciprocity, we are in a better position to negotiate.
10. There is not much difference.
11. I do not grow any of those articles.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased; quality better.
13. No perceptible difference.
14. Yes; through the improvement of our manufacturing interests and giving employment to a far larger number of operatives, thereby the consumption is increased.
15. Yes.
16. There was an increased tendency previous to the Manitoba fever; farming lands have somewhat decreased in value through emigration to the North-West.
17. Yes.
18. No answer.

RICHARD QUANCE,  
Elfrida, Co. Wentworth.

1. It surely would not be to the interest of Canada to admit produce free.
2. It has not affected prices as far as I know.
3. No effect at all.
4. It has not made the article any higher in our markets.
5. I think it has.
6. I cannot answer.
7. Canada can raise all she wants.
8. I think it has.
9. I would think we are in a better position.
10. Fishermen do not know much about wool.
11. No effect.
12. Quality just as good, and cost no more.
13. They have increased in quality, but not in price.
14. By keeping the American produce out of our markets.
15. It has.
16. There is an increase; Protection is the cause.
17. I think they have improved.
18. The legislation we want is to be true to your party and dismiss all rebels.

JOHN EHLER,  
Councillor, Co. Guysboro, N.S.

1. It would be to the interest of all classes in the Maritime Provinces to admit flour and corn meal free, because our natural trade is with the United States. We send our vessels there with plaster, coal, &c., get flour and meal in return, which not only gives us flour and meal cheaper, but return freights for our vessels.
2. The duty on Indian corn has made the price of oats and all other coarse grains advance materially.
3. The effect produced upon the price of wheat, &c., by the duty on American wheat has had a tendency to increase the price of flour of all grades, and bears heavy on the poor.
4. As we have to import nearly all of our pork, bacon and hams from the United States, the increased duty makes those articles higher in prices.
5. I think the increased duty on horses and other live stock has not made any material change in the price.

6. We find it profitable to breed horses, the profits being comparatively the same as other stock. We cannot supply our home market.
7. The Canadian farmer cannot raise profitably, sufficient grain to feed and fatten his stock, as there is a large quantity of American corn imported, notwithstanding the high duty.
8. I think it is not much affected either way. 9. It certainly would. I think we are now in a better position to negotiate a Treaty than we ever were.
10. Does not affect wool. 11. Very little, I think. 12. The price is about the same. We think the American article the best.
13. I think the articles in No. 13 have all increased by the Tariff, but not materially.
14. I do not think that the home market on the whole has been increased by the operation of the Tariff, oats and coarse grains excepted.
15. I think that in some instances the high Tariff has caused the manufacture of some articles in the Dominion previously bought in the United States, therefore giving employment to a few more hands than formerly.
16. I think that farm lands have increased in value since 1878, but the increase has been caused principally by the gradual development of trade in all branches, which always follows a term of depression.
17. They are. 18. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

*General Remarks.*—The interests of the Upper Provinces and the Maritime Provinces are so very different that it would require different legislation to suit the different Provinces in all respects. A free interchange of commodities with the United States would suit us a great deal better than high duties.

CHARLES SMITH,

County Councillor, Port Grenville, Co. Cumberland, N.S.

1. No. 2. Good effect; it raised the price of oats 20 per cent., rye, 15 per cent., corn, 20 per cent; barley and peas, 40 per cent.
3. In general to increase the price; there is no fall wheat here.
4. Of raising those articles about 20 per cent. 5. A raise of about 50 per cent.
6. Yes, breeding horses pays as well as other stock; here we find the United States our best market. 7. Yes; can raise plenty. 8. Yes; 40 per cent.
9. No. 10. A raise of about 15 per cent. 11. Nothing on flax and sugar beet; none cultivated here; but on tobacco it has the effect of a decrease on said cultivation by the farmer.
12. Cannot see any change in price or quality, being the same as in 1878.
13. Yes; increased some, but cannot give an exact account of it.
14. Yes; increased from 20 to 25 per cent on coarse grains; from 10 to 15 per cent. on wheat and flour, and from 30 to 40 per cent. on dairy produce.
15. Yes; the industrial classes find that the profitable employment to be obtained now is retarding emigration to the United States.
16. Yes; there is a certain tendency in this part of the country, but not much pronounced; the farm lands have increased in price nearly 40 per cent.
17. Yes; to a great extent. 18. To encourage the manufacture of butter and cheese; farmers in general are against the tax on tobacco twist. Why should there be taxes on the revenue of the land?

*General Remarks:*—If the duty of 4 cents per pound on Canadian twist tobacco could be dispensed with, it would certainly be beneficial to agriculturalists in general.

SIMON LABROSSE,

Reeve, St. Eugène, Co. Prescott.

1. No; it would lower the price of grain in Canada.
2. It has raised the price of coarse grain, oats, rye and barley.
3. The effect has been to give the farmers a better market and steady prices.
4. I am not in a position to answer, not being posted in this matter.
5. There is no doubt that the Canadians are doing better than ever before in this respect. 6. Yes, most certainly, it is better now than ever before.
7. I think they are able to raise all they need for fattening purposes.
8. Yes; no doubt of it. 9. Keep on the duty till you have a free exchange of everything, that is Reciprocity as it should be. 10. I cannot say.
11. It may improve both in time. 12. No; they are as cheap and as good as can be made in the United States or any other country.
13. In hardware I believe it would be better free of duty; woollens are better as far as I can judge. 14. No doubt of it, in every particular.
15. Yes; very much so; people do not go to the United States now to get work.
16. Yes; there is an increased tendency; you hear no one grumbling now as they did in 1878.
17. No doubt, wages are higher now than they were in the time of the Russian War.
18. I think as far as the Government is concerned people have no cause to complain.

J. C. WILLIAMSON,  
Postmaster, Ballyduff, Co. Durham.

1. It would not. 2. Our market for corn and oats which was completely destroyed before the National Policy, is now good; peas and rye better price; barley not affected. 3. I cannot answer.
4. It has increased the price of pork and lard, and encouraged farmers to raise and feed their coarse grains.
5. Has not affected so far. 6. Yes; they compare favourably with other stock; about equal for the United States and Manitoba.
7. He can; it would not. 8. The home demand for such articles being greater the prices are higher.
9. It would depend upon circumstances; we were not in a position before the National Policy, but at present we are.
10. I consider it is beneficial to the price of wool. 11. None grown in this section of the country.
12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper, and of a better quality.
13. Woollens and cottons about the same; hardware cheaper.
14. Yes; money being more plentiful, the home market is improved.
15. It has done both. 16. There is, on account of money being cheaper, and this through the effects of the National Policy; farm lands remain about the same in price, but they would have increased largely had it not been for the opening up of the North-West. 17. Yes, most decidedly.
18. No changes are required at present; the farmers are contented, and the country is prosperous.

RICHARD A. SLOAN,  
Reeve, Conway, Co. Lennox.

1. No, it would not. 2. It has raised the price of oats; the farmers now grow more barley, peas, rye and corn.
3. None; I think England is our best market for all kinds of wheat.
4. It is my opinion the farmers are benefitted, they are raising more hogs, especially those engaged in dairying.
5. No; the only horses imported in this section are for improving the stock.
6. It is profitable to breed a good class of horses; most of our horses are sold and go to the United States.

7. Yes; farmers can raise all kinds of coarse grain and roots required to fatten stock and to spare. 8. I think not.
9. Yes; and we are decidedly in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty than we were before the introduction of the National Policy.
10. None that I am aware of. 11. Very little tobacco, flax or sugar beet grown in this county.
12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper and much better since the introduction of the National Policy.
13. Tweeds and several other woollen goods cheaper; cotton and hardware about the same as formerly.
14. Little change in the home market; this is not a manufacturing locality.
15. It has. 16. Yes; money being cheap farms are increasing in value, and the country generally is benefited by it.
17. Decidedly; so the farmers are making money and the labouring classes find plenty of employment and good wages since the National Policy came into force. 18. I am not aware of any changes required.

J. H. MUNROE,

President County Agricultural Society, Morrisburg, Co. Dundas.

1. No. 2. It has had the effect of raising the price of oats, rye and corn, but not barley. 3. It has had the effect of raising both classes of wheat about equal.
4. It has had the effect of increasing the price to the extent of the duties.
5. They have had no effect. 6. Yes. Favorable. United States.
7. Yes. Would not pay to import corn. 8. Yes.
9. Would not be benefited by Reciprocity; if so, we are in a better condition to negotiate. 10. None. 11. None in this section.
12. No change. If anything cheaper and of better quality. All kinds of farming implements. 13. No material change.
14. It has to quite an extent. Manufacturing and building all booming causing a great demand.
15. It has. Capitalists placing more confidence in the financial standing of the country, that, with low interest, has had a tendency to cause said capitalists to invest, therefore causing a larger demand for labour.
16. Yes; increased in consequence of high prices for produce. 17. It has.
18. In cutting down all salaries and discharging twenty per cent of officials, it having a cause to reduce Taxation, also abolishing the mode of selecting jurors.

THOMAS HOGAN,

Reeve and Councillor, Wolfe Island, Co. Frontenac.

1. Yes. The coarse grain, corn and oats, are required for feeding stock in this vicinity, and barley could be exported at an advantage.
2. Corn and oats are the only grain imported in this locality. 3. None. 4. None.
5. None. 6. Yes. United States. 7. No. Yes. 8. No. 9. Yes. No better.
10. No effect whatever. 11. None grown here. 12. It does not affect them much.
13. Increased. Cottons and Union woollens 15 to 25 per cent. 14. No.
15. Not in this section. Emigration increased.
16. Not to any extent increased. Low rate of interest; good crops and fair prices.
17. Yes. 18. Free Trade.

W. B. COLLINS,

Reeve, Wyoming, Co. Lambton.

1. No.
2. Raised the price of oats, barley and peas ; rye and corn not grown here.
3. It has raised the price of spring wheat particularly more than fall wheat.
4. It has raised considerably.
5. It has.
6. Either draught or roadsters are profitable, but other stock considered most profitable ; the United States the principal market.
7. Never importing any here cannot say. There has been always sufficient coarse grain for fattening purposes.
8. Yes.
9. We would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty, and consider we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. Wool is down but cannot assign the reason.
11. None cultivated here.
12. Not much difference in the cost, the quality as good as formerly.
13. Not any dearer, if anything cheaper.
14. It has increased and been improved by the operation of the Tariff by giving us the home market.
15. Not in a position to answer being a purely agricultural community.
16. No ; land has decreased on account of emigration to Manitoba.
17. Yes.
18. The encouragement of improved stock and seeds.

WM. LANG,  
Reeve, Sydenham, Owen Sound, Co. Grey.

1. Most decidedly not, as I think it would be injurious to us here.
  2. It has raised the price of oats, corn, and encouraged farmers to grow more coarse grains.
  3. I am of the opinion wheat is not affected by the duty since Liverpool is our real market.
  4. Think it has benefited farmers and encouraged pork raising in our country.
  5. The duties do not affect us since horses hardly ever come from the United States to Canada.
  6. Breeding horses is profitable for the United States market.
  7. Farmers can raise all coarse grains for fattening purposes, and even more for the market.
  8. Very little change ; is affected for the better.
  9. Reciprocal trade is an advantage ; our chances are better through the N. P. Greater advantages to the labouring class through the N. P.
  10. It has a tendency to raise the price of wool, though wool has been extremely low in prices.
  11. I believe they have improved through the N. P.
  12. I firmly believe all kinds of implements that a farmer has to use are decidedly cheaper and better than before.
  13. Very little change in woollens and hardware ; I cannot see any ; cottons about the same.
  14. Home market is very materially benefited by the present Tariff.
  15. The N. P. encourages immigration to Canada, our favourite home.
  16. A very great deal on account of cheap money through the N. P., never known to be as easy obtained.
  17. Very much improved since 1878.
  18. Sir John has done all that would be desirable for the country, I believe honestly.
- General Remarks* :—I have but very little to say about this matter further than what I have stated already. I would just say all honour be to Sir John, hoping he may be long spared to hold the reins of so good a government as he has brought around by his good economy.

JAMES OVENS, J. P.,  
Alloa, Co. Peel.

1. It would, previous to the present Tariff. All kinds of agricultural products are lower in the United States than here. Spring and fall wheat, since 1878, lower here than there, therefore it would be in the interest of Canadians to admit American farm produce free of duty. Since the present Tariff has been imposed our markets are not as good as formerly, compared with the United States markets.
2. Evidently the imposition of a duty has had no effect in raising the price of coarse grains. Examining the markets now, the prices of oats, barley and peas are higher in the United States than here. In 1873, looking at an old paper, oats in Toronto, 40 to 41 cents; September 26th, in Chicago, 26 to 27 cents; now in Toronto, 44 to 45 cents; in Chicago, 40 to 43 cents. Must say the effect is very bad.
3. September, 1873, spring wheat in Toronto, \$1.16 to \$1.13; in Chicago, 95 to 96 cents; in Toronto, fall wheat, \$1.20 to \$1.33; in Chicago, 98 cents to \$1. March, 17th, 1882, wheat in Toronto, fall wheat, \$1.18 to \$1.21; in Detroit, \$1.26 to \$1.27; spring wheat in Toronto, \$1.20 to \$1.27; Chicago, No. 2 spring wheat, \$1.34 to \$1.34½. You can therefore see the effect is exceedingly bad.
4. Cannot see that it has any good effect to farmers; often saw pork as high as now; American prices as high as our own, in my observation sometimes higher. Dried hams, bacon and lard I never sell, except lard, of which we sell so little that it will not matter whether the duty is on or off, while to pork-packers, who get pork in from other place at 1 cent per lb. (no good whatever to farmers) will gain, while on dried hams they get 2 cents per lb.
5. It has not improved the market price, for horses when trade became depressed many turned to farming in the Western States, causing a demand for horses. Our best horses are bought by Americans. So many Canadians going to new territories, Manitoba and the United States, horses are in demand; increased duties have nothing whatever to do with the increased price for horses, and if it should, it would be cold-blooded cruelty—compelling the poor Canadians who went to Manitoba to pay more for their horses.
6. Horses at present are as profitable to breed as any other stock. Our principal market for good stock is the United States; most of the horses purchased for the Manitoba market are of an inferior quality.
7. They can in the County of Huron, at least, in the north part; in the south part of the county peas were a failure, it would have been profitable to use corn and import it. If corn is cheap, and no duty to pay, it would be better for us to sell our coarse grains and purchase corn, as we would make a profit thereby.
8. Eggs being on the free list, the present Tariff can have no influence on the price. Good butter always commands good prices, as high as in the United States. 20 to 25 cents in Toronto; Chicago, 25 to 45 cents. Poultry, sell none; vegetables, sell none. Large quantities of turnips went to the United States this last fall. Town population in this county is less than in 1878, consequently the demand for vegetables is still less.
9. Decidedly they would; our prices would then correspond with theirs. Cannot see that we are in a better position to negotiate a treaty. Promised that if the present Tariff was imposed on horses, cattle and sheep, Americans would take off the duty; but they seem to have paid no attention to the Tariff. But I cannot see that we are in a better position, unless Americans understand that they are being imposed upon by Protectionists.
10. Do not understand how the Tariff can raise the price of wool, as I find in the Statutes that unmanufactured wool is on the free list. Wool higher in the United States.
11. I do not know; never raised any flax, consequently I am not sufficiently interested to enquire into the working of the Tariff, but I understand flax is no higher than many times formerly, when the supply was short. Never raised any tobacco or sugar beet.

12. I cannot say, having only purchased a reaping machine since the Tariff was imposed. I bought the machine at the old price I could get it for before the imposition; but I should think the quality must be decreased or the price increased, as by the increased duty going into the manufacture of those articles, they could not afford to sell them at the same prices without a loss, or they were getting more than they ought to get previous to 1878.
13. I do not know; it is very difficult for farmers or those not engaged in the trade, as quality must be taken into consideration; but you cannot raise a large revenue, and have a large surplus, without we pay the tax. I conclude if I inquired minutely into it, that prices are largely increased, and although as cheap now as formerly, that it would be no criterion to go by.
14. Not the slightest in this part of the country, at least that I am aware of; but I answered that in question No. 8.
15. No; not in this part of the county, so many having left and settled in the United States or Manitoba. Never in this part of the county have so many gone away as since 1878; none have returned except speculators who went to the North-West; but none returned from the United States. A foundry in Brussels was running in 1878, but it has stopped now altogether; very fine buildings are now lying idle.
16. Farms are purchased from those going away, and have fallen at least 25 per cent. since 1878. I hope the Tariff is not partly the cause; I do not know why; I suppose better inducements were held out elsewhere.
17. The general condition of the farmers has improved since 1878, owing to the great demand for cattle, sheep, butter and cheese for exportation, and export of lumber. The condition of the workingman will be better, so many having gone away owing to increased demand for labour elsewhere; and as farmers will become prosperous, so will every branch of industry. I trust, however, the farmers will not be imposed upon any longer, as the National Policy is against their interests in every particular, and has nothing whatever to do with their prosperity.
18. Take the duties off everything as far as the raising of a revenue will allow, on all things we purchase, as every article you tax decreases our income, and we will have not as much money to drain, fence and beautify our farms and homes, neither can we employ so much labor nor purchase so much from the various industries, and decreasing the volume of trade, obvious to any person who will give it a moment's consideration.

*General Remarks:*—I trust the Committee of which you are Chairman will take the farmer's interests into their serious consideration, if they are the friends of the farmer. We want to impose no burden on anyone, but we do object to be taxed for every other interest. The number of manufacturers who are being benefited at our expense is not only a political wrong, but a crime against God and humanity, and how farmers will submit to this imposture by your pretending to benefit them, is beyond my comprehension.

THOMAS STRACHAN,

Reeve, Grey, Co. Huron.

1. It would be of advantage to have American coarse grains for feeding purposes free of duty. The admission of wheat free of duty would not affect the price paid to farmers, but would benefit the milling interest.
2. The effect of imposing a duty on Indian corn and other coarse grains has had the effect of increasing the cost of fattening stock. We have no means of fattening stock but with peas, as rye and corn are not grown in this section to any extent.
3. Effect not sufficiently known to make a statement of how it affects spring and fall wheat.

4. This question is more for a dealer in produce to answer than a farmer.
5. The duty has not materially increased the price, as the Americans are the largest purchasers in our markets.
6. Profitable to breed heavy horses; the principal market is in the United States.
7. American corn is the cheapest food for fattening stock the Canadian farmer can use, as he cannot raise other grains required. The price would not warrant the imposing of a duty on corn.
8. I know of no beneficial effect on either of these articles by the present Tariff.
9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.
10. No benefit to the farmer on the class of wool produced in the country.
11. Do not know, as none is grown in this section.
12. The cost of farm implements has materially increased since the present Tariff was imposed, the quality remaining about the same.
13. The price of woollens, &c., in use amongst farmers has been higher since the present Tariff was imposed.
14. Do not think any improvement has been made by the operation of the Tariff.
15. Not that I am aware of. 16. No. The price of farm lands has not increased in this section since 1878. 17. It has generally improved. 18. Legislation for freer intercourse in buying and selling in foreign markets.

THOMAS CHISHOLM,  
Farmer, Galt, Co. Waterloo.

1. Yes. We export barley and peas in large quantities to the United States, and import but comparatively little therefrom. We raise all the oats that we require for home use, and have a surplus for a foreign market. United States wheat pays little or no duty, and by a juggle is ground in bond. It is of no general advantage, therefore, to have these products taxed, while it would be better for the Maritime Provinces to admit them free. But it is against our interests to pay  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel on Western Indian corn, which we want to help us to compete with Western beef. That duty is a dead robbery on every cattle feeder in the country.
2. Corn is king, and when it is a poor crop, coarse grains, for which it is generally a profitable substitute, go up in price. The drought in the Western States last summer, seriously damaged the corn crop, and created a greater demand for our peas and barley. Little rye is grown in this section. The same cause affected the price of our potatoes and turnips. The same cause has produced similar results in previous years, and will do so in the future. So a small corn crop in the United States, and not the duty, puts up the prices.
3. The increase of duty has led to no increase of price. The British market rules that of Canada and the United States, and before the new Tariff was adopted, wheat and flour were sometimes higher than now. A war in Europe or the prospects of a bad harvest there does more to raise the prices than all the legislation ever attempted by those who think that value can be fixed by Act of Parliament.
4. It is doubtful whether the changes of duty really affects an increase of that paid upon live hogs. The principal home market for Canadian pork is in the lumbering regions, and lumbermen do not see many smoked hams. They consume pork, and it is a question whether the duty upon pork has been raised. If the Tariff does not advance the price of pork, it does no good to the farmer. Here, as elsewhere, the British market rules the price of surplus products.
5. Increased price of horses comes from demand in Manitoba and the United States. Yesterday, a carload of excellent horses was shipped at Elora for Dakota, and the prices paid for them was as high as for others sent to Manitoba. Cana-

- dian farm horses are better bred animals than the bulk of those in the United States, and Americans therefore buy them, and as no United States horses come here, the Tariff has nothing to do with the regulation of value.
6. It is profitable to breed good horses, but it pays better to raise thoroughbred cattle for breeding purposes and grades for beef for the British market. We sell horses equally well whether for the United States or Manitoba, the best class of horses going to the United States.
  7. It does not pay to feed peas worth 65 cents to 75 cents a bushel, where you can buy the same weight of corn as we did before the Tariff changed, for 40 cents or 50 cents. In the County of Wellington, where 'beef is king,' we want a repeal of that stupid duty on Indian corn, and a repeal of duty on malt, that it may be used for feeding purposes.
  8. Certainly not. Canadians raise more vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter, than they require—although a few of the very earliest vegetables are imported from the United States by those living in towns or cities.
  9. To the first part of the question I say unquestionably—yes; but, whenever it comes, as it may someday or other, it will have to be secured on other terms than a mere remission of duties upon farm products, which find a better market in Europe than Canada can afford. Our position has been weakened rather than strengthened by a Tariff which takes nothing from the pockets of the United States producers.
  10. Competent men, manufacturers, tell me that the duty on wool is of no effect. The present duty on long wool is only a farce,—put it on rotten wool and shoddy. 11. None that I know of.
  12. Prices are not materially increased, but quality has deteriorated in consequence of duties on raw materials. There was keen competition before the Tariff.
  13. Woollens about the same. The price paid last year to the farmers for wool was less than in former years. Cottons are higher, undoubtedly without benefit in any shape to the farmer who cannot grow cotton. Hardware generally has gone up in price. 14. No.
  15. Crowds of people are leaving the County of Wellington, one of the most prosperous in Ontario, for Manitoba, Iowa, Michigan, Dakots; and I am not aware of any instance of Canadians having returned from the United States to this section. Wages have advanced in consequence of this stampede for the Far West.
  16. You read of numerous auction sales in every newspaper, and find scores of farmers "selling out" at lower prices than were obtainable a few years ago. The competition of Western lands keeps down the price of farm lands, and there has been a decrease of values in Wellington since 1878, of fully 25 per cent.
  17. No. Where, however, farmers have turned their attention to stock-raising and feeding, and secured better bred cattle, they have, through the new market for beef in England, improved their condition. I know none dependent upon grain, &c., better off.
  18. I would venture to suggest that good would come from more economy in the administration of the Dominion Government, and a reduction of the Customs duties. This would add materially to general and individual wealth.
- General Remarks* :—For thirty-five years I have farmed in the County of Wellington, and speak from a farmer's point of view.

DAVID FOOTE,  
Reeve, Elora, Co. Wellington.

1. No. 2. Oats have risen in price and are grown more largely than formerly, the same may be said of rye, corn and barley; peas not increased, but this is due to the insect.

3. It has given the Canadian manufacturer the advantage of the Lower Province markets, thereby getting the farmers here a better price for their wheat than if they were compelled to ship to the old country at the present prices.
  4. More pigs have been raised, and the supply not being equal to the demand, prices have been good; hams, bacon and lard, although held at fair prices, are kept down by competition among pork curers.
  5. Yes. 6. Yes; better than other stock at present; probably Manitoba is the best market. 7. Yes. No.
  8. Yes; by the increased population in manufacturing towns and cities.
  9. Yes; because we would have a larger market. Certainly now, because we have something to offer in exchange.
  10. Improved it by stimulating manufacture of woollen goods.
  11. May stimulate the cultivation of sugar beet.
  12. Rather cheaper, the quality being as good. 13. On the whole it is not increased.
  14. Yes; same answer as to question 8. 15. Yes; greatly.
  16. Think not in this neighbourhood. 17. Decidedly yes. 18. None.
- General Remarks* :—Keep present Government in power to develop the National Policy.

FRANCIS H. MILLER,  
Farmer, West Flamboro', Co. Wentworth.

1. I think from a farmer's standpoint it would not.
2. It protects the agricultural interests as to all coarse grains.
3. This would apply to the Lower Provinces as we have no milling interest in this section.
4. The effect has been to insure better prices to farmers who raise hogs.
5. It has had a wonderful effect to increase the prices, and the demand has increased both from the United States and the North-West.
6. Yes; no stock pays better. 8. Yes; we can raise coarse grain much cheaper than by importing. 8. Yes, the improvement is most extraordinary.
9. I think so; and we are, in my opinion, in a much better position to negotiate now than before.
10. It don't appear to affect it any in this neighbourhood. 11. We don't raise any.
12. We don't find any difference in price. 13. I think not.
14. Very much; by excluding American produce coming into competition with what we raise.
15. Yes; there is no talk at all of emigration to the United States, and Canadians are returning.
16. Money is cheaper; farm lands have increased in value the last year.
17. There is a vast improvement. 18. No answer.

JOSEPH McARTHUR,  
Reeve, Fenelon Falls, Co. Victoria.

1. Canada being an agricultural country, we can raise all kinds of farm produce and the introduction of American farm produce will be to our disadvantage.
2. The Tariff on American Indian corn has raised our rye in value from what it was in 1877-78 about 60 per cent., besides keeping Canadian capital in our own country, and improving our manufactured whiskey. Has also raised the price of oats, corn and peas, and slightly improved the price of barley, since some farmers grow barley for feed purposes for stock.
3. Don't think the Tariff affects price of wheat since prices are regulated wholly by foreign demand.

4. Am of opinion that the Tariff on bacon of 2 cents a pound has raised price of same not less than 2 cents a pound, and that all flesh and fat taken from the hog has been correspondingly raised and gives an impetus to pork raising.
5. Very little farm stock of either horses, cattle, pigs or sheep ever comes from the Americans to Canada, but we believe the price in Canada has been improved by securing the Manitoba and North-West trade.
6. Our general market for horses is in the United States, and we believe breeding horses for said market is profitable.
7. Canadian farmers can raise all kinds of hay, grain and roots for fattening stock, and a great deal more will be raised since American grain is cut short from entering Canada.
8. The market for poultry, eggs and butter is not affected by the Tariff, since the United States always pays dearer for those articles than Canada, but we think our vegetable market is improved by the Tariff.
9. Canadians generally are in favour of Reciprocity, and we believe a fair Treaty would be of value to Canada, and our only chance for a Treaty is by placing a heavy Tariff, as at present, against Americans. When United States produce is admitted to Canada free, that is reciprocity to Americans, and it is all they want.
10. A Tariff against American cotton must assist our wool market.
11. The Tariff against foreign refined sugar must develop the sugar beet industry. A Tariff against cotton must assist manufacture of flax and also encourage tobacco raising for profit.
12. All kinds of farm implements are on an average at least 15 per cent. cheaper than in 1876 to 1878, and the quality is vastly superior; competition improves the article and decreases the price.
13. We do not find any increase in price in woollen or cotton goods or hardware.
14. Our home market for coarse grain, corn, oats, &c., has been vastly improved since the Tariff of 1878, or N.P., has been in force.
15. The N.P. has created such a demand for labour that it is hardly possible to secure good farm hands, and only yesterday I gave an order to a firm in Beamsville, which could not be filled since men could not be had to push the full business of the shop, and labourers have no need to go to the United States, as in 1877 and 1878, to find work.
16. Since the N.P. has been inaugurated, farm lands have raised in price and very much land is now changing hands at greatly advanced prices.
17. Farmers are now realizing at least 50 per cent. more from their lands than in 1877 and 1878, and labourers are much better paid.
18. One change much needed but belonging to the Local Government at Toronto, is that all bank and railroad stocks, as well as mortgages, and also money in whatever way it appears, should pay same tax as real estate; and a law in our Dominion Parliament enacting that non-residents cannot be eligible for election for either Houses of Parliament, and, only farmers should represent agricultural constituencies, thereby securing agricultural patronage in either Parliament.

*General Remarks* :—The above answers are written on unbiassed principles, and I believe they will stand a test of accuracy if properly analysed.

JAMES McCLIVE,

Farmer, Garrison Road, Co. Welland.

1. Yes; because a duty on articles of which we produce a surplus cannot affect the price, while a duty on anything we do not produce in sufficient quantity can only be put on at our own expense, and duty hinders considerable border trade.
2. It has raised the price of corn by the amount of the duty. Do not think it has much effect on other grains, at least in this county.

3. Am not competent to answer. 4. Cannot answer as to the general market. As to our local market it raises the retail price during a greater portion of the year, but it does not seem to create a better market at the time the bulk of our pork is marketed.
5. Think it has. But horses have never been imported from the other side; from my observation Americans are continually buying our horses.
6. Cannot answer. 7. He can in this county at least. 8. Slightly.
9. Yes. On the whole I think our Tariff is creating a sentiment for Reciprocity along the border in the United States which did not exist previously.
10. Do not know. 11. So far, none. 12. They have not increased, but think they would sell cheaper than they do but for the Tariff, as improved methods are continually lowering the price of all manufacturers.
13. As to woollens and cottons, cannot answer. Hardware, such as harness, household cabinet makers, has increased.
14. No. Our prices are continually increasing compared with prices on the other side, but except that of corn, are generally a little lower, and they do not respond as readily to their market as before. 15. Yes, to various classes.
16. Very doubtful. 17. Yes, their condition is gradually and continually improving.
18. The best devised Tariff must, of necessity, do more injury than good. Legislation should be confined to provide the needs of Government which is powerless to foster one industry only at the expense of others, and revenue should be raised upon all alike.

F. P. BOUTELLER,

Reeve, Belle River, Co. Essex.

1. No; the prices of all agricultural products have materially increased since the American products were prohibited.
2. Increased very much the prices of coarse grain, and better still encouraged the production of the same. 3. Increased. 4. Improved our market.
5. Horses are being very much improved in price; the principal market for section is Manitoba.
6. Breeding horses compare favourably with the profits on other stock; as I said before, Manitoba is our chief market. 7. Yes. I think not. 8. Yes.
9. Probably, but we are in a much better position under the present Tariff to negotiate terms. 10. Increase. 11. Cannot say.
12. Decreased; implements are better, having the very latest improvements.
13. Generally lower. 14. Very much. 15. Yes.
16. Yes; prices have decreased owing to the tendency of our people to go to Manitoba. 17. Yes. 18. Increased protection.

JOHN KAINÉ,

Farmer, Howick, Co. Huron.

1. No. 2. It has been good here; they raise a great quantity of coarse grain.
3. It has done good to this part; we get a good price for our spring wheat.
4. No answer. 5. Live stock is in good demand and going up.
6. They pay well; our horses go to Manitoba.
7. The farmer can raise his own grain and is much better than American corn.
8. They have improved. 9. We are better prepared now. 10 and 11, No answer.
12. Decreased. 13. I do not find any increase; some higher, but some lower.
14. By increase of labour. 15. Yes. 16. Increased in this locality. 17. Yes.
18. No answer.

PETER MCGREGOR,

Reeve, Dundalk, Co. Grey.

1. It would not. 2. It has the effect of increasing the price of all kinds of coarse grain.
3. It has increased the price of both fall and spring wheat.
4. It has increased the price of live hogs, dried ham, bacon and lard.
5. Yes, very much. 6. Yes, they are as profitable as any other stock we raise in the United States or Manitoba.
7. We can raise all the coarse grain we need without the American corn.
8. Yes, very much. 9. Yes we would. We are much better with the present Tariff than we would be without it. 10. I cannot say. 11. I cannot say.
12. I believe all farming implements cheaper now than they were five years ago, and equally as good, or better. 13. I can see no difference. 14. Yes, very much.
15. Yes, very much. I know many who have returned to Canada and some of them are now working for me. 16. I think there is. 17. Yes, very much. 18. Not any.

JAMES WOOD,

Lieut.-Col., J. P., Loughboro, Co. Frontenac.

1. No; it would not. 2. It has been an advantage to us, prices have advanced on all coarse grains.
3. An advantage to us; has increased the price. 4. It has brought up our prices nearly one-half. 5. It has. 6. Cannot reply fully.
7. He can raise all that is required. 8. Yes. 9. Hard to answer. 10. Not any.
11. Cannot say. 12. Cost not increased; quality as good.
13. Cannot answer particularly. 14. It has. 15. It has very largely.
16. Yes; everything was dull before 1878. 17. Yes, very much. 18. No answer.

PERCIVAL PLATT,

Farmer, Adolphustown, Co. Lennox and Addington.

1. Not at all. 2. Has raised the price of corn and oats materially; rye has been much higher; peas and barley not much change from N. P.
3. Has benefited farmers indirectly.
4. I think it has encouraged pork raising to some extent: coarse grain at present prices will not induce farmers to raise much pork.
5. The market of Manitoba will undoubtedly be an advantage.
6. I think cattle and sheep more profitable; the Americans take all the horses that suit them at fair prices.
7. Farmers can raise all the grain required for fattening, and more too.
8. I think the market is better. 9. I am doubtful whether we would be benefited much or not; the present Tariff is about all we require.
10. A small advance. 11. Not prepared to say.
12. Not increased and quality as good. 13. Woollens and cottons in common use among farmers have not increased. 14. It has decidedly increased.
15. N. P. encourages emigration to Canada by the encouragement of the establishing of factories of all kinds.
16. Money being more plentiful, consequently less interest, there is a tendency to invest capital in farm property; not much change; the Manitoba fever and the misrule of the Mackenzie Government for five years has had some tendency to decrease the value of farm property.
17. Very much. 18. I think the Tariff of the present wise Government has done all that is necessary.

*General Remarks*:—I have never heard one single individual that supported the National Policy in 1878 find fault with the working of the said policy; and I have no doubt of the policy being sustained at the next elections.

SAMUEL JONES, J.P.,

Hillier, Co. Prince Edward.

1. On the whole, Yes. Because our prices as a general thing are as good as theirs, and we only buy from them in case of scarcity, and the duty only adds to the already high price. 2. The duty on corn helps the farmer from London, south to Windsor, at the expense of the rest of Ontario. 3. No answer.
4. No benefit to the farmer, but protects our packing houses.
5. I think not, as we are sellers mostly.
6. Yes, fully as profitable as any other stock. United States and Manitoba both.
- 7 and 8. No answer.
9. Yes. The farmer would, on the whole, be benefited, but our manufactures certainly would suffer. 10. No answer.
11. On tobacco it protects the grower, but the Inland Revenue has completely destroyed one of our most profitable products. Effects on flax and sugar beet unknown to me. 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. No answer.
17. Very much for the better.
18. The only thing I could suggest would be the removal of all inland restrictions on tobacco, as the amount that could be produced in Western Ontario with profit, being reasonably protected would be immense.

*General Remarks*:—I have only noted such items as I could answer; those unanswered I do not feel competent to speak about.

JOHN VAN HORN,  
Farmer, Chatbam, Co. Kent.

1. To admit American farm produce would be detrimental in lowering the price of our grain, and not in the interest of the farmers in this section of the country.
2. The Tariff has raised the price of oats, corn, barley and peas 25 per cent. Our lands are too good to grow rye.
3. By having our own market we get better prices for wheat and flour; saving the price of freight, spring wheat is dearer than fall. I account for that by spring not being as much grown and not doing well of late years.
4. The market for hogs, hams, bacon and lard is fully 25 per cent dearer, having the control of our own market.
5. This question I cannot safely answer; horses are very dear; a scrub, \$100; a good horse, \$300. Manitoba takes the low priced, the good horses go to the States.
6. It pays well to breed good horses, and so with other stock, cattle paying the best; the markets about equal. Manitoba or the United States.
7. We can raise all our own feed with profit; peas are better than corn for fattening stock, and better for the land than growing wheat. To import American corn. 8. Not posted on this head. Prices good.
9. Certainly not, we have got our own markets and industries established. To have Reciprocity would dismember this and have a tendency towards annexation.
10. Not posted on this head. 11. We don't grow any of importance.
12. Farm implements are cheaper from 10 to 20 per cent, especially on ploughs and reapers, with more improvements and a better article. 13. Not worth mentioning.
14. Home market is the best and has improved by the operation of the Tariff, keeping out American produce.
15. Working men are very scarce, and high wages and the Manitoba fever are taking them away; the United States is nowhere.
16. The low rate of interest in our banking institutions creates a tendency to invest in farm property. Price of farm property about the same. 17. Yes.
18. A wise and economical Government with the blessing of Providence will make the country happy, contented and prosperous.

*General Remarks*:—Keep the Grits out of office.

WILLIAM GRAHAM,  
Reeve, Brucefield, Co. Huron.

1. Yes; as there is a surplus grown in Canada it cannot affect Canadian prices, which are fixed by the export price, and it would tend to give Canadians the carrying trade and other incidental advantages of commerce.
2. It has not affected prices for the reasons given in answer 1, except corn; the duty on that article has raised the price, but as it is imported chiefly for feeding purposes, the increased price is a disadvantage to the feeder, who has to compete with those using the same kind of feed at a lower price.
3. As stated in answer 1, the price of wheat and flour is fixed by the export price; it not only gives the millers less competition in flour, but binds him from producing the most desirable quality of flour, from his not being able to import hard spring.
4. The price of pork, which is the main product of the hog, being practically unchanged by the Tariff, live hogs cannot be much affected, and except the supply of Canadian hogs, falls short of quantity for dried meats, the price would not be affected, as it usually does towards the end of the season; the price of ham and bacon in that case is made higher.
5. No; as a considerable number are exported and few imported, the duties have not affected them.
6. Only the better grades; the profits are less than cattle or sheep. United States.
7. The grain that the Canadian farmer can most profitably raise is too valuable for feeding purposes; it would pay better to exchange for corn, except for the duty and often even then. 8. No.
9. Yes; we may be better supplied with arguments wherewith to convince the Americans of their illiberal trade policy. 10. No effect. 11. None.
12. Owing to the abundant harvest there is an increased demand, but the prices have not decreased.
13. Increased; blankets, horse-rugs, heavy coatings, 10 to 15 per cent.; cotton, the amount of the increased duty; the same with chains, bar-iron and rope.
14. The people were always fed and a surplus left which fixed the price for what was consumed as well as what was exported; that state of things is unchanged.
15. Emigration is greater than in former years, chiefly to the West, Manitoba and the Western States.
16. The price of farm property ought to have responded to the better prices for agricultural products, but has been kept down by emigration.
17. Farmers much better; labouring class not so much, as wages have not increased in proportion to increased cost of living, though labour is more in demand and more steady.
18. A reduction of the farmers expenses by reducing his taxation, leaving him a larger profit.

W. B. ARCHER,

Reeve, Campbellford, Co. Northumberland.

1. It would be in the interest of the agriculturalists to admit wheat and corn free of duty; it gives more labour in being manufactured into flour for a foreign market, and we have the bran for feeding. 2. A duty on corn is a great injury in feeding for home or shipping abroad. I cannot see what effect a duty on these different grains can have, because we reduce our stock by killing before they are half fed, or take for them what we can get, thus we lose a large quantity of fine manure by not feeding.
3. I for my part cannot see how a Tariff on fall wheat, spring and flour, can raise the price in home market, when we have often a large surplus to export; supposing the whole surplus of the United States was passing through the hands of Canadians it would be a mine of wealth to the country.

4. The quantity of feed would be limited, and a large quantity would have to be imported; the consumer would have to pay the duty, and the farmers profits would be small on account of few being fed.
5. The duty upon horses has not raised them in value; no horses imported from the United States to this section; horses are bought here for both the United States and Manitoba.
6. Breeding horses has been very profitable, and is as profitable as any other stock raising; our best market is the United States. Our heavy draughts go South and East; common West and Manitoba.
7. It would pay better to import all the grain required to fatten stock; as few peas are raised here on account of the bug.
8. The markets for the different articles cannot be improved by a Tariff, when we raise far more than we can consume.
9. I believe that a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would be of great benefit to the Canadian farmer; but to say that we are in a better position with the Tariff, for obtaining a Treaty with the United States, is what I could not give an opinion on.
10. I think the Tariff is no advantage to the farmer in raising the price of wool.
11. There is no flax, tobacco or sugar beet raised to any extent in this locality.
12. Farm implements have increased in value, and often the material in the articles is not so good. 13. These articles in general have increased in price. 14. The Tariff has not improved our home markets.
15. In this section there has been a large emigration to the United States, and there is nothing yet to retard its progress to that country.
16. Farm property has decreased in value; low interest has induced some to put their money into land.
17. I cannot say that the Tariff has improved the farmer, or the labouring classes, but hard labour and economy will.
18. I believe the best change would be fewer doctors and lawyers in the House, and put in more practical farmers, that is to say, if the House is going to turn its attention to the interests of agriculture.

*General Remarks*:—As far as my practical knowledge of the N. P. goes, it has been, I think, an injury to the farmers at large. The Tariff will never be a benefit to the farmer, for our determination is to buy at the cheapest market and sell at the dearest.

JAMES TORRANCE,  
Farmer, Porter's Hill, Co. Huron.

1. Not an. 2. Corn is 20 cents higher in price per bushel; oats, 10 cents; peas and rye have not been grown in this neighborhood for some time.
3. Fall wheat has been sold at an average of 25 cents per bushel, flour in proportion; no spring wheat has been raised in this part at present.
4. Live hogs have advanced 25 per cent., and more regular prices; hams, bacon and lard in proportion.
5. Yes, the price of all kinds of stock has advanced from 30 to 40 per cent. and ready sales.
6. I never raised horses for sale, but think that raising horses would pay equal to other stock. All that were in this part lately were taken to Manitoba.
7. It would pay any farmer better to raise his own grain for feeding his stock than to import American corn. 8. Yes.
9. I think that we are better off at present than to have a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. When American produce was admitted free we could not get Reciprocity with the United States.
10. Wool has not advanced; I think wool requires an increase of duty.
11. There is no flax, tobacco nor sugar beet raised here.

12. The cost of farm implements is about the same as was before the Tariff, the quality is improved considerably.
13. Woollens and cottons are about the same price as in 1878.
14. Yes, it has shut out the Western States wheat and oats almost entirely.
15. The Tariff has improved the condition of all industrial classes. There is no emigration from this part to the United States. but a great number of working men have returned from the United States this year.
16. Yes, purchasers can as money is so much cheaper than before the Tariff. Lands have increased 25 per cent. in value. 17. Yes.
18. I think it not best to change legislation as far as agriculture is concerned, at present it gives general satisfaction.

*General Remarks:*—I am of the opinion that the farmers all over the Province of Ontario are prosperous and satisfied with the Tariff. My reason for thinking so is that I made many inquiries of intelligent farmers about the Tariff and heard no complaints.

WILLIAM McKELLAR,  
Farmer, Komoka, Co. Middlesex.

1. Yes, it would be in the interest of agriculturalists in the Province of Nova Scotia to admit Indian corn free of duty for stock feeding, as no corn is grown here or can it ever be successfully.
2. The effect of the imposition of a duty on Indian corn is to make it more expensive to stall fed cattle for the English market. Oats and other coarse grain can be grown here successfully but not as cheap as Indian corn, if allowed to come in free of duty.
3. The effect of duty imposed on wheat and flour does not injure the farmers in Nova Scotia as we can get it from Ontario, also spring and fall wheat for seed and milling purposes, free of duty.
4. To my knowlege the increase duties on live hogs, dried hams, &c., &c., have not affected the agriculturalists, but I should consider the Canadian market to be favourable to our Canadian farmers.
5. The duties imposed on horses does help our market price as a large number of horses are sold annually in the United States, beside we are too far away from Manitoba and the North-West. For other live stock the duty imposed is not felt by our farmers, but I should say it is to our benefit.
6. Yes, we find it profitable to breed horses and the profits compare favourably with any other live stock. Our market is the United States.
7. Our farmers in Nova Scotia can raise profitably all the grain required to fatten their stock but American corn, and I think it would be in the interest of our farmers in the Province of Nova Scotia if the corn was allowed to come in free of duty.
8. Yes, the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter is improved by the effects of the present Tariff.
9. I cannot say that Reciprocity would benefit the Canadian farmer as a whole, no doubt it might help our Nova Scotia farmers in view of our coal finding a market in the United States again, and this might enlarge our home market. Decidedly we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty under the present Tariff, or when the American produce was admitted free.
10. The effect of the Tariff is in favour of the Nova Scotia farmer as our Province is destined to be a wool growing country.
11. The Tariff does not affect the farmer in any one way or another; as to flax, tobacco and sugar beet we do not cultivate either to any extent.
12. The cost of farming implements has not increased under the present Tariff; the quality is good. Such as mowing machines, cultivators, thrashing machines, horse rakes, reapers, ploughs, &c.

13. I do not know of any of the woollens, cottons and hardware in common used by the farmer to be increased in price under the Tariff.
14. Yes, the home market on the whole is improved by the present Tariff, for the simple reason that all our industries and public works are working to their full capacity, which creates a home market for our farmers.
15. Yes, the present Tariff, has given diversity of employment and other encouragement to our various industrial classes, and no doubt is keeping many of our young people from going to the United States and encouraging others to return.
16. Yes, I think there is a tendency to invest in farm property under the present Tariff and farm lands have increased in value since 1878, but in the meantime many of our farmers are going to the North-West and Manitoba, and I cannot say what this movement will lead to.
17. Yes, the general condition of our farms, and of our labouring class especially, has improved since 1878.
18. As a farmer I would not recommend many changes. I think our Legislature is doing all they can for the interest of agriculture. There are some changes that I would like in the Tariff, and one item in particular, that is the duty on Indian corn, it would be a great boon to the people of the Maritime Provinces to have the American corn allowed in free of duty.

DONALD FRASER,  
Farmer, Pictou, Co. Pictou.

1. It would, as we are principally a population of consumers, being a fishing, mining and manufacturing people.
2. The effect of the duty has been to raise the price of corn-meal and not the price of grain or cereals in this locality.
3. There has been no perceptible effect on wheat, but there certainly is on flour.
4. None. 5. Not at all. 6. It is profitable to breed horses; our market is in the United States.
7. It is doubtful if he could. It would not pay to import American corn to this island to fatten stock.
8. No; our market is in the United States for eggs and vegetables. 9. We would, and when American produce is admitted free, we would be in a better position to negotiate a treaty.
10. Not any. 11. Not any. 12. Increased. 13. All are very materially increased.
14. No increase. 15. Not any, but evidently increased by the emigration of our people to the United States and elsewhere.
16. No; and there is no increase in the value of real estate, but, on the contrary, a decrease. 17. No. 18. Reciprocity with the United States.

*General Remarks:*—Reciprocity with the United States would open up a market for the agriculturalist with the large cities and towns of that great country, by our railroad and steamboat facilities, and thus encourage both our fishing and agricultural interests all over the Province.

A. F. HALIBURTON,  
P. Ag. Society, Baddeck, Co. Victoria.

1. No. 2. The growing of grain is so limited that the duty has no effect upon it.
3. It has no effect upon price. It shuts out or compels the importer to purchase Canadian instead of American.
4. No trade in such articles. Cannot answer. 5. It has no affect in this section of country.
6. It is profitable, but other stock—cows and sheep—is more so. Principal market, Newfoundland and home consumption.

7. He can raise what grain he requires. 8. It has not effected it in this section of country.
9. I cannot say that he would. We are in a better position to negotiate a treaty than we would be without a Tariff.
10. It has caused the price to go up, the manufacture becoming greater. 11. None cultivated.
12. Materially decreased; quality about the same. 13. Average about the same.
14. Tariff does not affect the home market. 15. Not in this section of the country.
16. Cannot perceive any change. 17. Yes. 18. I am not aware of any.

JAMES A. TORY,

Collector of Customs, Guysborough, Co. Guysborough, N.S.

1. It is not in the interest of agriculture to admit any products of the soil from the United States free of duty.
2. There has been a large advance in price of rye, corn, barley and oats since the imposition of duties on the same; pease not much changed in price.
3. Cannot say that wheat of any kind is much affected by the imposition of duty; not much wheat raised in this county.
4. The effect of increased duty on all the articles mentioned in this question has been and still is to raise their price from 25 to 30 per cent.
5. Horses sell at greatly advanced prices since the increased duties were imposed upon them; our home market for North-West and Manitoba is very remunerative.
6. Breeding horses is equally profitable with other stock. Our market is both United States and Manitoba.
7. We can raise profitably corn and all coarse grain required for fattening stock of all kinds, and it would pay much better than to allow American corn to come in free. 8. Yes, much improved.
9. Would be benefited by Reciprocity with the United States in products of the soil; and our position to negotiate such a Treaty is much better under the present Tariff, for the reason that we have now something to offer, in 1878 we had nothing to offer. 10. Cannot say that it has any effect.
11. Not any raised here except a few sugar beets; cannot say there is any effect.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased under the present Tariff; the quality is much better in reapers, mowers and ploughs, likewise in waggons, buggies, sleighs and many other farm implements.
13. Woollen goods are cheaper and of better quality; cottons about as usual; hardware cheaper; cannot say that any articles we use have increased in price.
14. The home market for farm produce has been increased by the operation of the Tariff by the increase of manufactories in Gananoque, Brockville, Smith's Falls, and in fact in every little village in this county.
15. The effects of the present Tariff gave employment to all who wish to work, male and female; farm help is scarce and wages higher than for fifty years past.
16. Cannot say there is an increased tendency to invest in farm property at present, neither have farm lands increased in value since 1878, the why and wherefore is the North-West fever. Many farms are offered for sale, in fact more farms than purchasers.
17. Yes, the condition of farmers is immensely increased, and the labouring classes proportionately so.
18. The only legislation required to make agriculture profitable is to preserve Canada for the Canadians.

*General Remarks:*—I have answered the within questions to the best of my ability, and wish to say that it is not in the interest of party that I reply to

your request. I am not a good old Tory but a good old Baldwin Reformer, and believe that I have the real good of this Canada of ours at heart, and in such a case, must support John A. as the best Statesman in Canada.

ALEXR. ELLIOTT, J.P.

Chantry, Co. Leeds.

1. No. I think a Tariff should be imposed on all American produce.
2. The market price of oats and barley continues about the same. The price of rye has been increased on account of foreign demand; peas rule a shade higher.
3. Wheat and flour have ruled higher, but there has been a falling off in production.
4. The market for live hogs is much better. The production has fallen off considerably, which, together with less imported, has given a better market.
5. No, the prices obtained for horses in the Western States are equal to those obtained in Manitoba; consequently there could not be any profit in taking horses from the Western States, if the duty were removed.
6. Yes, the profits are as good as on any other stock. United States and Manitoba are our principal markets at present.
7. The cost of transportation would make American corn unprofitable.
8. The market for poultry and eggs has improved, the principal demand being from the United States. Consequently the improvement cannot justly be attributed to the present Tariff.
9. I think a Reciprocity Treaty would be beneficial if rightly arranged. The Government should know their position with the United States better than any ordinary person. 10. I have not observed.
11. None cultivated in this section of Ontario. 12. I think cost of farm implements remain about the same; quality is apparently as good.
13. I cannot state as to woollens and cottons. I think the price of hardware continues about the same. 14. I do not see any marked improvement in consequence of the present Tariff.
15. There is a large number gone from here to the Western States during the past two years; I have not heard of any of them returning.
16. No, farm lands remain about the same as in 1878. Difficult to sell.
17. Yes, there is a marked improvement in both classes. 18. Mature reflection required before answering this question.

JAMES PATTERSON,

Reeve, Glen Tay, Co. Lanark.

1. No. 2. It has had good effect. 3. Increased the value of fall and spring wheat about 20 or 25 per cent.
4. Profitable to the farmer. 5. Yes. 6. Manitoba. 7. No answer. 8. Yes. 9. and 10. No answer. 11. None raised in this part.
12. Quality is fully better and not any costlier. Thrashing, reaping and sawing machines, &c. 13. No; not generally. 14. Yes.
15. The present Tariff has given employment and encouragement to our various industries, and retarded emigration to the United States, and encouraged Canadians to return to this country.
16. Yes. Farm property has increased twice its value since 1878 on account of railway improvements and Protection.
17. Yes; especially that of the labourer. 18. No answer.

WM. BOURK,

Reeve, Oso Station, Co. Frontenac.

1. It would not be in the interest of Canadian farmers to admit any American produce free.
2. It has raised the price of oats, barley and peas. No rye or corn grown here for sale.
3. It has given Canadian farmers the privilege of supplying our own people with wheat and flour, and has increased the price of fall wheat and flour; very little spring wheat grown here.
4. It has been the means of increasing the consumption of Canadian pork, hams, bacon and lard, and the price of all these has greatly increased the last four years.
5. It has greatly improved the price of horses and cattle by given us our own market, and also the Manitoba market which the American supplied before the change in the Tariff.
6. We do find it profitable to breed horses, but cannot say which gives the most profit as all kinds of stock are profitable just now; heavy horses to the United States, others to Manitoba.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise peas, corn and oats profitably to fatten his stock without American corn. 8. Very greatly improved by the change in the Tariff.
9. I think we are as well now as when we had Reciprocity, but if it was desired we are in a better position to get it than before the change in the Tariff.
10. Not much effect on our wool, as it is all long wool we grow here, and not much of it wanted for our Canadian manufacturer.
11. I cannot say what effect, as there is no tobacco and sugar beet grown here, and very little flax.
12. The cost of farm implements, decreased and of better quality. Reaping machines, mowers and ploughs, and harrows all better and cheaper.
13. Woollens a little decreased in price, cottons greatly decreased; grain bags \$1 per dozen cheaper by the change in the Tariff; nails are cheaper; other hardware about the same.
14. The home market has been improved and increased by allowing us to supply our own people with everything they want.
15. It has given employment to all classes of workmen; farmers can scarcely get men at greatly increased wages; they are paying \$20 per month from now till next winter with board.
16. Not much tendency to invest in farm property here; all the spare capital is going to Manitoba; I think farm property has decreased a little on account of the opening up of the North-West.
17. All classes are greatly improved since 1878, and especially the farmer. If we had had two years more like 1877 and 1878, a great many of the farmers would have been insolvent.
18. I do not know of any change that would make it better for the farmer.

*General Remarks*:—I would remark that since the N.P. came into force it has been the means of giving the farmer that wanted to borrow money at about 3 per cent. less than they could get it before. The reason of that is, I think, the English capitalists find it a safe place to invest their capital seeing this country is in so prosperous a state now.

ANDREW ROBSON,

First Dep. Reeve and President of N. Middlesex Ag. Society,  
West McGillivray, Co. Middlesex.

1. It would not. 2. Decidedly better prices for all coarse grains—with a far more ready sale, as we have nothing that is a drug, as formerly.
3. Instead of selling to shippers for foreign markets, we get better prices from our own millers who grind it here; we think the duty a benefit to those who raise fall as well as spring wheat.

4. Undoubtedly a beneficial effect—better prices and a more ready sale.
5. We think the market for horses has been greatly improved, for there is no difficulty now in making sales.
6. Breeding horses are now becoming very profitable, as we have ready sales at fair prices; principally for Manitoba in this section.
7. We are satisfied there can be sufficient coarse grain raised in Canada for all uses, if encouragement be still continued to be given.
8. There is certainly an improvement in all these.
9. I think there could be no serious objection to Reciprocity. We think we are in a far better position with the present Tariff.
10. Nominal as yet, but the prospect is brightening, as manufactories are being established.
11. None raised in this section, but I think that it will be introduced if encouragement be given.
12. I cannot see that the price has in any way increased, or that the quality is not just as good; all farming implements.
13. If there be any increase it is not perceptible, as I have heard of no complaint from any of my neighbours on either side of politics.
14. We say yes, most decidedly; we have our own home markets.
15. That is the universal opinion of all who are free from party prejudices.
16. We think so; increased; better sale for farm produce principally; cheaper money partially.
17. Happily, very greatly increased, thanks to the National Policy and to John A.
18. Increase the duties on agricultural products coming into this country, if any change be meditated in the National Policy. We think the duty should be increased on Indian corn to 10 cents per bushel. I do not make this statement because I am directly interested in the culture of that cereal, for I am not, but I think it would still improve the price of all coarse grains.

G. H. CRYSLER,  
Agriculturalist, Port Dover, Co. Norfolk.

1. It would not. 2. Oats sell at 45 cents in our barns, and a local demand for all grown; rye and corn, none grown; peas, 80 cents, and a ready market.
3. Fall wheat, price steady; spring wheat, 8 or 10 cents a bushel higher than it would be had we no duty on American wheat.
4. An increase of about 30 or 35 per cent. 5. Price of horses increased about 35 per cent. Eight hundred left the township of Tecumseh in the past year; 90 per cent. shipped to the North-West.
6. Largest demand for horses ever known in this section; farmers breed from all available mares; Manitoba our principal market.
7. Farmers can profitably raise all coarse grains, and by so doing rest his ground.
8. For eggs and butter the market is improved. 9. We consider that Canada was never in a better position to negotiate for Reciprocity than the present time.
10. Wool has not been so high for the last year; can't say the cause. 11. None raised in this section.
12. Prices much the same for the last six or seven years; ploughs much improved in quality.
13. No change in prices, except some articles of hardware. Cross-cut saws 30 per cent. lower.
14. Home market for coarse grains has improved, as our villages have not been glutted with American corn and oats.
15. All Canadians leaving here go to the North-West, except about 5 per cent. that go to Dakota. A big demand here for farm labour.
16. Farms sell to-day for \$70 and \$80 per acre that would not bring \$55 in 1878.
17. Here all farmers are preparing to make improvements the coming season.

18. Farmers are satisfied this last year, and expect to see things much brighter if crops are good this season.

*General Remarks* :—We farmers consider that our Legislature has done a great deal for us in the last two years, and it would not be advisable to tamper with it any more at present, but give it a fair trial.

W. H. HANNWELL,

Treasurer of Cardwell Ag. Society, Beeton, Co. Simcoe.

- 
1. I think not. 2. It has increased the price of oats, rye and corn from 15 to 30 per cent.  
 3. It has advanced the price of wheat slightly. 4. It has increased the price very materially.  
 5. Yes. 6. In my opinion it pays better to raise cattle, sheep and hogs. Manitoba.  
 7. He can. 8. It has improved very materially. 9. As this is a question which would require a great deal of consideration, I will not venture to answer it. We are.  
 10. I do not keep sheep. 11. Very little grown in this section (Grafton).  
 12. The cost has decreased slightly. 13. Nearly all the articles are cheaper.  
 14. It has. By increasing the number of consumers, thus giving us a market at our own doors.  
 15. It has. 16. Cannot say, as I do not know of a farm for sale in this section.  
 17. Yes; very much improved. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—With regard to question 7, I am of the opinion that all the southern counties of Ontario are well adapted for the growth of corn, and as we can raise from 35 to 75 bushels to the acre, there is no crop that will pay the farmer better.

JAMES BARNUM,

Municipal Representative, Grafton, Co. Northumberland.

- 
1. No. 2. We have had a better price on coarse grains generally.  
 3. Not much change. 4. Better price for the farmer. 5. Yes.  
 6. Yes. Manitoba this last year. 7. The farmer can raise his grain. 8. Can't say.  
 9. Can't say. 10. No change. 11. We grow none here.  
 12. The cost of implements has not increased; the quality is improving. 13. No.  
 14. Yes, by better prices. 15. Yes. 16. No. Decreased. 17. Yes.  
 18. I am not prepared to offer any.

A. W. ESSELS,

Reeve, Wooler, Co. Northumberland.

- 
1. Yes. Wheat we can raise, and corn we can feed, and sell our barley.  
 2. Oats, dearer; corn, dearer; rye, don't grow any; barley and peas, none.  
 3. None. 4. Price advanced slightly. 5. No.  
 6. Yes; profits equal to other stock. Market for superior horses, United States; common class, Manitoba.  
 7. No. It pays better to import American corn if the duty is off. 8. Cannot say.  
 9. Yes. Reciprocity would be a benefit to the farmer. As to the latter, I can't say. 10. Wool is dearer than formerly; cannot tell the cause. 11. Cannot say.  
 12. Increased in cost; quality not as good. Reapers, mowers and seeders.  
 13. Yes, increased. Woollens and cottons slightly and stoves largely, and hardware.  
 14. Oats I think have.

15. No; the emigration out of Canada never was so great to Nebraska, Dakota and Manitoba. 16. No, farm lands have decreased in value since 1878. 17. Yes. 18. Access to the markets of the world to buy and sell.

GEORGE FOLLIS,  
Reeve, Gowanstown, Co. Perth.

1. No, not on any account. 2. The duty on American corn has affected our coarse grains in the follow manner,—that is we get from 5 to 10 cents more a bushel than we did when American corn was admitted free. 3. We get better prices for our wheat and flour since the duties have been imposed. Nearly double. In the year 1878, wheat sold at 75 cents per bushel, in 1881 and 1882, from \$1.20 to \$1.33. 4. The effect of the increased duties on American pork has made a great change in Canadian markets. In the years 1878 and 1879 the average price was from \$5 to \$6 per cwt., now from \$7.50 to \$8.50. 5. Yes. 6. Under the present prices it is profitable to breed horses, more so than any other stock. The market is well divided between the U.S. and Manitoba. 7. Yes, the Canadian farmer can raise profitably all coarse grains to fatten his stock, and have a surplus left. 8. Yes. 9. No. 10. The price of wool has differed but very little under the present Tariff. 11. None raised in this section of the country. 12. The cost of farm implements has decreased, if any, in price, and of better quality, under the present Tariff. Such as iron harrows, ploughs, reapers and seeders. 13. Woollen goods are fully as cheap, and of better quality; cottons I think are dearer; hardware is cheaper, such as nails, &c. 14. The home market is better under the present Tariff, and more Canadian produce consumed at home on account of so many new factories being in operation, which affords employment to a great many mechanics, who otherwise would have to leave the country. 15. Canadians with the existing Tariff can find steady employment at home and good wages, fully as good as in any part of the United States. 16. There is more capital invested in farm property, and the price of land is on the increase since 1878; because the country is more prosperous. 17. The condition of the farmer is greatly improved, and the labouring class who in 1878 got from \$9 to \$12 per month, now gets from \$18 to \$20. 18. I do not think there are any changes required at present, as the country is in a very prosperous state. Prices for farm produce are good, and the labouring class command high wages.

E. D. McEACHERN,  
Reeve, Eldon, Co. Victoria.

1. I think it would be well to admit all farm produce free. Corn is required for feeding; oats and wheat the millers require to keep their machinery running; the railroads could carry them at a profit, which would help farmers by increasing the competition. 2. Corn has been raised in price; the other coarse grains are lower than formerly as compared with American markets. 3. They are lower than formerly as compared with American markets. 4. Cannot say. 5. No, the Americans are buying in our markets. 6. I am unable to say what the relative profits are; a good many horses have gone to Manitoba lately; nearly all went to the States until the last few months. 7. No, it would often pay better to import American corn if the duty was taken off. 8. Not in this section.

9. Yes. Cannot say, but I would be very glad to see such a Treaty in force.
  10. It certainly has not increased the price. 11. None raised in this section.
  12. I believe they are higher in consequence of the Tariff.
  13. They are all dearer in consequence of the Tariff. Cannot specify.
  14. Not in this section.
  15. No; a good many have left quite recently and gone to the States, others are going in a few days. 16. No, I do not think they have increased in value.
  17. There is some improvement; crops have generally been good and a better foreign demand.
  18. Reciprocity, if it can be secured, if not, a return to a Revenue Tariff.
- General Remarks:*—The present trade regulations do not seem to have been framed in the farmers interest.

JOSEPH DUNINGTON,

Reeve, Chatsworth, Co. Grey.

1. It would not. 2. It has raised the price on oats, rye and corn, which before would not pay. Barley much the same as before.
3. There has not been much change in either kinds with us.
4. It has increased the price in our markets. 5. The price was never better.
7. I find it profitable to breed horses; at the present time they command a good price; at home or the United States market. 8. It has.
9. I think we would be benefited by such a Treaty. There is no doubt but our present position is better than before, to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. Not much change with us. 11. I have no knowledge.
12. I can purchase mowers and reapers, and all kinds of farming implements, cheaper and better than before. 13. There is not much change with us.
14. Yes it has. Before the present Tariff our country was flooded with the surplus grain from the United States; in my opinion, our only safety is to rely on the industry of our country for such. 15. It has.
16. There is an increase of capital in our country. In my locality there has not been much rise in farm property owing to the wise policy of the Government in opening up the North-West for settlement. 17. It has.
18. I have none to offer.

BALTIS ROSE,

Ex-Warden, Frankford, Co. Hastings.

1. It would not be in the interest of the farming community; we do not object to a reciprocal exchange.
2. The imposition of a duty on American corn has, I believe, aided us materially. Corn and American oats before the imposition of the National Policy were freely sold here, now we have our own markets.
3. I am of the opinion that the duty imposed has had the effect of preventing the importing of inferior American grain, and we have the benefit of the markets of the Lower Provinces.
4. American cured pork is yet brought here, but Canadian pork commands a better price and altogether we are satisfied with the Tariff in this respect.
5. Horses and cattle and other live stock command a good price here, we attribute it to the demand for home markets.
6. At present there is a large demand for horses, mostly for Manitoba; cattle pay well.
7. Yes; I do not think that any farmer requires American corn; our coarse grains are as good for fattening purposes.
8. Yes; the market for these products never was better.

9. I think not, our population is too small compared with United States. A home market for our produce is what we want. We are in a better position to secure a Treaty, as I think if the Americans want our markets free, they must feel that we want to be admitted to theirs free.
10. Do not know. 11. None grown in this section.
12. To my knowledge the cost of farming implements is not increased. Reapers, mowers, &c., are as cheap to-day as ever they were under the old Tariff.
13. I never, since 1870, knew woollens and cottons cheaper than now. I do not think that it has affected hardware. 14. I think so.
15. I cannot but think that the Tariff having created so many industries, there is more demand for skilled labour, and so encouraged Canadians to remain at home.
16. I do not think the Tariff has in any way affected farm property in this section. There are a great many farmers' sons going to the North-West to take up land. 17. There is no doubt about it, farmers and labourers are prosperous.
18. I know of none. We should be satisfied as matters are.

JOHN GILLESPIE,

Reeve, Amaranth, Orangeville, Co. Dufferin.

1. It would not. 2. It has had the effect of raising the price of oats, pease and barley.
3. It has had the effect of raising the price of both spring and fall wheat, because now we have the home market.
4. It has had the effect of giving the farmers more for their hogs, and has raised the price of hams, bacon and lard in proportion.
5. It has. 6. Yes; about equal to money invested; Manitoba.
7. Yes; it would not. 8. Yes. 9. Yes; we are in a better position to negotiate such a treaty under the present Tariff. 10. It has raised the price.
11. No answer. 12. The cost is decreased and they are of better quality.
13. The price is about the same as formerly. 14. Yes; by enabling the produce to be consumed to a great extent in our own country. 15. It has. 16. There is; farm property is about the same on account of so many going to Manitoba.
17. It is, greatly. 18. No change required; by keeping the present administration in power, it will have a tendency to make agriculture a more desirable and profitable occupation.

P. KELLY,

Reeve, Blythe, Co. Huron.

1. No. 2. Better prices for oats, barley and peas; there is no rye or corn grown in this locality; I therefore cannot say. 3. The same effect as question No. 2.
4. That we never had a better market for hogs than we have had this season.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, and profits equally as good as other stock; the United States was our market, but Manitoba is our best market at present, and better paying prices. 7. Yes; I have never used any corn. 8. Yes.
9. I believe in equal rights, and we must be in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. Wool is cheaper, there being less demand for long wools, such as we raise.
11. No answer. 12. Reapers, mowers, ploughs, harrows, &c., have decreased in cost and the quality is better. 13. Woollens and cottons, no change; hardware cheaper.

14. Yes ; by giving the markets of the Dominion to the Canadians. 15. Yes.  
 16. Lands are a shade lower in price, on account of so many leaving for Manitoba and the North-West. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

JOHN PRAIN,  
 Reeve, Harriston, Co. Wellington.

1. It would, for many reasons. One is, that it would keep the markets more in sympathy one with another.
2. I cannot see that it has affected the price of coarse grains in this section.
3. The effect must be as regards flour to those on the frontier whom circumstances have so placed them that they have to use American flour. To the amount of duty thereon.
4. It has the effect of raising the price of hams, bacon and lard to the consumer, to the benefit of the merchant, on our own pork, without being any benefit to the farmer, as the farmer sells his pork in its green state, in which state the pork-packer has the privilege of importing all he requires in bond.
5. It has not, for the Americans are our best buyers. 6. Cannot speak as to the profits of breeding horses. We find the best market in the United States. Of course a great many go to the North-West.
7. Now, with our railway facilities in our section, it would pay best to feed American corn and sell our peas.
8. None, so far as we are concerned, in this section. 9. Reciprocity by all means. We are not, as the N.P. has raised the spirit of opposition to us, while the other was more conciliatory.
10. It has no effect on the price of our wool selling, and we do not buy any.
11. We do not grow any, so it has the effect of making us pay more for them.
12. Indirectly the cost has been increased on all farm implements by the manufacturers' own showing, by putting less material in them, which will decrease the wear, though the quality may be as good.
13. Our woollens are mostly home-made; cottons are like the implements, we do not get the same weight for the price we did before, and we find all hardware increased in price.
14. They have not; there is a good demand for potatoes and turnips; this is owing to the failure of these crops in the States; foreign demand gives us \$1 a bag for potatoes, and 16 cents a bushel for turnips—the N.P. could not do that.
15. Speaking of this section, nearly all our young men have gone or are going to the States, and some to Manitoba; there has been no returning as yet.
16. The tendency in this section for some time is to invest in the States or Manitoba, and the exodus that is taking place has decreased. Farm lands in the meantime are below what they were in 1878.
17. The general condition of farmers have improved since 1878, owing to the great increase of foreign demand for our abundant harvests. Thanks to a kind Providence.
18. By returning to a Revenue Tariff; by creating no monopolies, such as the Syndicate, thus giving the farmer the benefit of competing lines of railways; by not legislating in favour of the manufacturer, merchant, doctor or lawyer, to the detriment of the farmer; by making a law so that money-lenders cannot charge more than 6 per cent., thus placing money within paying reach of the farmer; by decreasing representation in all our legislative bodies, thus decreasing the burdens of the farmer.

JAMES MURDOCH,  
 Reeve, Egremont, Co. Grey.

1. No.
2. The duty has raised the prices. Oats, 10 cents; rye, 25 cents; corn 10 cents; barley, 10 cents; peas, 15 cents per bushel.
3. There has been a decided improvement in the market. Wheat, 25 per cent.; no particular difference in classes.
4. Hogs are bringing \$1.50 per cwt.; hams, 2 cents per pound; lard, 2 cents; bacon, 2 cents more than under Free Trade.
5. Yes.
6. Yes, favourably. Both.
7. Yes. No.
8. Yes.
9. The farmer is better under the present Tariff.
10. The price is from 3 to 4 cents per pound higher.
11. There is none grown in this section.
12. Prices keep about the same; quality is better. All kinds of farming implements.
13. Prices are somewhat lower under the N.P.
14. Yes; there are more men employed in all branches of trade.
15. To a very great extent.
16. Yes, farm lands have increased in value, because it is more profitable to farm under the present Tariff.
17. Yes, very much improved.
18. No change required.

*General Remarks:*—The ratepayers of this district are perfectly satisfied with the workings of the National Policy and the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald.

ALBERT SPRING,  
Reeve, Draper and Oakley, Muskoka.

1. Most decidedly not.
2. Coarse grains are a better price and farmers are raising larger quantities.
3. Wheat not affected much by duty.
4. Hogs are also better price, and farmers are raising more pork.
5. The duty rather increases demand for horses at home, and markets are being opened.
6. They compare very favourably.
7. We raise all grain necessary to fatten our stock.
8. Farmers' produce is much better price now.
9. Our chances are much better under the N.P.
10. The price of wool is raised.
11. The sugar beet is grown more since the Tariff.
12. All kinds of implements are fully as cheap.
13. Are about the same.
14. We get much better prices for our farm produce, especially coarse grains.
15. All have found employment under the N.P., and wages are much higher, consequently a large emigration.
16. Farm property has increased greatly in value in the newer Provinces, and money is much cheaper.
17. We have been much benefited through the Tariff.
18. 100 years added to Sir John's leadership.

FULLARTON GIBSON,  
Farmer, Richmondville, Co. York.

1. It would not, as it would make a slaughter market of Canada.
2. It has raised the price of our peas from 80 cents to \$1.12½ cents per bushel; oats has also rose from 25 to 40 cents per bushel. It does not pay to grow rye or corn, as this section is better adapted for wheat.
3. The effect has raised wheat from 96 cents to \$1.28; we do not grow spring wheat.
4. It has raised live hogs from 4 cents to 7 cents per lb., which is the present price; dried hams, bacon and lard in proportion.
5. The increased duties on all live stock improved the price of horses and other stock, I would say 30 per cent.
6. I am convinced that the breeding of horses will pay better for some years than any other stock. Manitoba is our market.
7. A Canadian farmer can raise all the grain he requires to fatten his stock, with the exception of about one in every six hundred, who are stock farmers.
8. I don't think there is much change in vegetables; but there is a better market for poultry, butter and eggs.

9. It would be a benefit to the Canadian farmer to have Reciprocity with the United States, if we could get it on equal terms. We are in a better position now. The Americans never would have given us Reciprocity with our jug-handled policy.
10. I think there should be a Tariff on wool to keep foreign growth off our markets.
11. The Tariff has no effect here, on the cultivation of flax, tobacco or sugar beet, as we do not grow them.
12. The prices of reapers and mowers are no dearer; the price of other implements is lower and of a better quality.
13. Woollens and cottons, no change in price; hardware among farmers is cheaper, such as nails, locks, hinges, door bolts, forks, scythes, axes and shovels.
14. It has increased by the present Tariff by preventing the Americans from making a slaughter market of Canada for their surplus produce.
15. It has given thousands of our mechanics and labourers employment at higher wages and constant work; there is no class more benefited by the National Policy than this class.
16. There is an increased tendency, as money is more plentiful at lower interest. I don't see any change in the price of farm property in this locality.
17. The general condition of all classes has improved very much since 1878.
18. I don't conceive any change to improve the farmer's occupation, unless by putting a Tariff on wool.

WESLEY BUNTING,  
Farmer, Strathroy, Co. Middlesex.

1. It would be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit coarse grains free of duty, and I do not believe it would hurt the price of wheat, as Liverpool rules the price of wheat here, as well as in the United States.
2. Oats are dull of sale in this section of the country. Since the change of Tariff, formerly we had an oatmeal mill in Seaforth, but it has been removed to the States, and now there is no demand for oats. I do not know of any difference in barley or pease; rye or corn not grown.
3. No difference in price of wheat, but flour is higher in proportion to the price of wheat, than what it formerly was.
4. Pork has been ruling high this year, but the scarcity of hogs has, I believe, been the cause.
5. The duty imposed on horses cannot have increased their prices since; the United States is our principal market; cattle have increased in value since we commenced to export to the English market.
6. Horses pay well now, as there is a good demand for all kinds just now; the better class go to the United States, and the poorer class to Manitoba.
7. It would pay better to import Indian corn, as it can be grown cheaper than pease, and is better feed than barley or oats.
8. No improvement in this section of the country. 9. Most decidedly. I do not know whether we are in a better position now, or when American produce was admitted free.
10. Wool was very low in price last year. I do not recollect of it being so low for many years back.
11. No effect since none of the articles mentioned, save flax, and not much of that, are grown in this section of the country.
12. Farm implements have increased in value since the change in the Tariff, and the quality is not as good; machines of every kind are higher.
13. Cottons are higher by two or three cents per yard than what they can be bought in the United States. 14. It has neither been increased nor improved.
15. The Tariff has made no difference in regard to employment, and has not retarded emigration to the United States. More have left this section of the

country this last year for Dakota and other places in the United States than any four or five years formerly.

16. There is no increased tendency to invest in farm property, and farms have decreased greatly in value since 1878. Cause, opening up of Dakota and Manitoba.
17. The general condition of farmers has improved; the reason has been, that we have had good crops and fair prices, there being a good demand in England for all kinds of farm produce.
18. Admit agricultural implements free of duty from the United States, so that farmers can buy from whoever can make the cheapest and best implements. Admit American coarse grain, especially Indian corn, to feed cattle, as our pease are a failure, and no other grain except corn can take their place for feeding purposes.

ALEX. KERR,  
Councillor, Seaforth, Co. Huron.

1. Decidedly not. 2. It has raised the price of oats and corn, and encouraged us to raise more coarse grains. 3. Cannot see that wheat is affected by a duty.
4. It has raised the price of pork somewhat, and many are raising more hogs.
5. The duties rather increase the demand for horses at home. It shuts off the States and opens the markets in the North-West.
6. They compare favourably now. 7. We can raise all grain necessary to fatten our stock.
8. Farmers' produce is much better price since the Tariff. 9. Our chances are much better under the N. P.
10. The price of wool is raised, and farmers are encouraged to raise more sheep. There has been an instance of one farmer raising ten lambs from four ewes.
11. The sugar beet is grown more extensively. 12. All kinds of implements are fully as cheap and better. 13. All about the same.
14. We get much better prices for our farm produce, especially coarse grains.
15. The N. P. has given employment to many and wages were never so high. It has encouraged immigration to Canada.
16. Land has increased in price in the newer Provinces and money is cheaper. 17. Very materially so. 18. No changes unless an increase of Tariff on American produce.

*General Remarks:*—The majority in this section of our fair Dominion are wholly in love with the N. P., and their hopes are high in anticipation of better times, while it survives we have all felt the invigorating and vivifying influences of this great movement.

BENJAMIN WILLMOTT,  
Farmer, Richmond Hill, Co. York.

1. Think it would, in this vicinity anyway. Do not raise much wheat here. The United States is our market, and if wheat at least was free of duty we would get cheaper flour. 2. No effect.
3. Very little raised in this vicinity, hence we have to pay more for flour.
4. Has forced us to pay more for improved stock. Hams, bacon and lard do not affect us. 5. Not at all. Our market is the United States and if duty was off we would get higher prices.
6. Profitable at times. Price is regulated by the demand in the United States which is our market.
7. Would pay to import corn if duty free, and could be bought cheaper in United States than here. 8. Has improved, from the effect of outside competition, but in no way due to the N. P.

9. Most decidedly. Do not see that our position under the N. P. would give any advantages in that respect. 10. No effect here. 11. None raised.
12. Increased most assuredly—would take more space than you have allotted to specify the various articles.
13. This I consider a foolish question. The person writing this question must be a Rip Van Winkle. Everything we used has increased in price.
14. We have no home market to amount to anything. 15. Not here, I assure you. It has encouraged emigration, and has forced many to leave. It is simply a fraud.
16. No. Farm lands have decreased in value since 1878. Cause, in part, the increased tax put upon everything the farmer uses, which makes farming unprofitable. 17. Not a particle better, and in the case of the labouring classes a great deal worse than 1878.
18. Remove taxes from the necessaries of life and from the many things used by the people. Put a class of men at the head of affairs who will try and work in the interest of the country, instead of passing special Acts for the benefit of a favoured class who subscribe largely to election funds.

*General Remarks* :—The N. P. is, in my opinion, a great fraud and a delusion. With the good harvests we have had for a couple of years, if under the old Tariff, we would be in much better condition.

J. B. WATZER,  
Farmer, Wentmore, Co. Grenville.

1. Yes, because the duty does not increase the price of farm produce when and where there is a surplus, but it increases the price when and where there is a deficiency of any kind.
2. The effect of the duty on corn is very injurious to the farmers of this section, with little or no effect on oats, rye, barley or peas.
3. The effect of these duties is that flour is dearer, and as we cannot as yet grow wheat profitably here we feel this duty oppressive.
4. The effect of these duties is that pork is dearer; but as we cannot raise pork profitably without importing corn it does not benefit the farmer any.
5. No they have not. 6. There are but few horses bred here as yet; none for export.
7. No, the Canadian farmers cannot profitably raise all the grain required for fattening his stock; it would pay much better to import corn. 8. No, it is not.
9. Yes; and we are not in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty than when American produce was admitted free. 10. No good effect to the wool grower.
11. None. 12. The cost of farm implements has increased considerably under the present Tariff. 13. All woollen goods and cottons have increased in price by the Tariff, and also hardware. 14. No.
15. No, it has not, as there is a greater emigration to the United States these last three years than previously.
16. No, farm lands have decreased in price at least 25 per cent. since 1878, because the farmer has to bear the burden of nearly all the protection to other trades.
17. No. 18. The changes required in legislation are to take off all protective duties and give us as low a Revenue Tariff as possible.

JAMES S. MILLER,  
Assessor and Collector, Parry Sound.

1. No, I would think not at present without Reciprocity.
2. The effect of the duty on Indian corn has been to raise the price of our oats. As to rye, barley and peas, I think they are worth more in the States than here.
3. It has been to raise the price of these articles a little; as to spring and fall wheat I cannot say.

4. It has had the effect of increasing the price of these articles to the benefit of the Canadian farmer. We should have more duty on pork.
5. I think not, for we have a better market for horses in the United States, especially from Ontario and Quebec, the freight to Manitoba and North-West being high.
6. It is profitable to breed horses at the present time, as there is a good demand for them both in the States and Manitoba; the profits compare favourably at present in behalf of horses.
7. I think he can. I don't think it would pay to import corn under the Tariff.
8. I would suppose not, as the market for butter and eggs is better in the United States than in Canada.
9. I should think he would; I would be in favor of Reciprocity. I think we are in a better position under the present Tariff, because the States begin to feel it as much as we do.
10. In favour of the manufacturer to increase their profits.
11. I cannot say.
12. I would suppose the cost of farm implements was increased under the present Tariff, such as threshers, reaping machines, &c.
13. The manufactured woollens and cottons are increased in price by the Tariff; the raw material being admitted is in favour of the manufacturer.
14. The home market for farm produce has increased in price these few years back. I cannot say it was caused by the Tariff but by commercial improvement.
15. I think not, as there has been of late a large emigration of our industrial classes to the States.
16. I would think not, as farm lands have decreased in value these late years; caused, I suppose, by the increased emigration to Manitoba and Western States.
17. The condition of both classes has greatly improved since 1878, which I think has been caused by the improvement of trade.
18. The Dominion of Canada under one Federal Government and more power in hands of Local Councils of cities and counties.

*General Remarks*:—I think Reciprocity with the United States would be for our general benefit, and especially the lumber trade, as I understand there is a large duty on lumber going into the States; we might lose in some cases, but in general, I think we would be the gainers.

JAMES F. GRIERSON,

Reeve, Fitzroy Harbour, Co. Carleton.

1. It would be to the interest of a majority of farmers to admit Indian corn free.
2. The duty has had no effect in raising the price of grain; it might do so in the case of a large crop of oats in the States, and a small crop in Canada.
3. I can see none, as we can produce more than we can consume of both classes.
4. None that I can see.
5. I think not, as the Americans come here and give higher prices than we get at home, or the North-West.
6. It pays to breed good horses. Principal market United States.
7. It would pay better to import Indian corn if the duty was taken off.
8. It has not done so here; no improvement.
9. I think we would be benefited. The position is like a big man dictating terms to a little boy, who perforce must obey.
10. Nothing.
11. On flax nothing; tobacco and sugar beet, do not grow any.
12. Neither increased or decreased; quality not so good.
13. Cottons are higher; woollen goods the same.
14. I think the home market has not been improved by the operation of the Tariff.
15. It does not seem to give employment, as the emigration fever is and has been very high, and very few coming back.
16. The tendency is decreasing for investment in farm property since 1878, as so many are emigrating to the States and North-West.

17. The condition of the farmer is better; the crops have been better and prices higher; the short crop in England and other countries have helped the farmer in Canada.
18. You cannot legislate to help the farmer, while you protect others at their expense. All we ask is a fair field and no favours. You protect wheat, oats and barley, what good is that to us? You put a duty on corn and we pay that duty if we buy it. If you put a duty on the raw material the manufacturer must raise the price, or make it not as good, or take a smaller profit than he did before. Anything above a Revenue Tariff makes the rich man richer and the poor man poorer, and the farmer has to pay the lion's share—they are the dupes.

OLIVER SMITH,  
Ex-Councillor, Avonton, Co. Perth.

1. It would be to their interest to have all kinds of coarse grains admitted free, from the fact that we can dispose of wheat, barley, butter and cheese, and supply their place in keeping the farm in good condition. By purchasing corn and other coarse grains from the American market if they were admitted duty free.
2. The duty has practically shut out American corn from the Canadian stock feeder, a kind of grain that was largely purchased, and profitably fed to fatten cattle and dairy stock, and has not materially increased the price of other coarse grains, as our surplus finds the same market that it formerly did.
3. In this, I, as a farmer, can see no material difference, as the Old Country market is the outlet for both Canada and the United States for our wheat and flour.
4. Being a farmer making my own pork and lard I am not prepared to say; but the increased duty cannot help the farmer here, as pork is higher in the American market.
5. The increased duties on horses have not benefited us, as our best and most reliable market is the American.
6. Breeding horses at present prices is more profitable than other stock, as there is a good demand for those that are first class in the American market, and also a demand for some of an inferior class in the North-West.
7. Under ordinary circumstances it pays better to import American corn; as before stated we must have some way of returning to the soil that which is taken from it in milk or beef.
8. Poultry and butter being products of export find a market in the old country; it is not improved by the Tariff. If the Tariff has increased the population this may be the cause of the increase in price of eggs and vegetables, if any.
9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by Free Trade; and so far as the farmer is concerned our position to negotiate is unchanged by the Tariff.
10. The price of wool has been reduced since the increased Tariff.
11. Tobacco and sugar beet not cultivated in this locality; as to the effect of the Tariff on flax I am not prepared to answer.
12. Farming implements have not increased generally; ploughs may have increased slightly, and the quality is improving by greater experience.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are in most all cases, to the extent of the duty increased to the farmer, the manufacturer charges about the amount of the duty imposed as an increased profit; at best my experience is that we pay from 25 to 30 per cent. more for goods of that class that I purchased than I did before the increased Tariff. 14. It has not been improved.
15. From my own personal observation, I consider there are as many of the industrial classes going to the States as formerly.
16. There has been an increased tendency to invest capital in farm property at one time since 1873, and it arose in consequence of a reduction in the rate of interest, occasioned by money being sent into the country seeking investment.

17. They have improved, particularly that of the farmer; and the cause of the improvement is clearly due to Providence, industry and the energy of our people. ¶
18. The changes are many that might be suggested. I will mention some that occur to me: Abolishing the duty on corn, coal, woollen and cotton goods, and all coarser manufactured goods that are largely used by farmers, farm labourers and their families; imposing a duty only on finer goods and articles of luxury, and then only such amount as may be required for a Revenue Tariff.

*General Remarks*:—I have not based the foregoing from any compiled statistics, but from my own personal observation. I have consulted some good farmers on many of the questions, and answers as heretofore given would be endorsed by three-fourths of the farmers in this county of both shades of politics.

G. H. COOK,

President Agricultural Society, and ex-Warden, Co. Oxford,

1. I am of the opinion that it would not.
2. It appears to me that it has been the cause of the farmers paying more attention to raising coarse grain, the price of which has increased.
3. The only thing I know about it is, that the price is good, whatever is the cause.
4. It has increased the price very materially. 5. I think so.
6. I have paid very little attention to the raising of horses; however, I know many of our horses go to Manitoba.
7. I am of opinion farmers can raise all the coarse grain they require cheaper than to import it from the States. 8. I think so.
9. I am of opinion it would be a benefit, I think we are in a better position now.
10. Wool seems to be lower in price now, whatever is the cause.
11. There are none of those things raised in this section of the country.
12. The cost of farm implements rather decreased; quality rather better. Reapers, mowers, harrows, ploughs, &c., &c.
13. In this respect I am very much disappointed, I did expect these articles to rise in value under the Tariff, but I find I am able to purchase them rather cheaper than usual before the Tariff.
14. I am decidedly of opinion that there is an improvement in that respect.
15. I think a great improvement has taken place in that respect.
16. Farm property has rather fallen in price in this section, on account of Manitoba lands being so easily obtained.
17. There is a very marked improvement in the condition of both farmers and the labouring classes.
18. I am of the opinion that if the tariff of fees to lawyers, doctors and some other professions could be regulated so as not to bear so heavily on the farming community, it would be a good thing.

*General Remarks*:—The Tariff on the whole is working very well. I think that the Government of our country cannot do anything that would so much benefit this country as to pass a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

WM. HOWEY,

Reeve, Holland, Massie, Co. Grey.

1. No. 2. The effect has been to raise the prices on coarse grains, especially peas and barley.
3. The effect has gained for us a better price for our second-class samples.
4. The effect has increased the price of Canadian produce.
5. Yes, by all means. 6. Yes; profits compare well; United States best market for first-class horses; Manitoba for the average horse.

7. Yes, Can raise all that is required. 8. Yes. 9. I do not think he would.  
 10. I do not know. 11. No tobacco, flax or sugar beet raised in this locality.  
 12. Quality better and price lower. 13. No. 14. It has. 15. Yes.  
 16. Tendency to purchase greatly increased. 17. Wonderfully improved.  
 18. It would be to the advantage of the agriculturalists of the country if we had a better law for the importation of cattle for breeding purposes between Canada and the United States, as a great many of our farmers cannot afford to import from Europe, but could improve their herds by importing from across the lines.

SAMUEL STUBBS, J.P.,  
 Caledon, Co. Peel.

1. Would not be to the interest of the farmer to admit any kind of grain duty free.  
 2. The effect of the imposition of a duty on American Indian corn and other grains, especially on oats, rye, corn barley and peas, has been good here.  
 3. The effect produced upon the price of wheat is but little.  
 4. The effect of the increased duties on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard, the average is about double what it was before duties.  
 5. There is more demand for horses and cows than usual.  
 6. Manitoba. 7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required.  
 8. I don't think it has improved here. 9. We want no Reciprocity Treaty at present.  
 10. The Tariff has no effect on the price of wool. 11. I don't know.  
 12. The cost of farming implements increased under the present Tariff; the quality is as good. 13. Woollens and cottons have not increased, but hardware has.  
 14. It has. 15. It has given employment and has encouraged Canadians to return to this country. 16. Price of land is about the same as in 1878.  
 17. There is a great improvement both with the farmer and the labouring classes since 1878. 18. Legislate as cheap as possible.

EDWARD KING, }  
 LEONARD WAGER, } Councillors.  
 JAMES SHIELDS, Township Clerk,  
 Tamworth, Co. Lennox and Addington.

1. No. 2. Corn and oats pay us better since the new Tariff came in.  
 3. No answer. 4. The Tariff is in our favour on all these. 5. Yes. 6. Yes: Both.  
 7. Farmers can raise all they want; it pays better than to buy. 8. Yes.  
 9. Yes, Yes, with the present tariff. 10. I cannot answer this. 11. None grown here.  
 12. All farm implements are much cheaper than in 1878.  
 13. Woollen and cotton goods are both cheaper.  
 14. Yes, the next answers this. 15. Yes. 16. Yes, farm lands have increased in value. 17. Yes.  
 18. Give us cheap money, and the present Tariff, with honest industry, we can do well.

NEAL McNEILL,  
 Farmer, Jarvis, Co. Norfolk.

1. I think it would be against the interest of the Canadian farmer to admit American produce free, while their market is closed to us.  
 2. It has very much enhanced the prices of all our coarse grains.  
 3. It has given to the Canadian farmer the chance of supplying the home demand without having our markets glutted, as was the case with American wheat.  
 4. It has increased the price of live hogs, as our markets under Free Trade, were generally glutted from the Western States; ham, bacon and lard commands better prices under Protection.

5. It has improved the market price of live stock, especially horses. Our principal market for the common stock of horses is Manitoba.
6. Previous to 1878, horses were the most unprofitable stock we had, but under Protection horses are in good demand, and good prices paid. Principally for the Manitoba market.
7. The Canadian farmer can profitably raise all the grain to fatten his stock. I do not think it would be more profitable to import American corn.
8. Very much improved. 9. I think, on the whole, he would be. I think we are in a much better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. I cannot see that the Tariff has very much affected the price of wool.
11. I have no experience in the cultivation of these articles.
12. Farm implements have not increased in price and quality equally as good in reapers, mowers, ploughs and harrows.
13. I cannot see but these articles are cheaper under the present Tariff.
14. The home market has been increased, in that we have had the supply of our own market, and the home demand larger from the increased number of manufacturing industries that have been built up under the present Tariff.
15. It has done all this. 16. There is an increased tendency to invest and farm-lands have increased in value since 1878, in that farming is more profitable.
17. It has very much improved. 18. I think the best legislation is to let well enough alone.

*General Remarks* :—I was born in Canada, and am now 59 years of age, have never known the country more prosperous, or the people more contented and happy.

ROBERT BROWN,  
Reeve, Caringorm, Co. Middlesex.

1. It would not. 2. To increase the prices of all coarse grain making a steadier market, and increase the production of coarse grains. Before the Tariff, oats about 30 cents, now 35 to 40 cents; corn 40 to 45 cents, now 70 to 75 cents; rye, 45 cents, now 80 to 90 cents. Barley and pease not much grown in this locality, but in price not much difference.
3. This is a fall wheat section, the Tariff has increased the price 15 to 20 per cent., and farmers are turning their attention more to growing wheat than formerly.
4. A very beneficial effect. There is more than double the amount produced, with increased prices. A long felt grievance was that of American distillery fed pork, brought into the market, thereby depreciating the value of ours, which is a first-class article.
5. It has improved the price by giving us Manitoba and the North-West; prices are at present very high, and a very great demand; formerly the American duty of 20 per cent. effected sales very materially, but with the Canadian Tariff giving us the North-West and Manitoba, makes all right.
6. It is profitable to breed horses to a certain extent, but don't think they will compare with profits on other stock. Manitoba is the best market for good serviceable horses, but the United States and Ontario and Quebec for fancy animals.
7. They can. Our climate and soil are well suited for all kinds of coarse grains. To allow American corn to come in duty free frequently swamps our market to the great injury of the farmer. 8. Yes, decidedly.
9. No. Were a Reciprocity Treaty established, the resources of our own country would not be so well developed, we would be too much under the control of an American monopoly, both in agriculture, and more so in our manufactures, that we would soon lose our spirit of independence, whilst our National Policy is calculated to build us up and foster a spirit of self-reliance. 10. No very perceptible effect.

11. A good effect, as most of those articles can be produced, and in course of time will engage more attention than at present.
12. The cost is not increased, and the quality of the articles is more than 20 per cent. better; this has reference to agricultural implements and machinery of all kinds.
13. Woollen goods are quite as cheap as they were before the Tariff, and fully 10 per cent. better in quality. Cotton and hardware not much difference, perhaps a little lower, and very much better.
14. It has. By the Tariff protecting our markets, and by the increased number of manufactures established, giving employment to thousands of individuals, and creating a home market to supply their wants.
15. The Tariff has given encouragement to the agriculturalist and the manufacturer, creating a very great demand for labourers of every description. Men who, in 1878, could not find work of any kind are now eagerly sought for, and the best of wages willingly paid them. Many returning to Canada from the United States, much preferring their own country.
16. There is. Money is plenty and interest low, making farm property a desirable investment. Farm lands in this part of the country have advanced about 20 per cent.
17. Very much. The farmer is remunerated for the products of the land; the labourer finds plenty of work at good wages.
18. This is the hardest question on the list. On the whole, I think we have every reason to be satisfied as matters now stand. We appreciate the interest taken in the welfare of the people by those who now stand at the head of the Government and who legislate for us.

*General Remarks*:—I may say that I have consulted the feelings of the people in this neighbourhood in regard to the questions before me, and they all agree in the opinions I have endeavoured to express.

JOHN HAGGAN,  
Farmer, Grovesend, Co. Elgin.

1. No. 2. Oats created a better home market and better price; rye not cultivated in this part; corn, barley and peas same as oats.
3. No mills buying wheat here; cannot give a correct answer. Think the duty will not affect our market. 4. All in favour of the Canadian farmer.
5. By the Manitoba trade being kept for the Canadians it has increased the price of horses about one-third.
6. It is profitable to breed well bred horses. Profits will compare favourably with other stock; we can breed all we require. Our present market is Manitoba.
7. We can raise all we require and feed at a profit. 8. Improved from 20 to 25 per cent.
9. We can compete with the Americans in all branches, on the same footing. We are in a much better position to negotiate for a Reciprocity Treaty with the present Tariff. 10. Better home markets. 11. None cultivated in this section.
12. Reaping machines, mowers and ploughs, 10 per cent lower. Other implements not increased in price. The quality is equally as good.
13. Woollens about the same; cottons have not been dearer under the new Tariff. General hardware has not increased in price since 1878. Nails have been much cheaper.
14. It has been increased and improved by a good home market.
15. The Tariff has been the means of giving employment to many that would have left for the United States. Encouraged many to return.
16. Farm property of every description has increased in value in consequence of farming being more remunerative under the present Tariff.

- 
- 
17. The farming and labouring class are in a far better position than in 1878.
  18. Increase the Tariff on all home productions.

ROBERT CADE,  
Farmer, Mount Brydges, Co. Middlesex.

---

1. No; not under the present American Tariff regulation.
2. The effect has been to encourage our farmers to grow more rye, for which our land is well adapted, and to increase the price so that they can do so; the same will apply to peas, oats and barley, which have been more extensively grown since the duty has been put on corn.
3. To-day we are certain of getting the full market price for our wheat, whereas formerly millers told us they could buy wheat in the United States, delivered here, cheaper than our Canadian wheat. This applies to both fall and spring wheat. We now see very little American wheat in our neighbourhood.
4. The duty on these articles has given us a more ready market for our own produce of this nature, and the prices have been better, especially lard, which is in great demand at high prices.
5. So far as Manitoba is concerned. Yes, the rapid settlement of that Territory is creating a great demand for a certain class of horses, but the demand for heavy horses in the United States has also helped to raise the prices up to their present high pitch.
6. We find it profitable just now to breed horses at present prices than other stock; for certain classes, Manitoba, and other classes, United States—about equally divided.
7. Yes; for the cattle that he ordinarily fattens. There are only a few rich stock-raisers who require corn, owing probably to their land not being suitable for growing coarse grains, and who have very fine cattle that are to be shipped to the English market, and this year even they cannot buy corn were the duty not on it.
8. Yes, decidedly; we have a ready sale for anything in this line that we may take to market, and at increased prices.
9. Yes; that is, provided it was Reciprocity, and we have now something to give them in return for anything we may ask; whereas, formerly we could not say so.
10. Cannot say if the Tariff has altered the price or not, but our Canadian fine wool has increased in price.
11. In regard to this we can see little change. 12. Reapers, mowers, seed-drills and hay rakes are cheaper and the quality is equally as good. Ploughs and other implements are certainly not any dearer.
13. No. 14. Yes; the factories in towns increasing and giving steady employment to more hands create an increased demand for farm produce; and the working classes being in a better position to buy our produce, as they can all work full time now.
15. Yes. 16. Yes. 17. Yes. 18. We are not aware of any changes that are necessary, as we consider that a farmer who works his farm properly requires nothing more than the present prices for his produce to make it both desirable and profitable.

JACOB WALL,  
JOHN E. SCHULTZ,  
Farmers, Petersburg, Co. Waterloo.

---

1. No, corn excepted. 2. The effect of the present duty on Indian corn has raised the price of oats, corn and peas 20 per cent.
3. We received a better price for wheat last year than was realized for some years previous, but the present duty on American wheat had little to do in increasing the price.
4. Last year the price of pork was 25 per cent. higher than in 1880.
5. Horses have been in great demand at good prices lately, and many have been sent to the North-West.
6. For myself I cannot say that breeding horses has been as profitable as other stock, sheep have always paid me the best. I find the best market in the United States.
7. No, it would be better for those who keep and fatten stock to import American corn if the present duty was removed. 8. Slightly improved.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty, so far as barley, corn, wheat and live stock are concerned, is just what farmers want. Certainly we are in a better position now to negotiate such a Treaty, than when American produce was free of duty.
10. Slightly increased the price of long wool, and the price now paid for fine wool is much better than in 1880.
11. None raised in this part. 12. I can find no great difference in the price now paid for agricultural implements, and the price I have in past years paid for the same.
13. Hardware, and a few things required by the farmer are now higher than in 1879 and 1880, for the other articles mentioned, I cannot discover any change in price.
14. The home market is improved by the present Tariff to a limited extent. St. Catharines (our market) is slow to encourage manufacturers, but many are now returning from the States to start works in the city that will give employment to many.
15. Yes, many are now getting employment at good wages that, for some years, were nearly always out of work. Cannot say as to any returning from the States.
16. Not much at present. No great demand for farming lands except for choice lots for fruit raising.
17. The condition of the farmer is greatly improved, and the labouring classes now are getting higher wages than farmers can afford to pay in event of a bad wheat crop.
18. I cannot recommend any change at present except as a breeder or feeder of stock. I think it would be a great boon to farmers who feed all the coarse grain they raise to their stock if the duty on American Indian corn was cancelled. Of course if a Reciprocity Treaty could be made with the United States, we would have a far better price than we now get for wheat, wool, barley and live stock generally.

FRANK MYATT,

Reeve, St. Catharine's, Co. Lincoln.

1. No. 2. Oats, price higher and steady throughout the season; rye maintains a high figure, and is now worth growing; corn, increased price has induced increased acreage, with the prospect of the crop becoming a leading one in Western Ontario.
3. Spring wheat but little grown; fall wheat, the price has increased here from 5 to 8 cents a bushel regardless of the market price at Toronto, the farmer getting within a cent or two of the daily quoted price on change;—reason, increased local demand.
4. An increased demand at higher prices, all produced being required for local consumption. The competition from Buffalo being materially lessened, an additional cent of duty would block Buffalo without injuring the consumer.

5. Yes, the demand for horses and cattle for the North-West has raised the prices here very considerably, and further, there is now no difficulty in getting a customer.
6. Farming here is very varied (mixed husbandry) and hence only a few horses are raised, but these are mostly good ones and bring high prices, the best going to the U. S. and the remainder to Manitoba.
7. Yes to the first question, and he will raise all he requires very soon. He's got started and will not stop. A repeal of the corn duty would dishearten him.
8. Yes. We have no competition, the increased activity in all manufacturing concerns has so affected the produce market that the supply does not exceed the demand, and hence good prices and ready sale.
9. A very knotty question. We are certainly in a better position to treat with the Americans, we now having something to give in return for what we ask. We are doing well, and see increased prosperity in the near future, why then risk a change? I, for one, am content to let well alone.
10. Don't know. 11. None grown here.
12. The cost of farm implements is not increased and in some cases certainly lessened, as in reaping and mowing machines, ploughs and drills.
13. Have not noticed a change. 14. Improved by the profitable employment of the former surplus population in manufacturing concerns of one kind or another, leaving no idlers; every man can earn a good days wages and hence is an able and ready buyer of food. 15. Yes, we hear very little of any going to the United States.
16. The influx of capital seeking investment and the inability of the capitalist to obtain the high rates of interest formerly exacted by money lenders, has caused capitalists to turn their attention to land. This however has been to some extent checked recently by the mania for farm and village lots in the Great Lone Land. Farms have increased in value as a necessary consequence of the general improved state of the country, they are readily sold and often for cash.
17. Some farmers are now lenders of money instead of borrowers; the labourer is fully employed at materially advanced wages (say 25 per cent.) Four years ago the country swarmed with able-bodied beggars, it would be difficult to find one now.
18. In this portion of the country situated between lakes Ontario and Erie, with a climate and soil adapted to the production of fruits, perhaps not surpassed on the continent, it is desirable that this young industry should be fostered in every possible way. It is marvellous to witness the increase during the past three years, in the production of peaches, grapes, apples, pears and small fruits, in this favoured spot.

*General Remarks* :—The increase is dated from and owes its impetus to the National Policy of 1879. The industry would be aided by an addition to the duty on most of the fruits. No danger to the consumer for the production has no limit. The capital already embarked, and that now about to enter, will in a very short time give employment to increased hundreds. A canning factory is now about being built which will give employment to 200 hands the year round,—during the winter season cans and packing cases will be manufactured.

SAMUEL BERRIMAN,  
Stamford, Co. Welland:

1. No. 2. Raised the price of oats 12 cents, also peas 10 cents.
3. Spring wheat 10 cents up. 4. Hams and bacon are higher than ever before in my recollection. 5. Yes. 6. Yes, as good. Manitoba. 7. Yes. No. 8. Yes.
9. No. 10. None. 11. None grown. 12. Decreased. All farming implements are cheaper and better. 13. Woollens and cottons are, if anything, cheaper; hardware greatly reduced.

14. Yes, by preventing wheat, oats, and hay coming in by boat from Michigan and Minnesota. 15. Yes, wages are higher than ever before.  
 16. No. Decreased, every person going to Manitoba. 17. Yes.  
 18. A bonus of \$10,000 to every man in the Dominion who has cleared a bush farm and is still living on it.

*General Remarks*:—Tariff giving general satisfaction in this neighbourhood.

ROBT. McNAUGHT,

Reeve, Sarawak, Co. Grey.

1. No. 2. I think they all have brought a better price.  
 3. All brought a better price. 4. The effect has been better prices. 5. Yes.  
 6. Think it pays to breed horses. Heavy horses take best in United States; light horses take best in North-West. 7. Can raise all he wants. 8. Yes.  
 9. Do not think it will be any benefit to us. 10. No answer. 11. No answer.  
 12. Just as good. No increase in price, if anything lower. 13. No increase.  
 14. By better prices being paid. 15. Yes. 16. Farms are fetching a far better price.  
 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

JAMES POTTER,

Berlin, Co. of Waterloo.

1. Yes, it would bring it into competition with Canadian grain and raise the price of the latter.  
 2. It has caused a large quantity of coarse grain to be fed, and did not realize to the farmer what he could have sold it on the market for, which he would have done only for the duty on corn.  
 3. Do not think there has been any particular effect, only to lower the price.  
 4. Cannot say. 5. No. 6. Yes Manitoba. 7. No. Yes. 8. No.  
 9. Yes. No, a worse position. 10. To lower the price. 11. Cannot say.  
 12. Yes, slightly; not so good. 13. Yes, all kinds. 14. No. 15. No, no.  
 16. No. Decreased. 17. The last two good harvests have helped the farmer greatly. The labourers condition has not improved. 18. A reduction of duties.

THOS. FAIRBAIRN,

Reeve, Teeswater, Co. Bruce.

1. No. 2. An increase in price. 3. Improved price of fall and spring wheat.  
 4. Greatly increased the price. 5. Yes.  
 6. First-class horses pays equal to any other stock for Manitoba.  
 7. Farmers can raise all the grain they need, and do better than to send their money to the States to buy corn. 8. Yes.  
 9. I think the farmers would be benefited by Reciprocity, and that we are in a much better position to obtain it than under Free Trade.  
 10. Improved the price. 11. Increased amount of flax raised.  
 12. No increase in price; much better quality. 13. No. 14. Yes. 15. Yes.  
 16. Yes, there is a great increase in the desire to invest in farm property at improved prices, since 1878. 17. Greatly improved.  
 18. No change in legislation is required to make it profitable, and that is the way to make it desirable.

MATHEW CANNING,

Reeve, Islington, Co. York.

1. It would probably be better. Some things we cannot grow profitably, and if Western grain were carried through Canada it would make export brisker. Witness, we used to sell butter to United States to ship to Liverpool, now we make enough to ship direct.
2. Oats and peas have probably sold higher ; rye has doubtless felt it some, but the demand in Germany has been the great cause of an unprecedented boom in rye ; barley unchanged.
3. Wheat not much raised in this section, more than two-thirds of the people buy their bread.
4. Live hogs and lard have sold well of late. Do not know why. Is there a duty on Western pork to cause it ? 5. Decidedly not ; to any appreciable extent.
6. We do. Favorably. United States.
7. We fatten principally on sour milk, grain to finish ; it is considered unprofitable to fatten exclusively with grain.
8. No ; England and United States buy our poultry, eggs and butter.
9. He would. Cannot say whether we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty or not. Think we will get it in course of time.
10. Not much posted in the wool business ; prices with us have not varied much ; we make it our object to raise lambs for export trade.
11. Not cultivated in this section. 12. Farm implements have been steadily decreasing in price during the last ten years ; probably too high yet.
13. Do not think the Tariff has materially affected the price of these goods.
14. It has not. 15. It has not had such an effect.
16. There is an opposite tendency. Farm lands have very sensibly decreased in value since 1878 ; because so many are selling out and moving West.
17. It has ; especially farmers.
18. Opening up foreign markets and increasing home consumption.

*General Remarks* :—This circular was given to me by our Reeve, James Dickey, Esq., with the request to answer the questions, according to my convictions and observations, and I have tried to do so, as it relates to this part of Eastern Ontario. Perhaps you will write me down a "Grit." Well, so be it. However, I am a "Free-Trader." I do not even approve of a "Revenue Tariff." Direct taxation is a simpler and less expensive mode of providing a revenue.

GEO. C. TRACY, J. P.,  
Farmer and Township Clerk, Gallingertown, Co. Dundas.

1. It would be a great benefit to the farmers in Canada if American corn was admitted free, and it would at least do us no injury to allow all American grain to come in free, for the reason that stock can be fed cheaper on corn than any other grain, and their other grain could not affect our market, as we have a surplus.
2. Rye and corn are not grown here ; oats are cheaper now than before 1878 ; our surplus barley is shipped to the United States, therefore the Tariff could not affect it. The bug has done more for the peas than the Tariff.
3. None whatever. Liverpool rules our wheat and flour market. 4. We ship hogs, hams and bacon to the United States, and I cannot see how the Tariff would affect them.
5. Our market has been, and is now, the United States and Great Britain. The home market as yet is not equal to the supply.
6. Breeding heavy horses is profitable ; they command a ready sale and high prices in the American market.
7. It would pay better to import corn. We formerly got  $1\frac{1}{2}$  bushels of corn for one of peas, and the former is almost as good as the latter.
8. We ship these articles to the American market ; this we have done for years, therefore the Tariff could not affect them.

9. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would benefit the farmer and all classes; a high tariff hinders commerce. The answer to the second part depends on how the Americans look at the question.
10. Wool was as low last season as ever it was generally.
11. Flax has been about the usual price—\$12 per ton—ever since the interest began here. Tobacco and sugar beet are not grown.
12. Improvements about the normal price, but much lighter and not so durable.
13. Woollens increased from 20 to 25 per cent.; cottons about 10 per cent.; nails and tools fully 30 per cent.
14. No. When foreign markets rise, ours rise; when they fall, ours fall.
15. Good crops in Canada and bad crops in the Old Country has given us high prices and good times here; but emigration from these parts to the United States has been larger during the past few years than ever before.
16. Farm property is very low, chiefly through so many selling out and emigrating to the United States and Manitoba.
17. They have during the past two years; the good crops has improved the farmers, and emigration has improved the labouring class, as they are getting scarce here.
18. I candidly believe that we would be better with Free Trade, and if we cannot get that, give us a Revenue Tariff such as would be sufficient to carry on the affairs of the country judiciously.

*General Remarks:*—The Tariff has not increased the price of anything which the farmer produces, but it has increased the price of nearly everything he has to buy, therefore it injures him. We have had two good crops, and in Britain they have had bad ones, therefore we get high prices, and times are good with us at present; but these good times are not due to the Tariff, as it cannot make crops good here and bad in Britain. These answers given are in accord with the opinions of a large number of the farmers in this neighborhood, of both political parties.

GEORGE FRAME,

Deputy Reeve, Sebringville, Co. Perth.

1. I think it would be in the interests of the farmers to leave the duty as it is.
2. To make a better market and give us a better price.
3. In my opinion it has given us control of our own markets, and in consequence a better price. 4. In 1878 I sold live hogs for 3 cents per lb., in 1881, 6½ cents.
5. In my opinion there is no doubt but it has. 6. I don't breed horses.
7. I think it is far better to raise his own grain. 8. I think it has.
9. I think it would. Better. 10 and 11. No answer.
12. Decreased. Waggons, reapers, mowers, rakes, &c.
13. I think, taking the quality into consideration, the price is lower. 14. It has.
15. It has. 16. There is. Increased considerably. 17. It is.
18. I don't think there is any great necessity for any particular legislation at present.

*General Remarks:*—Farmers have never done better in this section of the country than they are doing now. Reformers and Conservatives all think Protection just the thing in a business point of view. Reformers don't like it politically.

J. R. REID,

First Deputy Reeve, Lynedoch, Co. Norfolk.

1. No, it would not. 2. Duty on Indian corn has improved the price of oats, rye and corn; barley and pease are not grown here as a market crop.
3. The duty imposed on wheat and flour has given us a better grade of flour, and a better price for wheat.
4. It has given us a home market and stimulated the production of pork in our own country. 5. Most decidedly.

6. Yes I do, and find profits equally as good as upon other stock. The market in this section is divided between United States and Manitoba.
7. I know of no Canadian farmer but can grow grain to fatten his stock to better advantage than buying American corn.
8. Yes, particularly vegetables. 9. I hardly think it would be at the present time, but consider the position to negotiate for such a Treaty decidedly better with the present Tariff.
10. I am not prepared to answer fully, but I believe the Tariff to be a benefit to Canadian wool growers. 11. I am not acquainted with any of these industries.
12. I do not think the price of farm implements has increased owing, I consider, to the competition of Canadian manufacturers. Quality equally as good. I include all farm implements.
13. I do not feel fully competent to answer this question from actual knowledge, but I do not think the Tariff has increased the price on anything excepting cottons and carpets, which I would attribute to a lack of manufacturing capacity:
14. I think so decidedly by protecting farmers in their home markets.
15. It certainly has. 16. There is. Farm lands have increased in value owing, I believe, to the protection given to the farmer. 17. Yes, very much.
18. I consider it highly necessary that an agricultural college should be established for the benefit of the farmers sons and others, and also that agricultural chemistry should be taught in the public schools throughout the Dominion, which I believe would have a tendency to do away with the prejudice that now exists against farming.

*General Remarks* :—The Tariff on fruit I consider a very judicious act for the country, and trust the Government will continue the same. It has already caused many enterprising men to engage in the business, and has caused that line of industry to receive a large amount of attention which it otherwise would not have. I firmly believe if continued it will have a tendency to cause the Province of Ontario to become one of the finest fruit growing countries in America, and that it will give employment to a large number of persons who otherwise would leave the country.

J. STEELE,  
Fouthill, Co. Monck.

1. No. 2. 15 cents per bushel on oats in favour of the farmer. The administration of the Honourable Alex. Mackenzie destroyed the peas to a certain extent, but of late years they are getting better.
3. 35 cents per bushel on wheat in favour of the farmer.
4. \$3 per hundred in favour of the farmer in this section of the country. 5. Yes.
6. It is not so profitable to breed horses as horned cattle; our best horses go to the United States.
7. As I remarked in a previous question that since the Honourable Alex. Mackenzie went out of power peas were getting better, I think it would be as well to leave the duty on the American corn for another year, for it is my opinion the bug is going to leave altogether. 8. Yes. 9. I am not prepared to say.
10. No answer. 11. Not raised in this section.
12. About the same as they were before the Tariff. 13. Decreased considerably.
14. Yes, by imposing a duty on the American wheat. 15. Yes.
16. The emigration to Manitoba has had a tendency to decrease the value of farm lands here.
17. Yes; farmers in this section of the country are happy and principally out of debt.
18. To encourage emigration to this country, and to remain in this country and settle in Ontario. Farm labourers are very scarce, and the wages they ask is more than the farmer can afford to pay; and servant girls are also very scarce.

CAPT. B. DIGMAN,  
Sable, Co. Middlesex.

1. No. Much better as we are.
  2. Oats, corn and peas, dearer, as American corn and oats are kept out of our market.
  3. All kinds of wheat 5 to 7 cents per bushel dearer. I came to the above conclusions by comparing our prices with Liverpool quotations.
  4. All kinds of hog products dearer.
  5. Never knew good horses selling as well as this season. Cause: good demand for Manitoba, and plenty of money to pay for them.
  6. Yes, it pays better to breed 'good horses than any other animals'; but all good stock pays well to raise.
  7. We are well able to grow all the grain required for feeding stock. Corn and pease grown here and are better than any grain that we can import.
  8. Yes, the towns are increasing in population so rapidly, causing the demand much better than formerly, so, better prices.
  9. Do not want Reciprocity, but we are in a much better position to negotiate than formerly. I would have no objection to a fair exchange of some American products for our barley. 10 and 11. Not able to express an opinion.
  12. Farm implements cheaper and much better quality than formerly.
  13. Do not know, but we have to pay about the same at the stores as far as I can judge.
  14. Yes, we now supply our own mechanics that are well paid, and as a class do not hoard up their money.
  15. Yes, the Tariff now in force enables manufacturers to pay good wages, and all hands now employed that are willing to work.
  16. Good farms will never go begging in Ontario, yet Manitoba cheap lands will lessen the demand here.
  17. Yes, never so prosperous in my recollection.
  18. Nothing. Give us our own markets for ourselves and that is all that we require.
- General Remarks* :—Do not lessen the duty on imports on anything that we can produce ourselves, and our present prosperity is almost certain to continue.

JAMES MARR,

President of McGillivray Agricultural Society, Co. Middlesex.

1. Yes, we want corn to feed.
  2. It shut it out, and advanced the price of oats and peas a little. 3. No change.
  4. Can't see that it done us any good, as the advance was in cured meats, giving the packer the benefit. 5. No, very few go West to be sold.
  6. Yes; better than any other, unless sheep. In the States.
  7. No, we want corn to feed if we can get it as cheap as we used to get it.
  8. No, we are exporting. 9. Yes. 10. No use. 11. No effect.
  12. When the producer has to pay more for the material he must charge more, or have less profit; all are good.
  13. On these goods the consumer pays the duty. 14. No; but oats and peas.
  15. No; there is more going every year, and very few returning.
  16. No, diminished; the cost of living increased.
  17. No; but on account of labourers being scarce wages are now higher.
  18. A liberal Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.
- General Remarks* :—No Prohibitory duty, nothing but what is really necessary for revenue purposes.

DENNIS SCULLY,

Councillor, Downeyville, Co. Victoria.

1. No. 2. Has improved the price of coarse grains of all kinds.
3. Has no doubt affected the price somewhat on account of the duty, but home consumption has had a great effect on the price of grain and flour.

4. On live hogs has increased more than the duty; on dried hams, bacon and lard has increased very materially, and encouraged the raising of pork.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, favourably; formerly our market for such stock was the United States, but now the opening up of Manitoba by the Syndicate, it undoubtedly furnishes us with the best market on account no doubt of the absence of duty.
7. Yes. No, inasmuch as we can raise all coarse grains required for fattening purposes; the raising of coarse grains encourages the rotation of crops.
8. Somewhat. 9. Yes. Yes.
10. Affects it slightly, inasmuch as woollen goods comes in competition with cotton goods. 11. It has encouraged the cultivation of these articles.
12. It has decreased the price and improved the quality, as we have now more home-competition. 13. On the average no higher.
14. Yes, very materially, on account of having more consumers.
15. Most decidedly so. 16. Yes, on account of cheap money, and it being a safe investment. Has decreased on account of the exodus to the North-West.
17. Undoubtedly so. 18. As a rule farmers want more protection, for pork and wool especially.

*General Remarks* :—The National Policy has undoubtedly been in the interests of the agricultural community.

W. H. HILL,

Farmer, Secretary of Emily Agricultural Society, Omamee, Co. Victoria.

1. It would not; it is better to have a duty on all farm produce.
2. Our prices are fully as good on coarse grains, oats, rye, corn, barley and pease, since the duty was imposed.
3. The duty imposed on flour, fall and spring wheat, caused a higher price in the Canadian market.
4. The effect has been good. The prices of these articles are much improved. The American farmers cannot crowd our markets with pork as they formerly did.
5. They have. The prices of horses and of other live stock has been improved, and many of our good horses are bought for Manitoba.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, and will pay as well as any other stock. Some are bought by Americans, but the greater number for Manitoba.
7. He can, and it will pay much better than to import American corn.
8. It is; we have a better market than we had any time previous, to the Tariff taking effect, for those articles.
9. I do not think a Reciprocity Treaty would benefit us. We are now in a better position to negotiate a treaty with the present Tariff, than when American produce was admitted free.
10. The effect will be good, when the manufactories in Canada now in course of erection will be in operation.
11. I am ignorant as to the effect of the Tariff on these articles, as they are scarcely cultivated here.
12. There is no noticeable change in the price of farm implements under the present Tariff, the quality is as good now as before the duty was imposed.
13. There is no increase in the price of woollens, cottons or hardware in common use amongst the farmers.
14. It has been much improved by the operation of the Tariff. The imposed duties on American farm produce prevents the sale thereof in Canadian markets with profit.
15. It certainly has, and I have known many artisans and labourers, since the Tariff came into effect, who have returned from the United States and told me, they could do better in Canada.
16. There is not. Farm lands have decreased a little in value. The decrease may be imputed to the great number of farms sold, and offering for sale, by persons who are going to Manitoba.

17. It undoubtedly is; the only difficulty we farmers have to contend with, is the exorbitant hire that farm hands now require. They are scarce at any rate of wages.
18. I really believe there can be no better change made to render agriculture a more desirable or profitable occupation.

*General Remarks* :—I have been often present at the discussion of the within queries amongst farmers, and am satisfied that nine out of ten of them would freely admit that the N. P. has been a great benefit to all classes of Canadians. There are only a few who think otherwise; these are persons led by party spirit. The last general election clearly shows how much the people wished for the change. The longer it works, the better satisfaction it will give.

WM. LEHANE, J. P.,  
Farmer, Downeyville, Co. Victoria.

1. Not unless they give us equal rights. 2. It has had a tendency to raise the price of oats, 5 cents per bushel; rye, 10 cents; corn, 20 cents; barley, 15 cents; peas, 10 cents.
3. The price of these articles has not been materially affected.
4. We sold live hogs for \$6 per hundred last fall, under the old Tariff we sold for about the same dressed. 5. Think they have.
6. Raising good horses pays better profits here than other stock generally. Our principal market is in the United States.
7. It pays better to raise it here. 8. It has. 9. Reciprocity established upon a fair basis would be desirable. I think we are in a better position to deal with them now, as we have shown them we can live and prosper without it.
10. To discourage farmers from raising it.
11. These are not cultivated to any extent in this vicinity.
12. Decreased, particularly mowing machines, which we buy now for \$50 and \$60, just as good as those we used to pay \$75 to \$100 for before the imposition of the Tariff. 13. No perceptible change in these articles.
14. It has. By protecting the industries of the country, thereby shutting out the surplus of American produce that was always sure to find its way into our market when admitted free. 15. Think it has.
16. There certainly is; land has increased in value about \$10 per acre under the National Policy influenced by the increased prices of produce.
17. Very much. 18. Impose a duty of 10 cents per pound on American wool.

J. D. JOHNSON,  
Mayor, St. Thomas, Miranda, Co. Missisquoi.

1. No. 2. It has raised the price of oats, rye and corn, and has encouraged the raising of coarse grain, and thereby gives the farmer the benefit of rotation of crops. 3. I cannot say that prices are affected.
4. It encourages the raising and fattening of our own hogs, and gives us the benefit of a home market.
5. We think it does, for we have the privilege of selling our horses in Manitoba; without duty the market would be supplied from the United States.
6. Yes; this year our market was Manitoba, formerly it was the United States.
7. Yes. It pays better to raise our own. 8. Very little change.
9. With the exception of barley we think not, and if malt houses were erected we think not entirely. We think we are in a better position to obtain Reciprocity. 10. It gives us our own market.
11. Not cultivated in this section. 12. Decreased in prices and better quality.
13. Unchanged. 14. Home market benefited by the Tariff. 15. We think it has.

16. We think that the Tariff has increased the price of land, but the emigration to the North-West has reduced it to about the same as it was before. 17. Yes.  
18. If possible encourage the erection of malting and smelting houses, and we think that we should be the most happy and contented people in the world.

ALLEN OLIVER,

Farmer, Napanee, Co. Lennox.

1. It would not. 2. It has increased the price of oats, rye and corn.  
3. It has increased the price of our wheat. 4. Three years ago I got  $4\frac{1}{2}$  cents for my pork, this year I got  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents by the hog.  
5 and 6. I cannot say as regards horses; I do not breed them, but horses in this section never were so dear.  
7. Yes, we can; it does not pay to fatten stock and have to import your feed.  
8. Three years ago the average price of butter was 14 cents, last year it was 17 cents; and eggs and vegetables are a better price and in more demand.  
9. Yes, if it was equitable; and the prospects are better now.  
10. It has a good effect, but it ought to be higher.  
11. I only cultivate beets for feeding purposes. 12. Cheaper.  
13. I find cottons a trifle higher, but it is the price of the raw material that makes that. 14. Yes.  
15. I do not hear of a single one going to the States, but there are several young men who have returned.  
16. Yes; there are great changes in our township, and all obtain increased prices.  
17. Yes, and labour never was so high or scarce.  
18. For railroads to be compelled to carry our produce as cheap as they do through freight.

JOSEPH MUMBY,

Ex-Roeve, Dunnville, Co. Haldimand.

1. The duty on American produce does not affect the price of our grains in an ordinary year. In a year of scarcity; from failure of crops it would increase the price; but as farmers themselves are usually purchasers in such years, while it benefited some it would be injurious to others.  
2. No doubt it has increased the price of corn, very little of which has been used lately; many found it profitable to sell their coarse grains, and buy American corn for feeding purposes; foreign markets control the price of barley, pease, &c.; the duty makes no difference, except in times of scarcity.  
3. Wheat buyers in this part of the country are governed by the English markets; I am not aware that the duties have had any effect.  
4. These articles are all selling at a high price just now; I cannot say what effect the increased duties have had upon the market.  
5. The principal buyers this year are Americans (especially for horses); working oxen and breeding stock are being sent to Manitoba; it is difficult to say what effect increased duties can have on the prices at present.  
6. It is profitable to breed horses at present prices; usually there is more profit in breeding cattle since the opening up of the English trade. Our best buyers are the Americans.  
7. I am engaged to some extent in fattening cattle for the English market; pease are the principal grain used, and is a better feed than corn, but quite frequently it paid better to sell pease and buy corn, excepting in a few counties where corn is grown; the free importation of corn would be an advantage.  
8. Not in this part of the country. 9. Yes; many think the present Tariff places us in a better position, and others hold the contrary opinion.

10. I do not know ; the present price of wool is very low. 11. I cannot say—none grown here.
12. I have not purchased implements lately ; I do not think there is much change. Steel is being substituted for iron, making the implement lighter.
13. I have not had time to make enquiries. I cannot say.
14. I do not think the Tariff has anything to do with it. When there is a good foreign demand our markets are good, and when the foreign markets are poor, ours follows suit.
15. The only class of which I have a personal knowledge is farm labourers ; very few of them left now ; we are looking to new arrivals as our only hope.
16. No ; farm lands have decreased in value ; one farm near here, valued at \$12,000 four years ago, is now offered at \$8,500, and not sold. The Tariff makes no difference ; the decrease is caused by the large number who are selling out and going to Manitoba,
17. Farmers are generally prosperous, having had good crops, and the failure of the crops elsewhere has given us good prices.
18. In a country like this there is no such thing as practically protecting the farmer, as the price of nearly everything he produces is fixed by circumstances over which the Legislature has no control. In exceptional years, the price of some kinds of farm produce may be increased by duties ; that is when there is not enough to supply the home market, but I never knew such a time in which the farmers themselves were largely represented among the buyers. Under these circumstances all the Legislature can do is to allow him to buy in the cheapest market.

CHARLES DRURY,

President Agricultural and Arts Association of Ontario,  
Reeve, Oro, Crown Hill, Co. Simcoe.

1. Corn is the only kind of grain that comes in close competition, as we export more of any kind of grain than we import.
2. Corn has been increased in price, about equal to the amount of duty ; barley has not been affected, nor any other kind of grain to any extent.
3. Not any in this western section, as the millers have the advantage to cover everything by grinding in bond.
4. Pork has been higher, but whether prices have been ruled by scarcity or not I do not know. I think hams have been higher, as the markets get cleaned out in summer, and we have to import from the States.
5. Horses are very high ; but it is my impression that the Americans have no horses to spare, as they are also buyers in our market.
6. I think it pays to keep good horses. Some of the highest priced horses have been shipped to Philadelphia, from Chatham, about two weeks since.
7. The counties bordering on Lake Erie can raise all the corn necessary for their own consumption, and perhaps more ; but I think the duty on corn too low. I think Canada can raise all the coarse grain required. 8. Not to my knowledge.
9. I think the country would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I am unable to say whether we are in a better position under the new Tariff or the old.
10. It has reduced the price of wool, and also reduced the number of sheep, as I find that T. K. Taylor & Co., of Chatham, only purchased 60,000 lbs. in 1881, instead of 200,000 lbs. as formerly, 11. I have no knowledge.
12. I think they are increased in price under the new Tariff ; the quality is the same.
13. Woollen goods about the same ; cotton goods a little higher ; rubber goods 20 per cent. higher ; hardware from 10 to 20 per cent. higher, and the quality not so good, especially nails.

14. Prices have been higher, but, with the exception of corn, the Tariff has had nothing to do with prices, as wheat is ruled by Liverpool markets; and beans are shipped to the States as well as barley.
15. I am unable to say; not to my knowledge.
16. At present land is lower than one year ago, owing to so many farmers moving to Manitoba and the North-West. 17. I think there is a general improvement.
18. One change wanted is to place a duty on all wools, and increase the duty on corn, hides and leather, as these commodities are such that we import more than we export.

*General Remarks*:—I am of the opinion that on the whole the farmers get very little direct benefit from the Tariff, still I am in favour of the Tariff until the Americans give us Reciprocity.

JOHN WRIGHT,  
Reeve, Dover, Chatham, Co. Kent.

1. I don't think it would be.
2. On the whole the prices are better on almost all kinds of coarse grain, especially corn. No doubt the Western States can produce corn cheaper than we can, but I have been informed that it is not as good as ours for fattening purposes. 3. I am not prepared to give an answer to this question.
4. The average price is certainly better.
5. Yes, very much; horses are at least 25 per cent. higher now than four years ago.
6. Yes. I think there is more profit in raising "good" horses than any other stock. Our principal market is Manitoba.
7. Yes he can. It would not pay better to buy American corn. Our farmers were never in the habit of buying American grain unless there was a failure of crops. 8. I think they have.
9. I am not sure that he would be. We are most undoubtedly in a better position to negotiate for a Treaty with the Tariff than without it. If the Americans had our market, it is quite certain they would not trouble themselves about finding a market for us.
10. I think wool has improved some in price, but it is low yet.
11. I am not prepared to answer this question as there is little or none of either raised in this county.
12. They have decreased in cost; the quality is as good. Such as reapers, mowers, forks, spades, ploughs, &c., are as cheap if not cheaper.
13. I don't think there is much difference in the prices now and four years ago.
14. I think it has improved. Lumbermen purchase more coarse grains from us after the fall market for shipping wheat has closed. Millers buy from us in place of going to the States to buy an inferior quality of wheat.
15. It has. Every class of labourers find ready employment and demand good wages. There is ready employment for every one who is worthy and willing to work.
16. There is. Farm lands have increased in value since 1878. There has been more business done in the way of buying and selling land in Essex in the last three years than in five preceding years.
17. Yes, there has been a marked improvement. Pauperism has almost disappeared in our township.
18. Since the change of policy in regard to tobacco has taken place, I am not prepared to say that any change in legislation is needed just now.

*General Remarks*:—If it was not for the party feeling that has been stirred up by leading politicians of strong prejudices, we would never hear a word of complaint among the farmers. All seem well satisfied with the price they get for their produce, and also with the price they pay for what they purchase.

PETER WRIGHT,  
Reeve and Farmer, Oxley, Co. Essex.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculturalists. It would not be fair trade to allow the produce of the United States to come into Canada free of duty, while Canadian produce has to pay duty going into the United States.
  2. Indian corn entering into competition with other coarse grains as food. The duty has raised the price of corn, oats, rye and peas.
  3. It has had the effect of raising the price of red wheat. White wheat used to bring the highest price, now red wheat brings the highest price.
  4. There are more hogs raised and fattened now and bring a higher price.
  - 5 and 6. A large number of inferior horses are bought and sent to Manitoba, thus enabling the farmer to hold his better class of horses for which, if he sells them, he will have higher prices. The better class generally go to the United States.
  7. It pays the farmer to raise his own corn where the soil is favourable; where the soil is more favourable for oats, the higher prices obtained for them enables the farmer to purchase his corn as profitably now as before the duty was placed on that article, thus giving the farmers living on lighter soils a better chance. 8. The farmers chances of successfully dealing with these articles are improved by the imposition of duty.
  9. If Reciprocity can be obtained without interfering with the building up of a home market, then let us have it. 10 and 11. No answer.
  12. The price is not increased. There is a great deal of improvement in farm implements, such as reapers, mowers, horse-rakes, ploughs, cultivators, seed drills, &c. 13. I do not think these articles have increased in price.
  14. Yes, increased and improved. The labouring classes being better paid for their labour they live better. 15. No answer.
  16. So many farmers are selling their farms and going to Manitoba and the North-West, it would be difficult to state what effect the Tariff has on the price of farm lands, for some are selling low because they think they have better chances of making money in the North-West.
  17. It has improved, the farmers being enabled to pay higher wages. 18. No answer.
- General Remarks*:—The National Policy has been a great benefit to this country. Everything we farmers have to dispose of bring fair prices, and money is cheaper than formerly. If we had to pay a little more for our supplies, which I do not think is the case, we would be much better off under the N.P.

E. M. CRYSLER,  
Farmer, Lynedoch, Co. Norfolk.

1. None. 2. It has raised the price of oats and peas, and damaged barley; rye and corn not grown.
3. It has had the effect of raising the price in the event of a short crop.
4. It has had the effect of raising them the amount of the duty imposed.
5. It has improved the live stock. 6. The profits on horses are better than on other stock. United States for No. 1. 7. He can. 8. No answer. 9. No.
10. No answer. 11. Not cultivated in this section.
12. Decreased; quality just as good. All farming implements. 13. No.
14. Yes, everybody appears to be able to buy more. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. Have increased because farming is a paying business now. 17. Yes.
18. Let well enough alone.

THOMAS HAMILTON,  
Ex-Reeve, Hereward, Co. Dufferin.

1. No. It would make home grown produce worth less than at present.
2. Since the duty on American corn and coarse grain much more corn has been grown here with success; and the price of coarse grain has been much higher.

3. The duty does not affect us as Europe is our market for our surplus wheat.
4. It has been the cause of farmers raising more hogs, which are paying well.
5. Yes, by giving us the Manitoba and North-West markets for our surplus stock and horses.
6. It pays well to raise horses. Our heavy horses, many of them, go to the United States, and our lighter ones to Manitoba.
7. Farmers can raise all the coarse grain they need to fatten their stock.
8. Very much; by increasing the population, thereby having a greater demand and a home market.
9. Reciprocity would be an advantage to the farmer. The present Tariff will make the Americans more desirous for Reciprocity.
10. It has encouraged the growth of fine wool, and the price is higher.
11. No answer. 12. The quality is quite as good and many articles are much cheaper. 13. They are not dearer.
14. Yes; by increasing our population and giving a home market for our produce.
15. Many industries have began which have given employment, and have nearly stopped emigration to the United States, also caused many to return to Canada.
16. There is an increased tendency to invest capital in farm property on account of the low rate of interest. Land is about the same value.
17. The condition of the farmer is greatly improved, and also the labouring class, by giving constant employment and increased wages. 18. None.

WM. DONALDSON,

President North Riding Oxford Agricultural Society, Co. Oxford.

1. Yes, coarse grains in particular, and some for exchanging seeds.
2. It has a tendency to advance prices, particularly when shortness of crop exists in our county, and generally detrimental, except barley, which is the only one exported.
3. The difference in prices here and Chicago, are about 10 cents; cannot see why it can advance prices here. 4. There being none of any consequence imported, cannot see that it has an material effect.
5. The American demand being so much greater than in the North-West, cannot see that increased duties assist the seller.
6. Heavy draughts and roadsters are profitable. Two-thirds are sent to the United States. 7. In usual cases they have to import; free Tariff best. 8. None.
9. No doubt benefited by Reciprocity. Coercive measures not profitable in civilization. 10. The way the Tariff is graded it cannot affect coarse grades of wool.
11. None. (If so, not posted.) 12. Increased, decidedly. Drills, reapers, ploughs, &c.
13. Cottons and such goods have decidedly increased. Can be bought much cheaper in the United States. 14. No. People lived as well years ago as now.
15. No. The exodus comprises our best and most intelligent citizens.
16. About the same as in 1853, when the Russian war increased prices; they have increased in our section owing to short crops and advanced prices.
17. Prosperity has increased, and affects all; from progress, good crops, &c.
18. Remove needless restrictions from classes of goods consumed by all.

JOHN REYCROFT, Reeve, Highgate, }  
HENRY WATSON, Clerk, Clearville, } Co. Bothwell.

1. It would not be against our interest. Americans cannot undersell us in any kind of grain except corn, that we need from them.
2. The duty on corn does not increase the price of other coarse grains, as no other grain that can be profitably raised will take the place of corn for fattening purposes.

3. No effect whatever. The English markets and prices affect us. 4. No increase in average price in these markets.
5. I do not think the duties have improved the home market in the North-West, as horses are higher in price in the United States than here. A poor class of horses have been shipped to Manitoba; the result, no demand now from that country.
6. It is profitable to breed good horses, and profits compare favourably with profits on other live stock. The principal market for good animals is the United States.
7. In this locality it is the most profitable to raise wheat, barley and oats, sell these crops, and use corn or pease for fattening. We cannot raise pease profitably now and corn is not a sure crop. 8. No, not at all.
9. Most decidedly benefited. Reciprocity in trade would be an incomparable benefit to Canada. I cannot see that we are in a better position to negotiate a treaty under the present Tariff, for it only tends to irritate the Americans.
10. The Tariff has ruined sheep farming. Wool is so low in price that very few sheep are now raised in this county. Farmers in bygone days depended upon their wool to pay the expenses of haying and harvesting.
11. I have not given these products any attention, as they are not cultivated here.
12. Cost of implements of all kinds increased, while the workmanship and finish is not so good.
13. The prices of these goods and hardware increased to the extent of the duties imposed; we can't expect it to be otherwise.
14. There is no improvement in the home market for farm produce.
15. The Tariff has not given variety of employment to labouring classes, nor has it encouraged emigrants to return from the United States; but, on the contrary, a great many farm labourers have gone to Michigan and other parts of the United States.
16. The investment of capital in farm property seems to have decreased. Value of land also decreasing. The question why, is not easily answered, while money is at a low rate of interest. Perhaps the difficulty of procuring labourers has some effect, or a tendency to invest capital in manufactures rather than in farm property.
17. The condition of the farmers is slowly improving by a better system of farming and good crops here, while in Britain the crops have been poor.
18. To make agriculture more profitable and the country more prosperous, would require such changes in legislation that will remove all duties tending to increase the cost of agricultural implements and all other things required by farmers, or, in other words, legislate so that manufacturing interests shall not be built up to the injury of agriculture. Obliterate from the Statutes the N.P., which to farmers means the National Plague.

*General Remarks* :—To make agriculture more desirable, we require a change in the system of education, so that agriculture may be a branch of study in Public Schools. This belongs more properly to Provincial Legislation, but I see nothing to prevent the Dominion Government establishing such institutions as the Agricultural College, Guelph. I hope my answers may be of some use to the Committee.

T. W. CHARLTON;  
Ex-Warden, Rosebank, Co. Brant.

1. No. 2. It has tended to raise the price of all coarse grains. 3. It has tended to raise the price of wheat. 4. It has increased the price as much as the amount of duties imposed.
5. Yes; we now have a choice of both markets, and numbers of horses have been sold at increased prices, and gone to Manitoba from this locality.
6. Since the National Policy has been in force it pays well. Favourably.

7. Yes, decidedly so. Not in the County of Peterborough. 8. Yes.  
 9. I think that they would with the present Tariff. 10. It tends to increase the price of wool.  
 11. There is but little flax or tobacco grown in this part of the country; but should think that it would tend to encourage the manufacture of sugar from the sugar beet.  
 12. The price of all agricultural implements has decreased, and the quality, as far as I can see, is as good, if not better.  
 13. As far as I know the prices have not increased.  
 14. Yes; by encouraging manufactures. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Yes, because money is more plentiful. 17. Yes, decidedly so. 18. No changes that I know of required.  
*General Remarks* :—Keep the National Policy in force and the Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald at the head of the Government, and the farmers will all become prosperous and happy.

F. BIRDSALL,

Farmer, Westwood, Co. Peterborough.

1. Upon the whole, yes. 2. We have all these grains to sell except corn; consequently the duty on foreign produce does not increase the price.  
 3. The prices of wheat and flour are regulated by the foreign market, and will so long as we have a surplus to dispose of.  
 4. To drive our pork packers to the United States. 5. No.  
 6. Yes, it is profitable to raise good stock of any kind, especially horses. Our principal market is in the United States.  
 7. We can raise all we require, but it pays better to import corn when cheap, and sell our barley, rye, &c.; the duty is so much out of our pockets. 8. No.  
 9. Yes; but we are not likely to get it by a retaliatory Tariff.  
 10. None, because not protected; and we have to compete with foreign producers, hence the price is not enhanced. 11. None raised for sale in this part.  
 12. Our manufacturers cannot make so good an implement for the same price as before; the cost of production of everything is increased, from a reaper to a horseshoe.  
 13. Yes, coal, coal oil, nails and dry goods have increased in price to the amount of the duty. Dealers of all kinds tell us that goods of all kinds (imported) can be laid down in Toronto, Bowmanville and elsewhere, at certain prices, and they sell them to us at a reasonable profit, plus the duty, and our own manufacturers know how to keep their prices up to the imported article, and the consumer suffers.  
 14. No. 15. Not with us; the exodus is greater than ever; our population is decreasing every year.  
 16. No. Farm lands have decreased in value since 1873. This is partly caused by the attractions of the North-West.  
 17. Yes; Providence has favoured us with good crops, and our surplus has found a ready market abroad with good prices, hence the country is prosperous.  
 18. Give us cheap transport and allow us to buy and sell where we can do so to the best advantage.

JAMES RUNDLE,

Reeve, Bowmanville, Co. Durham.

1. No, so long as the Canadian farmers raise sufficient agricultural produce to supply home consumption at reasonable remunerative prices, with a surplus to export. It would be the means of injuriously affecting the interests of agriculture to encourage foreign competition, to keep down prices below the cost

- of production ; and of driving the Canadian farmer out of his own home market, to seek a foreign, more doubtful and more risky market, in competing with the agricultural products of the world.
2. It induces a greater impetus to raise a larger quantity of the coarse qualities to meet home demands, with a direct tendency to increase prices and retain at home the money paid for the imported Indian corn. In this locality, peas, oats and barley are largely cultivated.
  3. It secures the home market for spring wheat and flour, and in extending and securing the markets of the Maritime Provinces, and thereby increasing and forming the prices of both wheat and flour. Fall wheat less cultivated now than in former years.
  4. By giving encouragement to raise a greater number of swine to supply the wants of the home market at remunerative prices.
  5. The prices for horses range about the same as in former years, and for live stock Britain is the principal market. At present the trade with Manitoba for horses and cattle from this immediate locality is only commencing to be taken advantage of.
  6. Yes; more especially the heavy and middle classes; in raising such horses the profits compare very favourably with other stock, and the principal market at present is the United States, where such horses find a ready sale.
  7. Yes; in this part, peas, oats, barley, hay and roots are extensively raised, producing a three-fold tendency, in having a plentiful supply of feed for stock, manure for the farm and the alternation of green and grain crops, thus keeping up the fertility of the farm, and more profitable to raise feed at home than buy from abroad.
  8. In the article of butter, when properly made and carefully preserved, the price rules high; the other articles enumerated command a readier market, with firmer prices than formerly.
  9. Yes; by opening up a more extended field for the natural productions of the Dominion; by having reciprocity an opening would be made in competing in the United States market, in supplying the wants of fifty millions of a population. Trade to be healthy and remunerative to both parties must be fair as well as free; by having it free to the United States only, they would have all they wanted, and consequently would have no inducement to grant Reciprocity.
  10. In this locality the coarser qualities of wool are chiefly raised; and the prices so far do not vary much from former years.
  11. As to flax, tobacco and sugar-beet, very little is cultivated in this part of the country.
  12. From the time that the present Tariff was imposed a greater degree of confidence has prevailed; money became more plentiful and cheap; manufacturers profited thereby; competition keeps down prices and promotes improvements; hence all kinds of machinery and farm implements in general use have decreased in price and improved in quality, such as thrashing-machines, reapers, mowers, seeders, cultivators, waggons, ploughs, harrows, tanning-mills, &c.
  13. No; the heavier kinds of woollens, as blankets, are lower and of a better quality; so are tweeds, &c. Cottons of the coarser kinds are cheaper, as grain-bags, a few years ago would cost \$5 per dozen, retail, now the very best sells for \$3.50. Hardware, such as hay-forks, hoes and axes, are somewhat lower.
  14. Yes; by increased trade, increased manufactories and increased consumption, and by securing for the farmer the whole or principal control of the market of the Dominion.
  15. Yes; by increasing the number of manufactories it gives employment to a greater number of operatives, and by getting constant work and remunerative wages at home, it checks emigration to a foreign country.
  16. In this locality the tide of emigration leaving to find a home in the North-West, checks, to a certain extent, investment at present in farm property; but the value of farm property remains the same.

17. Yes; the general condition of the farmer has improved very materially by good crops and remunerative prices for farm produce, and by increased employment required in the various industries and the migration to Manitoba leaves farm labour scarce, and increased wages to farm labourers follow as a natural consequence.
18. I am not aware of any further legislation necessary at present, only to secure to the farmer the benefits he has already got.

ROBERT COLVILLE,  
Farmer and Reeve, Clarke, Orono, Cb. Durham.

---

1. I do not consider it would be to the interest of Canadian farmers to admit American farm produce duty free, until such time as Canadian farm produce is admitted duty free into the United States.
2. The duty on American corn and other coarse grains] does not affect our market in this Island.
3. The prices of wheat and flour have not been affected by the duty on these articles.
4. The price of hog products has been above the average during the past year.
5. The duty on horses has not affected our market, but in all probability has increased the prices of horses in Ontario.
6. The breeding of good horses is no doubt a profitable business, but is more uncertain than the breeding of other farm stock. Our market for horses is principally the States.
7. I consider our farmers can grow grain for fattening purposes cheaper than they can import it.
8. The duty has not affected our market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter.
9. The United States being our best market, a Reciprocity Treaty would be of great benefit to P. E. Island farmers. I think we have more chance of getting a Reciprocity Treaty than we had before 1878.
10. The price of wool has been above the average the last two years.
11. Flax, tobacco and sugar beet are not cultivated to any extent on this Island.
12. Farm implements are no dearer than previous to the adoption of the Tariff, and mowing machines, rakes, ploughs and cultivators are improved.
13. Woollens and cottons are increased, but nails, iron and groceries are no dearer.
14. Our home market has not been affected by the Tariff, owing to the want of manufactories on the Island.
15. For a like reason our labouring population has not been benefited, but farm labourers get higher wages than formerly.
16. Farms are bringing good prices in this section of the country, and have increased in value.
17. I consider both classes better off than in 1878, especially the farmers.
18. The fulfilment of the Terms of Union giving us uninterrupted communication winter and summer with the mainland, will give us a better market for our produce abroad, and will encourage the establishment of manufactories on the Island, thereby giving us a better home market.

*General Remarks*:—Owing to the insular position of this Island the adoption of the Tariff has not materially benefited the Island, excepting so far as it has benefited the rest of the Dominion, of which we form a part.

GEORGE F. OWEN, J. P.,  
Farmer, Cardigan Bridge, Co. King's.

---

1. No.
2. To raise the price of pease only. Don't think it has had any material effect on the price of others.
3. Don't think it has had any appreciable effect.
4. It has had a good effect, namely,—to raise the prices, and I would like to see the duties even higher yet.
5. Yes.

6. I am not personally engaged in breeding horses, but think the profits higher than on any other stock. 7. Yes, the Canadian farmer can certainly raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock, and it would not pay better to import American corn. 8. Can't say. 9. Yes. Yes.
10. Not beneficial for the reason that fine wools are admitted at a low duty. I think a higher duty than the present ought to be imposed.
11. I have had no experience. 12. It has had no appreciable effect on prices, and quality is at least as good as previously.
13. I think cottons and hardware are raised in price. I would specify scythes, hoes, forks and weigh scales. 14. I think not, except as to pease and pork.
15. Don't know as to this. 16. Cannot say that there has. 17. Yes.
18. The cost of municipal legislation ought to be reduced; the introduction of pure bred stock encouraged, and the changes indicated in the foregoing answers.

JAMES COCHRANE,  
Farmer, Kilsyth, Co. Grey.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculture to admit all kinds of produce free. However, I think our farmers would benefit to some extent by the remission of duty on corn meal.
2. Prices have been satisfactory here whether from this reason or some other.
3. Flour has not at all increased in price here by the duty has some allege.
4. The prices are better than they were previous to 1879.
5. The prices live stock have produced have been very satisfactory during the last two years.
6. We find it more profitable to breed sheep and horned cattle here than horses.
7. To some extent the use of corn would be profitable to our farmers. 8. Yes.
9. In this section of Canada he would; most decidedly we are in a better position.
10. No answer. 11. These articles are not grown here.
12. The cost has not increased, and the quality is very much the same.
13. We buy these goods as cheap as formerly, and the quality is better.
14. Decidedly increased, through the greater employment of miners, mechanics and to better wages being paid them. 15. Yes.
16. Very much the same as formerly, principally because our young men are fonder of mechanical employment. 17. Yes.
18. A better assessment law, the best possible arrangement for the improvement of our road system; every possible encouragement given to the creation of a home market by the employment of workmen and miners in the country; in this section of the Dominion better railway accommodation; a strong effort made to induce the United States to allow some of our main products principally potatoes into their market duty free; encouragement given to the establishment of agricultural institutions such as stock farms and colleges; and a strong effort made to make known the excellent soil, climate and capabilities of the country.

ROBERT MAXWELL,  
Municipal Councillor, Lime Rock, Co. Pictou.

1. I do not think it would be in the interest of Canadian producers or manufacturers to admit such lines free.
2. None at all; we do not export any grain beyond a small local trade.
3. We don't import from the United States, therefore, I do not know what advantage there is in the duties imposed.
4. There is no effect on the price, as there is none imported here.
5. It has no effect in our locality whatever, as we do not go in much for exporting horses or cattle. 6. Not very profitable; our market is local.

7. So far as it is profitable it would pay better to use our own produce to fatten stock. 8. Not any.
9. Some localities it would and in others it would not, although I believe we are in a better position to obtain Reciprocity under the present Tariff.
10. None. 11. None. 12. I believe there is very little change in small ware, but in large implements they have decreased in price.
13. I believe the enumerated articles have decreased on account of competition as much as any other cause.
14. The Tariff has very little effect as far as we are concerned, as we do not export very much, still our market is a little better.
15. The Tariff has given some extra employment in places; still the emigration is increasing largely to the United States.
16. Very little increased tendency for farm property, and lands do not increase any the reason why is our young men are all leaving the country.
17. In some places there is an increased tendency for the labouring classes of late.
18. I do not pretend to be a political economist, therefore I cannot suggest any change in the matter.

JOHN McINNIS,  
Trader, Wallace Ridge, Co. Cumberland.

---

1. No. 2. It has enhanced the price of all kinds.
3. As a general rule it has been a benefit.
4. Has increased the value of all these articles. 5. Yes.
6. I believe it is profitable to raise horses. Our markets for this section are both Manitoba and the United States.
7. It pays better for Canadians to raise their own grain. 8. Yes.
9. No. But we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty under the National Policy than under the old Tariff. 10. I am not prepared to give a correct opinion.
11. I do not know. 12. I am not in a position to give an opinion.
13. I think there is no increase in price.
14. Yes. Markets have improved by the operation of the present Tariff by means of lessening imports. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. And lands have increased in value.
17. Yes; decidedly improved. 18. I am not sufficiently versed in farming to offer an opinion.

*General Remarks*:—I am firmly convinced that on the whole the National Policy has been a grand success.

WILLIAM SOMERVILLE,  
Mayor, Shawville, Co. Pontiac.

---

1. No. 2. It has raised the price of oats and corn and indirectly pease.
3. It has raised the price of wheat materially, but not flour in proportion to the raise in wheat. No difference in spring and fall wheat here.
4. Pork, lard and bacon have advanced about 40 per cent. 5. Yes.
6. Yes, quite as profitable as other stock raising. Manitoba principally. 7. Yes.
8. No answer. 9. Better without reciprocity till we are able to stand competition.
10. Our wool is not a competing wool with the imported. 11. Don't know.
12. Price decreased and quality better.
13. No increase in prices; on the contrary, the price is less.
14. Improved by greater home consumption and protection on pork and grain.
15. Yes. 16. Not in this section. 17. Yes, materially. 18. None.

R. A. PRESTON,  
Farmer, Newboro, Co. Leeds.

1. Do not think it would. 2. The effect of the imposition of duty on American Indian corn has had the effect of producing a ready and quick market for the sale of all the coarse grain our farmers grow.
3. Ready sale at remunerative prices. 4. A decided advance. 5. Yes.
6. Yes, compare favourably. Principal market, Manitoba. 7. Yes. 8. No answer.
9. No. 10 and 11. No answer. 12. Cost decreased; just as good or better. Mowers, reapers, ploughs, grain-drills, &c., &c. 13. Not increased.
14. Yes. Increase of business. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Lands increased. General improvement and prosperity of the country. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

BENJAMIN TETT,

Reeve, Bedford Mills, Co. Frontenac.

1. None but corn meal, as we can raise all we want in this county.
2. Little or none, as there is none imported. 3. I think about 50 cents per barrel on both classes to the best of my judgment.
4. None, as we can raise all we want in the Dominion. 5. No, none, as the markets remain the same as before the duty. 6. Not as profitable as other stock market for horses in the United States. 7. No, not by any means; it will pay better to import American corn. 8. Little or none.
9. Would be better benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty, providing the Americans would admit our stock free of duty. 10. None.
11. None, as there is very little raised in this county; flax only.
12. Increased in particular on American scythes, as they are better and cheaper with the duty on than what the Canadian article is free of duty.
13. Increased in price. Hardware and cottons of all kinds.
14. Very little, if any. 15. Improving. 16. Very little as yet.
17. Improving gradually. 18. Bounties on the best stock and on farm produce.

*General Remarks:*—The population of the county is about two-thirds lumbermen and fishermen, and the duty on flour and corn meal is very injurious to these two classes of industry.

JAMES E. DAUPHINEE,

Councillor, Co. Lunenburg.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculturalists in Canada to admit American produce free. 2. The effect of the duty on American coarse grains has driven them out of our markets, and given Canadians their own market and a better price. Oats, 5 to 10 cents; rye, 20 cents; corn, 10 cents; barley and pease, each 20 cents better. 3 and 4 no answer.
5. Yes, the market and price are both improved.
6. It is fully as profitable to breed horses as other farm stock. Our market is Manitoba principally, although the United States takes a large number.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise the grain profitably to feed stock.
8. Yes, the market has improved greatly; we can now sell at our doors for a better price. 9. I think a Reciprocity Treaty would be better for us. But we are in a decidedly better position to negotiate with the Tariff than without it.
10. Do not know. 11. Flax and tobacco are not grown here, and sugar beet only for feeding purposes.
12. The cost of farm implements has not increased; with decided improvements and of the best quality. 13. No increase in price, in fact many are lower.
14. The home market has been greatly improved, for the simple reason that we now have all our own market. 15. The Tariff has retarded emigration, and given more employment at better wages.
16. Real estate is more easily sold, and better prices; because it pays better to farm than it did when the Americans had our market and their own.

17. Greatly improved ; they are now paying off mortgages that before the Tariff was imposed they could scarcely pay the interest.
18. The only improvement I could suggest would be for the Government to import new varieties of seed grain and stock, similar to the Governments of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

GEO. VAN KEUREN,  
Reeve, Dunnville, Co. Monck.

1. Admit none. 2. All advanced in price.
3. Both have advanced in price. Spring wheat is now worth more than fall, as what was imported from the Western States was principally spring.
4. All have advanced in price, and our markets are not now glutted as formerly.
5. Decidedly so. 6. I find it is profitable to breed horses, the profits being very good, especially since the the market for Manitoba has opened up.
7. He can raise all required ; it is unprofitable for any farmer to buy.
8. A slight improvement. 9. I don't know that it would benefit the Canadian farmer very much as there is too great an odds ; we are certainly in a better position to negotiate. 10. It has not advanced much in price.
11. I do not know as I am not at all interested.
12. There is neither increase nor decrease, and I think the quality fully as good.
13. Woollens are no higher ; cottons have advanced slightly ; farmers hardware much the same.
14. I think the home market on the whole is improved by the operation of the Tariff, as it prevents foreign competitors. 15. It certainly has.
16. There is. Farm lands have decreased some in Ontario, owing to a great many forcing sale to go out to Manitoba. 17. Yes.
18. I cannot advise at present any change of legislation, as I think farmers have no need to complain at present.

*General Remarks* ;—I am a farmer and have followed this occupation for about fifty years, during which time I think there has not been a more prosperous year than last one, with the exception of the year of the Russian war—I mean to take all things into consideration.

WILLIAM TINDALE,  
Farmer, Director Ag. Society, Fergus, Co. Wellington.

1. It makes little difference as they do not compete with us in any farm produce that we can grow profitably in the home market, but if it would improve the trade of our carriers by being admitted would help us indirectly.
2. The coarse grains have been higher in the U. S. than in our markets since the duty was imposed, and they could not have been imported had there been no duty except corn, of which, see No. 7.
3. None whatever, so far as I am aware, we grow little but fall wheat, there was one time when we thought we were going to get the benefit on spring wheat, but the grinding in bond regulations allowed the millers to export the equivalent of the wheat they imported, and they were shrewd enough to export soft wheat flour so they undersold our spring wheat flour and the price dropped.
4. We only grow pork for family use and can say nothing of the effects of the Tariff on the subject, not being interested, would suppose that Conadian pork would be bettered by amount of duty.
5. Not as far as I am aware ; not more than one per cent. of our horses are sold to go to Manitoba. 6. Yes, think that horses are the most profitable stock raised on the farm if one takes care to breed for the U.S. market, which is our only market.

7. We are unable to grow peas on account of bugs. The year 1877 was the last year we had a crop of peas, and barley is generally too high priced to feed to stock; have been trying to grow corn, had a fair crop in 1880, but was a failure in 1881, owing to the drouth. We have to buy American corn and pay the duty too so you can judge of the benefits.
8. Not with us; eggs in enormous quantities are exported to the U.S. and butter to Britain. 9. After the abrogation of the former Treaty we felt it for some time until we found other outlets for our produce, and now we care very little. The Americans have made our Tariff the excuse for placing increased duties on our products, so it would not seem that we were in a better position.
10. None whatever, as we do not import a pound of the long combing wool on which a duty has been placed; our long wools are 25 per cent. cheaper since the National Policy came into force. 11. Cannot say as I do not grow any of those, but flaxmen tell me that the Tariff hurts more than helps them.
12. Decreased slightly since 1878, but not as rapid a decrease as in former years. Reapers fell from \$120 in 1872, to \$90 in 1878, and have stood at that since; horse rakes fell from \$32 in 1872 to \$24 in 1878, are \$25 to \$26 now; ploughs have decreased since, but owing to a change in material, chilled iron in place of steel, the quality of some are better in consequence of improvement in design.
13. Yes, in woollens the increased cost of production has been offset by a reduction in the price of wools; cottons, ducks, denims and shirtings have increased 20 per cent. Nails, builders hardware, paints and fence wire have increased, besides we have not got the benefit of the introduction of improved machinery for the manufacture of those articles that we should have had, but for the Tariff.
14. No, the home market for farm produce has not increased materially, and there is no article except poultry that we do not export largely, and the home market is regulated by the export price.
15. From this township, the Banner township of the county, and the one that has the least poor land or poor farmers either, dozens of families have left for the United States or Manitoba to my knowledge within the last year, among them a son and two sons-in-law of one of the strongest N.P. advocates in this township. I cannot now recall to memory one that returned to stay here.
16. Up to 1875 farm property sold almost as quickly as it was put on the market at good prices. One farm in this township, 100 acres, which sold at \$100 per acre in 1874, would not command more than \$80 per acre if put under the hammer now. My neighbor was offered in 1876, \$73 per acre, he held for \$75, and sold in 1881 for \$65 per acre, 100 acres.
17. Yes, the condition of farmers and those depending on them for subsistence has improved owing to the better crops and better prices for our surplus products in foreign markets.
18. I am not a legislator, but I think that a Tariff for Revenue only would improve our condition. If we had fewer men at Ottawa doing nothing but voting like good boys, as they are told, it would be better for us. There are just two classes, producers and consumers, and all who produce nothing either by brain or muscle live off those that do.

*General Remarks*:—The replies here given are how the questions appear to me here, and I only speak from my personal observation and for this section of the country.

C. D. SWANSON, Ex-Deputy Reeve, Downie,  
Director S.F. Agric. Society, St. Mary's, Co. Perth..

1. No it would not. 2. It has had the effect of raising the prices of each of these kinds of grains and giving us the home markets.
3. We think it has not materially affected the prices; but it has given us a better home market.

4. It has made the prices higher and given us control of the home markets.
5. It has improved the prices and given us a monopoly of the home markets.
6. Yes. We think that it is as profitable as raising any other kinds of stock. For good sound draught and driving horses our principal market is in the United States, but for a cheap class of horses Manitoba and the North-West.
7. Yes. It would not. 8. It has improved the market for vegetables, but has no effect on butter and eggs. 9. Yes. Yes.
10. It has raised the prices of fine wool, but has not materially affected the price of coarse wools. 11. It has led to the effect of having more of this produce raised.
12. Not much increased or decreased. The quality is as good.
13. Cottons have increased slightly. Woollens and hardware have not increased.
14. Yes. By increased prices and giving us a home market.
15. Yes. Plenty of work for all our people. 16. Very little variation. 17. Yes.
18. Do away with market fees, tax church property, and make all owners of stallions pay a license for the same, if used for breeding purposes.

HUMBERSTONE COUNCIL IN SESSION,  
Humberstone, Co. Welland.

---

1. No; under good cultivation Canada can raise all the grain that is required for home consumption.
2. The effect has been to raise the price of oats, rye, pease and corn in this county, but I cannot say that the Tariff has raised the price of barley.
3. Wheat and flour has raised about 50 per cent. since 1878. 4. About 25 per cent.
5. Yes. 6. Yes. I find that raising horses compare very favourably with the raising of other stock, and I think it will continue for some time as there is so many required in Manitoba and the North-West Territory which are the principal markets.
7. Canadian farmers can raise all the coarse grain and roots required, and I do not think they require to import American corn. 8. Yes. 9. I think not.
10. Cannot say that there is any difference.
11. Cannot answer this question as we do not cultivate either tobacco, flax or sugar beets in this part of the country.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased a little, but there is great improvement in quality, especially in ploughs, harrows and threshing mills.
13. I cannot say that there is any increase in price. Cotton and woollen goods are cheaper than they were in 1878.
14. Yes. This part of the country being a lumbering country, immense quantities of pork consumed in the shanties, the duty on American pork increased the price of Canadian pork and beef.
15. Yes there is employment (at present) in Canada for every man and woman that is able or willing to work.
16. There is quite a tendency for investing capital in farm property, and prices of farms have increased since 1878, because the country is prosperous and money can be got at a reasonable rate of interest.
17. Yes, farmers are wiping off old debts and placing deposits in the banks, and the labouring class can get all the work they can do at double the wages they had in 1878. 18. Not any that I am aware of, let well enough alone.

A. T. MANSELL, J.P.,  
Westmeath, Co. Renfrew.

---

1. I would admit none. 2. It has raised the price of pease, oats and corn; I may say there was no cash market for pease or corn until the Tariff was put on; I cannot say whether it has affected rye or not; as far as I can find, the rye goes to Germany, but there was no market for it until the Tariff was put on.

3. Wheat and flour has been higher since 1878 than previous; I should think that wheat and flour should be the amount of the Tariff dearer.
  4. There is no live hogs sold here; I don't know how much it has affected hams, bacon or lard; I think there should be a duty put on pork in barrels; as far as I can find, there was none in 1878, it was left as under Mr. Mackenzie.
  5. It has. 6. Yea; for Manitoba.
  7. He can; if not, he should go out of the business and become a labourer.
  8. The market for poultry and eggs has improved since 1878.
  9. I think the Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty. We are undoubtedly in a better position to treat now than when American goods were admitted free; the most ignorant should see that.
  10. I cannot say, as there is hardly any market for wool here.
  11. There is none of those articles grown in these parts, except some flax and tobacco for home use, by the Germans. 12. So far as I can find out, I think not.
  13. I think cotton has gone up some; woollens no dearer; forks, axes and hoes are equally as cheap as previous to 1878, and I think a better quality.
  14. I believe it has; it has given the farmer the home consumption or market, and not allowed the Americans to come in.
  15. Since the Tariff has been put on there has been a great improvement in the industrial classes; of course, when there is plenty of employment at home, and about equally as good wages, it will hinder emigration to the United States.
  16. There would be a great increase in farm property, but for the emigration to Manitoba.
  17. There is a vast improvement in both the farmer and labourer; good prices for everything the farmer has to sell, and big wages and plenty of work for the labourer; there is no comparison between now and 1878.
  18. I think it would be wise and for the benefit of the agriculturalist to put more duty on pork, and thereby encourage Canadians to raise more of it.
- General Remarks* :—Of course the lumberman will object to a duty on pork, but I think he is well able to pay—his profits are large, and he fares sumptuously.

JACOB GRIFFITH,

Reeve, Wilberforce, Eganville, Co. Renfrew.

1. Positively no, if our markets were to be glutted with American produce, our own would have to come down as a matter of course.
2. The effect has been better prices now than formerly, or before the N. P. came in force. In 1878 oats could be got for 30 to 35 cents, in 1882 from 42 to 44 cents, in 1878 rye was from 50 to 60 cents per bushel, in 1882 from 75 to 80 cents per bushel.
3. In this it is pretty much as in the coarse grain. In 1878 flour rated at about \$5.50; now it is from \$6.25 to \$6.50. Fall wheat rated about \$1.10 per bushel in 1878, now it brings \$1.35 to \$1.40. Spring wheat in the same ratio.
4. The same effect has been produced in this as in the above. Live hogs, green pork, dried hams, bacon and lard bring a better price and a readier market. I believe owing to the N. P.
5. I think it has, and believe it to be quite obvious, as there are more horses bought lately for Manitoba than for the United States.
6. It is profitable, if the kind of mares and stallions are first-class. I think it more profitable than other live stock. I believe the best market is the North-West.
7. We can raise pease, which are better than corn for fattening hogs. I do not think it would pay to buy American grain to fatten stock.
8. I firmly believe it has improved through the effect of the present Tariff.

9. I believe he would and this is what he wants. And certainly we are in a better position to negotiate now than when the Americans were pouring in their produce free of duty.
10. I believe our wool finds a readier market now than formerly.
11. Not much of this grown in this section.
12. I believe we can purchase now as cheap or cheaper than formerly, and as good, if not better articles. Reapers, mowers, harrows, rakes, ploughs and cultivators of Canadian make.
13. I know of no articles of cottons or hardware that have in any way increased materially, if at all, in price.
14. It certainly has. I think the cause is quite obvious as to how. I beg leave to refer to the second article which shows the cause.
15. It has. I know of no place better for any man to get employment and good wages than this section. The same may be said of girls, and I think there are many who would be bettered by coming back from the United States.
16. There certainly is, farm lands have increased under the present Tariff, and no doubt would to a greater extent, but for the Manitoba fever; the why I believe to be Protection. 17. It is unmistakably improved.
18. I think if the Government could cause the several Railroad Companies to lessen their exorbitant charges it would benefit not only farmers but the whole community.

*General Remarks:*—I wonder how any intelligent man can raise tongue or pen against the N. P. Speaking a few days ago with an elector, who is a Reformer, or indeed I might say a rabid Grit, he said to me, he would not vote for a man who would go against the N. P.

ROBERT COBURN, J. P.,  
Farmer and Reeve, Pembroke, Co. Renfrew.

1. Yes; grain coming in does not come into competition with our raising, and before the Tariff was increased our grains were relatively higher here than in the United States. 2. It has had no effect.
3. We think that it has had the effect of making keener competition with the mills here from small mills along the line of the Grand Trunk, they being unable to ship advantageously in competition with large mills grinding in bond, hence they have to depend largely on the Ottawa Valley for their market.
4. Does not affect us here. 5. No, for the North-West there is nothing suitable except a very choice animal and the Americans buy every kind.
6. Yes, to a certain extent, and good stock can always be sold at paying prices; principally the United States and to our lumbermen.
7. It would be better to import corn, and sell our pease and rye, as we cannot raise corn at any price. 8. No.
9. Yes. No; the retaliatory Tariff will have the effect of irritating the American Government and prevent Reciprocity for some time.
10. It reduces the price of our home grown wool to a certain extent. 11. None here.
12. No perceptible change, except that ploughs, reapers, mowers, &c., are of lighter material, and perhaps the better of being so.
13. Yes; cloth, common factory cotton, nails and iron, the retail price of the above has increased about 10 per cent.
14. Since Montreal commenced exporting rye and pease, our market here for these grains has improved.
15. At present no; our country will soon be depopulated if the present stream of emigration continues to Dakota and Manitoba. 16. No. About equal.

17. Owing to the revival of trade in lumber, &c., farmers are better off; having had three extra fine crops in succession they are undoubtedly better off, and also labouring classes find ready employment with farmers.
18. Reciprocity, and if that cannot be had return to a Revenue Tariff.

JOHN DOONE,  
Reeve, Osceola, Co. Renfrew.

1. I do not see that it would benefit farmers here, save what they need of pork over what they raise and sometimes corn when oats are a short crop.
2. Corn has never taken the place of our coarse grain save when they were a total failure.
3. I cannot see the least effect produced on the price of flour or any kind of wheat.
4. I am not in a position to say, but the duty on pork should raise the price to the extent of the duty, if we had the same class of pork to sell.
5. I have never seen an American horse brought here, we sell to them but don't buy. There were ten horses sent to Manitoba before the Tariff for every one since.
6. Don't know, I rather think not; prefer cattle and sheep. The demand of late has been for lumbering purposes here, some still for Manitoba.
7. It would all depend on the relative cost of the article. Corn is the best fattening grain I know of.
8. Certainly not, our poultry and eggs are sent to the United States. Butter is worth 50 per cent. more there than here.
9. Yes. If we are it is a shame that we don't, we were told retaliation would fetch them, but they are not down on their knees yet and no signs of it.
10. I don't know, but wool is still very low. 11. There is neither flax, tobacco or beet root grown here.
12. I think there is no change either way with machines, reapers, &c., cannot say for smaller tools.
13. These must have all increased to the extent of the duty, unless we manufacture more than we consume, and have to export the balance, and even then the market price may be kept up here and the residue slaughtered abroad.
14. How could it, when we have to compete in a common market with the world?
15. The emigration to the United States notably Dakota has lately been disheartening to every true Canadian. I know of none returning.
16. No. Too many seeking to sell out and go to Dakota or Manitoba.
17. Yes, because we have had good crops and a good price for rye and peas for export, because lumbermen have paid higher prices for the labour of men and teams.
18. Remove the Customs duties Parliament has imposed for the benefit of manufacturers upon the goods which we have to buy; facilitate foreign trade; simplify the laws and their administrations; remove every monopoly; inspire confidence and produce contentment by a pure and economical management of our affairs.

JAMES FINDLAY,  
President, N. Renfrew Ag. Society, Co. Renfrew.

- 1 to 4. There is no grain either exported or imported in this part of the country. The lumbermen consume all that is grown at present at a good fair price to the farmers. 5. No answer.
6. The supply of horses is not equal to the local demand at present. 7 No answer.
8. There is a good home market for both eggs and butter in this part.
- 9 and 10. No answer. 11. We do not grow any of these in this part.
12. We find farm implements about the same price as before.

13. They are about the same price as they have always been.  
 14. to 16. No answer. 17. It has improved a good deal in this part.  
 18. No answer.

CHARLES ROBERTSON,  
 Reeve, Cardwell, Co. Simcoe.

1. It would not. 2. It has a tendency to increase the price of all kinds of grain.  
 3. Increased prices. 4. Increased prices.  
 5. It has no doubt increased the market price. 6. Yes; about equal.  
 7. Pays better to raise our own grain. 8. Yes. 9. Yes; much better.  
 10. Small increase. 11. No answer.  
 12. Decreased generally and quality as good. 13. No increase. 14. It has.  
 15. It has decidedly. 16. There is quite an increase in this section.  
 17. Most decidedly. 18. No answer.

B. C. LLOYD,  
 Reeve, Napanee Mills, Co. Addington.

1. No, I think not. 2. I think the whole of these have improved in price, and the effect of the imposition of the duty on American corn is good.  
 3. I do not think it has anything to do with it, as the European markets regulate the price. No fall wheat grown.  
 4. Caused them to bring a better price, and it appears to me that everybody is benefited thereby, as the farmer finds a better market and the poor man appears to get more to eat. 5. I do not know.  
 6. I do not think there is much profit in breeding horses, cattle and sheep pay much better. A few horses have been sold lately to go to Manitoba but none to the United States.  
 7. The Canadian farmers can raise all the grain they want for this or any other purpose, and to spare. We want no American corn.  
 8. The market for butter and eggs has undoubtedly improved.  
 9. I do not think we need trouble ourselves much about this, but if it is thought necessary I do not think it would do any harm, and we are now in a better position to negotiate than when we admitted their produce free.  
 10. I don't think it has much. 11. None to my knowledge; none grown.  
 12. I find no difference in either the price or quality. 13. I find no difference.  
 14. The home market has improved, but how I cannot say, except it is that everybody is better off, and consequently able to buy more.  
 15. Very much so. We have had no emigration to the United States since about 1877 when some Dutch families then left for Minnesota; they have not returned. We generally have some young men go to Michigan to the lumber shanties, but none went this year, as there was plenty of work at home at high wages.  
 16. I do not find very much of this in Ontario, that appears to me to be mostly left for Manitoba at present; but farm lands with everything else has increased in value since 1878. 17. Yes, particularly the labouring classes.  
 18. Encourage the use of beer by taking the duty off, and all restrictions as to the manufacture and sale thereof (of course I mean free malt of home manufacture, hops of home growth, and everything else produced in Canada that enters into Canadian manufactured beer), also home made wines; increase the duties on spirits, particularly whiskey, or, what would be better still, prohibit it altogether.

*General Remarks:*—I hope at the rising of the House of Commons at the end of the present session, it will be dissolved, as I went very strongly against the National

Policy in 1878 and should like a chance to make all amends in my power by voting and working in favour of it as soon as possible. Seeing the immense good it has done to every class of the community, it should be sustained, and the sooner it is confirmed by the voice of the people, the better.

THOMAS TAPPING,  
Reeve, Barrie, Hardinge, Co. Frontenac.

1. I do not think it would as the Tariff ensures us a steady market.
2. It has had the effect of raising the prices on all coarse grains, such as corn, rye, oats, peas and barley, and gives us a better and surer market.
3. It has the effect of raising the price of fall wheat from 90 cents to \$1.40; spring wheat from 90 cents to \$1.50.
4. It has had the effect of raising the price of hogs from \$4 to \$6 live weight; dried hams, from 10 cents to 13 cents; lard, from 8 cents to 15 cents, bacon, 10 cents to 15 cents.
5. It has improved the prices very much on all kinds of stock, especially on horses, and by the number that is sent to the North-West, I should say that the North-West market is the best.
6. I find that breeding first class draught horses is the most profitable of any farm-stock that can be raised in this county; even for our own use and home market as our lumbermen are always ready to buy a good span of draught horses, and it does not cost more to raise a span that will sell from \$200 to \$400 than it would to raise a pair of oxen that would not sell when fatted for more than \$160 to \$180.
7. It would pay to import corn if it could be got as reasonable as it could before the duty was put on it. 8. I think it has very much.
9. I think we should be benefited by the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, and I think we are in a better position to obtain it than we were before the N. P. was known.
10. I do not find much difference in the price of wool or in the price of our Canadian cloth. 11. I cannot say anything about flax or tobacco as there is none raised in this county for market.
12. We can buy farm implements as cheap if not cheaper than before the Tariff, and as good if not better, as they are improving every year.
13. The farmers in this county can buy woollen or cotton cloth or fine cloths, tea or sugar, in any stores and groceries cheaper at the present time than they ever could before.
14. The home market for farm produce has improved here since the Tariff has come into operation.
15. The main industry, apart from farming, is the lumber business, which has increased so much this last three or four years that it has been the means of hundreds of young men returning from the United States to this country to seek employment, again under their old employers, as they would rather work in Canada than in the United States.
16. Real estate has raised in value to a certain extent; it would have been far greater had it not been for the North-West fever, which has taken such a hold of all classes of the people.
17. There is a great improvement in the condition of the farmers and the labourers for the better.
18. I do not know of any change that would benefit us, only what I see has already been done by taking off the duty from the articles that we daily use such as tea, coffee and other articles.

*General Remarks*:—I have answered your questions according to the best of my judgment. As regards the National Policy I can truly say that the very elements seemed to rejoice from the very hour that election was decided September 17th,

1878. The dark cloud that had been spread over the Dominion for five years was rent asunder by the grand flashes of lightning and terrible peals of thunder that shook the very heavens and earth as the telegrams came flashing over the wires proclaiming the successful inauguration of the National Policy, and dispersed the cloud, and restored confidence to the people and brought back prosperity to which we have enjoyed ever since.

JOSEPH WYMAN,  
Ex-Mayor and J. P., Onslow, Co. Pontiac.

1. Not without Reciprocity.
- 2 to 4. In this isolated locality where the inhabitants are in a manner amphibious, being more fisherman (who are perfectly satisfied with the Tariff and pleased with the bounty they are to receive) than farmers, I will answer your Committee giving general views *en bloc*. We are perfectly satisfied with whatever Tariff the wise, talented and patriotic ministry of the Dominion may, after their searching investigation, adopt. Although I have been president of the Agricultural Society here for eleven years, I have never heard the Tariff discussed at any public meetings.
- 5 and 6. No answer. 7. Can be raised profitably. 8. It has.
- 9 to 11. No answer. 12. Decreased; and the quality is just as good. Mowing machines, thrashing mills, horse rakes, &c., &c. 13. No answer.
14. It has been improved on the whole. 15 and 16. No answer. 17. Yes.
18. Change the climate for this District.

*General Remarks*:—Of course we all believe in a Protective Tariff for the manufacturers, agriculturalists of the Dominion, though we would certainly like to have Reciprocity with our cousins across the line. We are much amused with the speeches of the hon. gentlemen of the House of Commons, but know perfectly well that they are not so bad as their opponents would wish to make them. The Finance Minister, Sir L. Tilley, explained all matters well in his Budget Speech. There is general satisfaction with the progress made in the various Provinces of the Dominion. We are here isolated far from any railroad, and our surplus produce is generally sold to fishermen, or merchants who supply fishermen or lumbermen. Port Daniel where I reside, is the first Township on entering the Bay des Chaleur on the north side.

WILLIAM McPHERSON, J. P.,  
Mayor, and President of the Agricultural Society,  
Port Daniel, Co. Bonaventure.

1. So long as the United States upholds their present Protective Tariff I think it would not be judicious.
2. On this Island I do not think the effect has been felt much either way.
3. Not being in the trade I cannot tell, but think it has effected little change.
4. Have hogs we sell but few, but the price of pork is better now than in 1878.
5. I cannot say, as we have no dealings with Manitoba, except the drawing in of our young men for the last two years.
6. Horses are raised here with profit, as there is always a demand for good horses in all the United States markets, and also in the Upper Provinces.
7. We can raise all the grain we require for feeding purposes, much cheaper than to import it.
8. The price of poultry has increased for canning purposes, which causes an increased demand; eggs more lively; butter the same as before.
9. Yes, most decidedly, if obtained on sound commercial principles; I think we are in a better position to negotiate now than in 1878.
10. Wool has increased in price from 22 cents in 1878 to 27 cents in 1881.
11. We raise no flax to affect the market, and no tobacco.

12. Home made implements are about the same as in 1878, such as carts, ploughs, harrows, waggons, sleighs and thrashing machines; but imported articles such as harvesters, mowers, rakes, and such like are cheaper.
13. I can see but little difference in these articles to speak of, but we, I think, are getting a better article in common wearing. Cloth and blankets are better.
14. Our home market has not increased, so far as the Island is concerned, owing to the want of Free Trade.
15. The Tariff has not affected the emigration to the United States, as has the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate by drawing our young men to Manitoba instead of Colorado.
16. Real estate is not on the rise on account of so many of young men going to the West. 17. Yes, most decidedly. 18. Cannot say.

*General Remarks:*—The above remarks apply especially to Prince Edward Island. The absence of factories, except a few woollen factories, a couple of small foundries, and two or three sleigh factories, are all that we can boast of—so that our isolated position makes us an exception to the other Provinces.

WILLIAM HASLEM,  
Farmer, Springfield, Co. Queen's, P.E.I.

1. Decidedly it would not. The reasons why are self-evident. 1st, Prior to 1879 our local markets for consumption were more or less occupied by American produce, to the serious detriment of the Canadian farmer. 2nd, The abrogation or reduction of the present Tariff on American products would not only be an act of extreme folly in a national point of view, but palpable injustice to Canadian agriculturalists, while the United States Tariff on similar products practically exclude them from the markets of the United States.
2. An universal upward tendency of prices compared with those prevailing prior to 1879. Oats at times were then largely imported by Ottawa dealers from the United States for home consumption, but now discontinued; increase, 5 to 10 cents per bushel. Rye, formerly 35 to 40 cents for the past three years, has ranged from 75 to 95 cents; increase, 45 to 55 cents per bushel. This marked increase of price is not so much attributable to our Tariff as it is to the continued brisk demand for German exportation and the policy of the present Government in fostering export facilities *via* Montreal and Quebec, thereby lessening freights and commissions between the producer and consumer. Formerly this trade passed principally through American hands and seaports of the United States. Corn, formerly 60 to 65 cents, now 70 to 75 cents; average increase, 12 cents per bushel, as the result of our Tariff lessening importations and stimulating home industries, thereby increasing local demand. Peas, formerly 60 to 65 cents, now 75 to 80; average increase, 15 cents per bush, as the result of our Tariff by increased local demand; and as cited in case of rye, the Government's policy of inducing exportations *via* Canadian seaports. The export trade in this item from this section was heretofore principally done *via* the United States, now more *via* Montreal and Quebec. Barley, not directly effected by the Tariff, formerly from 45 to 50 cents, now 55 to 65 cents per bushel; average increase, 12 cents. Large proportion raised in this section too dark for exportation.
3. Throughout the Ottawa Valley the product of wheat, though increasing, is not equal to the local demand for consumption, arising principally from the lumber trade. Heretofore the deficiency has been largely obtained from the United States, but for the past three years, in both wheat and flour, wholly from Western Ontario. Wheat, since 1878, price for both spring and fall, average increase, 15 cents per bushel; formerly, price for fall wheat, 10 to 15 cents higher than spring wheat; latterly, price of spring wheat 10 to 15 cents higher than fall wheat. Flour, for past three years, no appreciable in-

- crease of price, if any, not to exceed 25 cents per barrel, while the milling interests generally are not unfavourably affected thereby, owing to increased local markets, recent improvement in manufacture, and the general advance in price for their offal. For example, bran, formerly \$10 to \$12 per ton, now \$16 to \$18. No exports from mills in this section, except in case of oatmeal.
4. Can give no reliable data in respect to these items; but pork in the carcase has increased in price from \$2 to \$3 per 100 pounds during past three years; average increase, \$2.50.
  5. During the past three years prices have increased, not so much the effect of duties imposed on these items as from the general Tariff whereby all industries of our country have been stimulated, producing increased local demand, but mainly from increased demand in Manitoba and the North-West, while, as formerly, the United States demand continues active.
  6. The experience of farmers in this section proves that the breeding of heavy Clyde horses is more profitable than other stock—principal market above stated—while the fattening of cattle both for home market, and foreign export, is found profitable, and for the past three years has largely increased, thereby consuming more of their coarse grain on the farms, much to the benefit of the land.
  7. Yes, and do not think a case can be cited throughout Central Canada of a farmer having imported or purchased imported American corn for the feeding of stock when the same was duty free.
  8. Yes, as its general effect stimulates local and Dominion demand, while the continued demand by the United States and for export elsewhere, is in no manner affected thereby.
  9. Yes, if equitably adjusted in every respect. Yes, in much better position than when American produce was admitted free.
  10. An advance from 2 to 5 cents per lb., caused by increased local demand arising from protection afforded our woollen factories, &c.
  11. Necessarily beneficial, though cannot give particulars as these items are not produced to any extent in this section.
  12. Cost materially decreased; quality much improved in respect to every item. Horse rakes formerly, \$30 and \$32, now \$26 and \$28. Single reapers, prior to 1879, price \$120 to \$130, now, same makers, \$90 to \$100. Mowers, prior to 1879, price \$80, now same makers, \$60 to \$65. Ploughs, first class, prior to 1879, price \$16 to \$17, cast iron beams now \$14 to \$15 best iron beams. Plough-iron, all kinds, now 20 per cent. less price. Quality 20 per cent. better. Hand rakes, scythes, cradles, hoes, shovels, &c, now from 5 to 10 per cent. less price and general improved quality. The above respecting agricultural implements of the larger class is obtained from the Dominion agent of one of the most extensive manufacturing firms of Ontario, who also states that prior to 1879, all our Maritime Provinces were supplied from the United States, and from personal knowledge knows they are now wholly supplied from Ontario and Quebec with more satisfaction to the farmers of those Provinces with respect to both cost and quality.
  13. No appreciable change in prices. Any exceptions arise from fluctuations in cost of raw material; the general tendency is towards reduction of prices and improvement of quality arising from increased competition among manufacturers.
  14. Yes; as a rule notably so. Caused by marked increase of consumers at all our manufacturing and business centres.
  15. Yes, as evidenced by the following facts:—Now, no person in our country, able to work, need be without remunerative employment. Whereas, prior to 1879, for some years, our cities, towns and villages were more or less overrun with indigent poor seeking in vain for sustaining employment, and of necessity became claimant on public and private charities, whilst throughout the country parts the professional tramps had become a recognized institution.

16. Yes, there is a decided increased tendency to invest in farm lands. For some years, prior to 1879, throughout this section the prompt payment of instalments for loans on lands were the exception, the current rate of interest from 9 to 12 per cent., and the foreclosure of mortgages at ruinous sacrifice the order of the day. Whereas, now prompt payment of loans is the rule, and capital clamorously seeking investment by way of loans on farms at from 6 to 7 per cent, while several farms in this section, about being vacated by owners removing to our North-West, have recently changed hands on cash terms, at higher prices than the same would have commanded any time during the past twenty years. 17. Yes, in every respect.
18. None that can be reasonably claimed from the ' Dominion Government, wherein new legislation is required, but the writer will venture to suggest that the granting of all possible facilities to manufacturing industries connected with all water powers under control of the Government, consistent with the reasonable claims of navigation interests is worthy of special attention on the part of the Department of Railways and Canals, notably so, respecting those furnished by the Rideau Canal, thereby materially benefiting the farming community throughout its entire length. 1st. In a direct manner by furnishing them convenient and reliable milling facilities they require. 2nd. Indirectly by creating increased markets for their produce within their own rural districts.

*General Remarks:*—The foregoing answers apply especially to the counties of Carleton and Russell and the Ottawa Valley.

M. K. DICKINSON,  
 Manufacturer and General Trader,  
 Manotick, Co's. Carleton and Russell.

1. Not on all farm produce, I would admit corn meal free.  
 2. The effect has been to raise a greater quantity of coarse grains, such as oats and barley. Rye, corn and pease are not raised in our Township.  
 3. We do not observe any difference since the change in the Tariff.  
 4. The average has been higher, since the increased duties.  
 5. My opinion is they have. 6. We find it profitable to breed first-class horses, but, perhaps not as profitable as thorough bred beef steers. Our market for horses is St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., but principally to the United States.  
 7. He cannot. We are of the opinion it would pay better to import American corn. 8. It certainly has.  
 9. We are doubtful. If we had the proper legislation, and open up the markets in foreign countries. Undoubtedly we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty with the present Tariff. 10. We do not notice any difference.  
 11. None raised in our section. 12. Decreased to a large extent; we think the quality is as good. Mowing machines, horse rakes, scythes, axes, forks and other improvements of husbandry.  
 13. We think there is a small increase in cottons; there is none in woollens or hardware, rather a decrease.  
 14. It has, by giving employment to the labouring classes, and giving an impetus to the manufacturing industries of our country.  
 15. By the operation of the present Tariff, employment is given to the industrial classes, keeping them at home and causing Canadians to return.  
 16. There is. Good farm lands have increased in value. We can dispose of our surplus produce to better advantage. 17. They certainly have.

18. We, as farmers, are under the impression that agriculture would be more desirable and profitable if we had an uniform Assessment Law throughout the Dominion. What we want is an income tax.

*General Remarks:*—I have answered as correctly as possible, considering the locality in which I reside.

MARTIN CHAPMAN,  
Amherst, Co. Cumberland.

1. No. 2. No effect in this section. 3. None. 4. to 7. No answer. 8. Yes.  
9. This section of the Dominion would. We are in a better position to negotiate such a treaty with the present Tariff. 10. The price is better.  
11. No answer. 12. The cost is decreased and the quality is as good: Mowing and reaping machines, cultivators, &c. 13. No.  
14. Home market here is not affected by the Tariff. 15. No answer.  
16. No, but not on account of the Tariff. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—This section of the Dominion, as a whole, is well satisfied with the National Policy.

SAML. McDONALD,  
Postmaster, Dundas, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. Yes, because the trade is directly with the United States.  
2. It has been damaging in the extreme on corn; the other grains are raised by our farmers in sufficient quantity to meet the demand; more could be produced if required.  
3. An unjustifiable imposition to tax such a necessary of life as flour.  
4. We have produced more and of better quality; Yankee wooden hams are at a discount. 5. I note no difference. 6. Only enough bred to meet wants.  
7. No. Yes, if it would come duty free. 8. No answer.  
9. Reciprocity is the only thing that will materially benefit Nova Scotia; we were never in so good a position to negotiate such a Treaty.  
10. We can't import. 12. None perceptibly.  
12. Increased—quality not so good as a rule; all implements except ploughs; we believe the Canadian superior to the United States.  
13. Increased—all woollen goods. 14. Yes.  
15. No; emigration to the United States is constantly increasing.  
16. No; increased slightly. 17. A slight improvement.  
18. Reduce the salaries of jackasses at Ottawa 95 per cent., and apply the reduction to the encouragement of farmers to improved stock, in endowing agricultural societies, and in developing the agricultural capabilities of the Dominion.

JAMES H. THORNE,  
Mail Courier, Lower Granville, Co. Annapolis.

1. In my opinion it would not be in the interest of Canadian farmers; markets would be glutted and prices poor.  
2. The effect has not been perceptible in this section of the country, as operations are few. 3. The effect has been good, as far as I can judge.  
4. The duty imposed on live hogs especially, have operated most favourably.  
5. Not in my opinion; the Americans should be afforded every facility to purchase our Canadian stock, horses and cattle.  
6. Our best market for horses is the United States; it pays us here to breed horses for sale for the American markets.  
7. Yes; and very profitably too. No, it would not. 8. Yes, in my opinion.

9. No ; certainly not. Yes, the present position is better.  
 10 and 11. The effect cannot be appreciated here. 12. The cost has decreased, and the quality better ; all articles alike.  
 13. The difference is hardly perceptible ; 14. Yes ; the prices of the home market have been better ; we obtain better prices for all our produce.  
 15. Yes ; emigration has been retarded, and our people are encouraged to return.  
 16. Yes ; there exists an increased tendency to invest capital in farm produce ; farms have increased in value. 17. Yes ; there is much improvement.  
 18. All the changes in the Tariff tending to decrease the duties on all articles necessary to farmers.

*General Remarks* :—Our agricultural interests have improved generally since the protective legislation was introduced in 1878: The National Policy is quite favourable to the farming population.

OLIVIER LACHANCE,  
 Farmer and Warden, Co. Chicoutimi.

1. Yes, it allows more fine grain than would be exported.  
 2. Stopped the feeding of a larger quantity of cattle, as peas are too high for feed. Oats are not raised for exporting. Canada is not our market for rye or barley and can have no effect.  
 3. Freight has advanced and does not correspond with markets having the same facilities in the United States. No spring wheat raised.  
 4. No advantage ; pork is higher in the United States, and Black Sea trade. 5. No.  
 6. Yes, large breeds for the United States markets ; Manitoba buyers pay low prices.  
 7. No. Yes. 8. No. 9. Yes. No, you cannot drive fifty millions of people having everything they require. 10. It has not raised the price. 11. None.  
 12. Yes, and quality inferior ; costs me about one hundred and fifty dollars more to run my farm for everything I have to buy.  
 13. Yes, it is not worth while to go over every article. About twenty per cent.  
 14. No. 15. It has closed the largest flourishing mill in the county ; there is a larger emigration this spring than ever. Keep on your National Policy and drive the Canadians into emigration.  
 16. No. Decreased ; by sending emigration to United States. I have bought there, and if I could get anything like the figures offered in 1878, I would remove.  
 17. Crops and the foreign demand regulate this. I was a supporter of the National Policy in 1878 ; but what a failure. 18. Free Trade.

*General Remarks* :—You can understand what a humbug means ; can't fool farmers again.

JOHN STICKNEY,  
 Reeve, Lynn Valley, Co. Norfolk.

1. Of course not. 2. It has raised the price of oats and peas, and encouraged farmers to raise coarse grains more profitably.  
 3. Not much yet, but if our population increases, as it has since the National Policy, we soon will have a home market for our farm produce.  
 4. It has benefited farmers and encouraged pork raising.  
 5. Yes, as we have a good market our horses, oxen and cows go to Manitoba.  
 6. Horses are profitable if prices keep as they are now. Our market is Manitoba.  
 7. Farmers can raise all coarse grains for fattening, for peas is our most profitable crop since the National Policy. 8. Yes, for we have more people in the country.  
 9. Reciprocal trade is advantageous, but our chances are better through the National Policy. 10. Tariff on cotton raises the price of wool.  
 11. Sugar beet has improved through the National Policy.

12. Farm implements are cheaper and better since the National Policy.
13. The same; rather lower than higher.
14. The home market is very materially benefited by the present Tariff.
15. The National Policy encouraged emigration to Canada.
16. Yes, there is more money and lower interest. 17. Yes, very materially.
18. If any changes, rather higher than lower.

ANTHONY SHOEMAKER,  
Township Councillor, Formosa, Co. Bruce.

---

1. Yes; because it would cheapen them to the farmer who uses them in place of more expensive kinds raised here, and if they are not wanted by the farmer they are not wanted at all.
2. The only effect has been to cause feeders to use oats and peas at a greater cost than corn for fattening purposes.
3. It has not affected the price of wheat, but made flour higher.
4. Dried hams, bacon and lard have been made dearer to the extent of the duty. No effect on live hogs.
5. No. The American and European demands have improved the market.
6. Yes, better profits (through Montreal) in the United States. About 1 out of 10 horses sold here goes to Manitoba.
7. But for the duty it would pay better to import American corn.
8. Nor perceptible difference. 9. Yes. Cannot say.
10. Lowered it about 30 per cent. 11. No answer.
12. Cost about the same, but most machines are lighter and less durable, especially so reapers.
13. Hardware is made more expensive; hinges, bolts, &c., about 20 per cent.
14. No; but by the great foreign demand.
15. No. Emigration to the United States is greater from this section than for many years past.
16. No. Farm lands have decreased in value since 1878 by about 25 per cent., because so many people are leaving the country. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

W. H. HOWDEN,  
Warden, Co. York.

---

1. No. 2. An increase in prices, and a great increase in the quantity of corn, oats and barley; pease sparingly raised at present, owing to the presence of the pea-bug; and rye not raised at all.
3. Better prices and steadier demand for fall wheat; but little spring wheat raised.
4. Better prices, and increased production. 5. Yes.
6. Yes; but find equally as good profits on cattle and sheep and quicker returns. Manitoba is the principal market for horses. 7. Yes; but the profits depend very much on the quality of the stock he feeds it to. 8. Yes.
9. No. We are in a decidedly better position to negotiate such a Treaty, but in my opinion are much better without it. 10. A little improvement in prices.
11. I can't say, we do not raise any.
12. In some cases the cost has decreased and the quality has improved. Notably in reapers, mowers, sulky-rakes and ploughs. 13. Prices not perceptibly higher.
14. Yes. By bringing the producer and consumer together, thus saving largely in the cost of transportation, and by giving steady employment and increased remuneration to all classes. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. Very little difference in the price of farm lands.

17. Yes. The condition of the labouring classes improves with that of the farmers, and *vice versa*. 18. Only such as experience shows to be advisable.

*General Remarks*:—The County of Oxford produces a greater quantity of cheese than any other county in the Dominion and I can only attribute the cause to Protection.

JAMES G. PETIT,  
Clerk and Treasurer, Burgessville, Co. Oxford.

1. Yes, corn. 2. Rye and corn are raised in price. 3. No answer. 4. Very little  
5 and 6. No answers. 7. No. Yes, American corn if it was not for the duty.  
8. No answer. 9. Yes. 10. Wool was never lower than it has been late of years.  
11 and 12. No answers. 13. Yes, in a good many cases. 14. Not here.  
15. No answer. 16. No. 17. Yes. 18. Corn free, then it could be raised for the English  
market.

SMITH HINMAN, J.P.,  
Dundonald, Co. Northumberland.

1. Yes, all kinds; we require corn for feed, other grain we have a surplus, and they  
only compete with us in a foreign market.
2. I cannot see as there is any great difference.
3. American prices in general are higher than ours, therefore it cannot give us  
any higher price. 4. It has increased the price some on hams, lard, bacon, &c.
5. No; we have a surplus of horses and cattle, and the trade is the other way, we  
are getting good prices from the States and shipping a large number.
6. It pays well to raise horses, equally as much so as other stock on the United  
States.
7. It would pay better to import corn generally for feed, but there should be a duty  
on corn for the manufacture of whiskey. 8. No; we are exporters.
9. Give us Free Trade as nearly as possible. 10. I do not think it has improved  
it much, as wool is very low in price and large stocks on hand.
11. No effect whatever in this section as there is not any growing of any account.
12. About the same as usual. 13. Woollens, cottons and hardware in general use  
have risen in price considerably or depreciated in quality.
14. No; for we always lived before, and live still, and there are a great many less to  
feed on account of the exodus to the States.
15. If you could see our village at present, you would not think there was much  
diversity of employment. No! No! If the emigration continues for a year or  
two, Canada will be depopulated.
16. No; you can buy farm property from 25 to 50 per cent. cheaper than two or  
three years ago. Why, emigration to the States and the North-West.
17. The extra demand this year has given farmers good prices, though their condi-  
tion generally for the past five years has been very low. The labouring class  
has not improved much as a general thing. Wages have improved con-  
siderably, but provisions and clothing have risen, also fuel, in price, but on the  
whole he is very little better off.
18. Give us Free Trade for at least five years to try it; let us buy in the cheapest  
market, and not have to spend our hard earnings in paying double prices for  
what we require, to bolster up a few manufactories. The Government is sup-  
posed to legislate for the masses of the people, not for a dozen or two manu-  
facturers who are benefited by the present Tariff. The present Tariff presses  
very heavy on all classes, and the agriculturalist in particular, particularly on

harness, trimmings, coal, iron, sugar, &c., &c. I as a manufacturer would like to see Free Trade, it would enhance the value of our raw material; but if it opened the American markets to us I would be well satisfied.

JOSEPH FISHER,  
Brewer and Reeve, Portsmouth, Co. Frontenac.

1. Not by any means. 2. It has raised the price of coarse grains of all kinds,
3. Wheat is not grown much in this section, but should think it did not affect the price materially as the United States is not our market.
4. It has been beneficial to the farmers here, having raised the market.
5. It does not affect the price of horses, as we never get them from the United States.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, and the United States is the principal market.
7. Farmers can grow corn profitably, and benefit their lands thereby.
8. Not materially. 9. Reciprocal trade would be to our benefit, and our chances are better through the N. P. Wages are better.
10. Wool brings a better price. 11. None grown in this section.
12. All kinds of implements fully as cheap and much better.
13. Find no material difference. 14. Nearly all kinds of produce bring a better price.
15. There has been no emigration from this section only to the North-West.
16. There is no material difference, but would have been but for the North-West.
17. Yes, very much. 18. Cannot recommend any at present.

W. N. DOLLER,  
Reeve, Napanee, Co. Lennox.

1. No. 2. It has encouraged agriculturalists to raise a large quantity of coarse grains, and the duty has considerably increased the price of such grains.
3. It had the effect of raising the price of both. It has also increased the price on the different classes of spring and fall wheat.
4. Very beneficial to the farmers, as it increased the price from 25 to 40 per cent.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, but not as profitable as other stock; both.
7. The farmers of this county can raise profitably all grains required to fatten his stock. 8. Yes. 9. No. Yes. 10. No material difference.
11. None grown in this county. 12. Decreased and quality better. 13. No.
14. It has, by increasing value of almost everything used in this country.
15. Yes; it has.
16. Very little change in value; we think the value would materially increase had Manitoba not been opened up for settlement. 17. Yes.
18. Not any that we know of.

A. S. KIRKLAND, M. D.,  
Reeve, Nottawasaga, Duntroon, Co. Simcoe.

1. It certainly would not. 2. Has raised the price of oats and corn, and encouraged farmers to grow more coarse grains.
3. I am of opinion wheat is not affected by a duty since Liverpool is our real market.
4. It has benefited farmers and encouraged pork raising.
5. Duty does not affect since horses never come from the United States to Canada.
6. The principal market for horses at present is Manitoba. 7. Farmers can raise all coarse grains for fattening purposes and even more if required for market.
8. Very little change is effected.

- 
9. Reciprocal trade is advantageous, our chances are better through the N. P. of getting a better one than we have had, greater advantages and wages to labourers through the N. P.
  10. Tariff on cotton raises the price of wool.
  11. Improved in price by the N.P.
  12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper, and the workmanship more substantial.
  13. Woollens and hardware unchanged, cotton goods about the same.
  14. Home market very materially benefited by the present Tariff.
  15. N. P. encourages emigration to Canada.
  16. A very great deal on account of cheap money through the N. P.
  17. Very materially so.
  18. Sir John has done all that can be done, and it is to be hoped that he may be long spared to complete the works so nobly begun, and save the Dominion from ruin.

JOS. L. DOWSLEY,  
Merchant, Eccott, Co. Leeds.

---

1. I think it would.
2. We were not benefited in the least, we have no better home market for all the kinds of grain mentioned.
3. We were obliged to sell our spring and fall wheat for less money than when these duties were not imposed.
4. We have no better market than before these duties were imposed.
5. The United States is our chief market.
6. In the United States.
7. Import American corn.
8. No, but decreased.
9. Yes.
10. Injurious.
11. Very little or none in this locality.
12. Increased; the quality may be as good.
13. Woollens and cottons may not be increased much. Hardware, such as all kinds of iron and nails, is increased very much.
14. It has not.
15. It has not, but sent our young men into the United States, where many of them have made it their home, and they are lost to Canada for ever.
16. For the years 1879-80 and 1881, the tendency was decreased on account of a railroad passing through the township; it has increased this year.
17. Not for the first year or two; there is a slight improvement at present.
18. I am convinced that the National Policy is a humbug, and that the sooner the Tariff is readjusted the better for the farmers of this country.

ALEXANDER FRASER,  
Reeve, Tayside, Co. Stormont.

---

1. Certainly not, as we are able to grow more than we can consume, and an over plus for export.
2. The effect is a better demand and price, particularly for oats and peas.
3. The effect so far is a brisk demand and fair price, and encourages the farmers to raise more as it secures the home market.
4. It has stopped to a great extent the heretofore importation of pork from the States, and the demand and price is improved thereby.
5. The market is certainly improved, and a great many have been purchased in this neighbourhood by Manitoba buyers.
6. Yes, but I find other stock pay better. There have been buyers here from both Manitoba and the States.
7. Certainly; no occasion to import any.
8. It is greatly improved.
9. Yes, we are in a better position to negotiate such a treaty, as it is not likely we would ever get it if we admitted their produce free.
10. I cannot say at present, prices are very low.
11. These articles are not much cultivated here.
12. The cost, if anything, has decreased and quality as good of mowers, reapers, ploughs, waggons, harrows, horse rakes, &c.

13. We can get such articles as cheap if not cheaper by the present Tariff.  
 14. Yes, very much ; we can sell everything we can raise at remunerative prices.  
 15. Yes, it has encouraged Canadians to return, and also emigration from other countries to Canada.  
 16. Yes, farm lands have increased in value since 1878; the demand and price for farm produce. 17. Very much. 18. I don't know of any at present.

*General Remarks*:—I only received this document from our Township Clerk to-day, consequently could not answer sooner.

JAMES McPHERSON,  
 Farmer and Reeve, Rama, Co. Ontario.

1. No, it would not be in the interest of the agriculturalists to admit any of the American farm produce free, because we are an exporting country, and they have a duty on our produce going into their market.  
 2. It has given the producer a good paying price for coarse grains.  
 3. I have had a good fair price for what little wheat I have to sell ; it is 'fall wheat I raise.  
 4. I have sold live hogs for \$6 per cwt., hams, 12½, and lard 14 cents a pound, and the average price of these articles are higher in the Canadian market.  
 5. Duties imposed on horses, I think, have not improved the prices, as the States is the only best horse market. Other live stock has improved in value.  
 6. I am not breeding horses for market, my stock is principally milch cows, sheep and hogs. The United States is our principal horse market.  
 7. We can profitably. 8. I don't think it has made the prices better.  
 9. I think we would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the States. We are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff.  
 10. I don't think it has increased the price of wool.  
 11. I don't cultivate flax, tobacco or sugar beet. 12. Not where I have purchased.  
 13. Not any that I can notice of what I consume.  
 14. It has, by preventing the Americans along the line of having a free market, when prices are higher in Canada than in the States. 15. It has.  
 16. There is ; some lands have increased and some decreased ; lands owned by farmers and not encumbered by mortgages have increased, and those encumbered have decreased. 17. No answer.  
 18. Changes in the usury laws and cheaper money will encourage farmers to improve their farms.

*General Remarks*:—I believe the repeal of the Insolvent Act has been of more benefit to the country than the N.P. I believe it would be a great benefit to our country to prohibit the woollen manufacturers from making taffy and shoddy cloth, also of cotton manufacturers using starch.

W. C. RAYMOND,  
 Dickinson's Landing, Co. Stormont.

1. Certainly not. 2. The price of Indian corn increased ; oats and rye increased. I do not think the price of barley or pease has been materially affected by the Tariff.  
 3. The imposition of duties on wheat must have a tendency to increase the price ; perhaps you will get a more intelligent answer to this question than I can give.  
 4. The effect has been to increase the price of these articles very much.  
 5. The increased duties have certainly improved the home market.  
 6. The profits on horse-breeding will compare favourably with that on other stock ; our principal market is in the United States. A few have gone to Manitoba, chiefly taken there by intending settlers.

7. Yes; but I suppose it would pay better to grow and sell barley if the high prices are maintained, and buy corn if there was no duty.
8. Previous to the N.P. our markets were flooded with American vegetables; the duties have been a great benefit to the producers of vegetables in Ontario. I do not think the prices of poultry, butter and eggs have been much affected.
9. That is the general opinion. I think we are in a better position with the present Tariff than when American produce was admitted free.
10. I do not think the Tariff has affected the price of wool very much; but I think the Canadian farmer should be encouraged to grow the finer grades of wool; they are quite able to do this. 11. I cannot say; but sugar beet is a failure, it seems.
12. The price of implements has slightly increased, and the quality very much improved.
13. The prices of these articles have increased. Farmers generally say that almost everything used by them is increased in price; but persons in the trade can inform you more correctly than I can.
14. I think the home market for farm produce has been improved by the operation of the Tariff, especially by the duties on live stock, coarse grains and vegetables.
15. Our industrial classes are better employed than they were a few years ago; yet the population in many parts of Ontario has very much decreased; some have gone to the United States, others to the North-Western Provinces, but few return.
16. The tendency to invest in farm property is much the same; the security is thought to be the best. Land has rather decreased in value since 1878; a great quantity of land has been thrown on the market by persons migrating to the North-West, which has had a tendency to lower the price.
17. General condition of the farmers improved, and especially the labouring classes, since 1878.
18. A very difficult question to answer; I will give it up at present.

*General Remarks* :—In answering the questions propounded, I have found a good deal of difficulty, but I have done so to the best of my ability. I have endeavoured to divest myself of all political bias. Perhaps it is only fair to say that I have been identified with the Reform party; but to show you that I am quite independent in this matter, I have taken the liberty to enclose part of a report written by me in January, 1878, for the East Durham Agricultural Society. Though published as the Directors' Report, it originated purely with myself, and was adopted by the annual meeting. The part I send you was published by the *Mail*, and I believe all the leading Conservative journals in the Province copied it. It was my opinion for some time previous to this that Mr. Mackenzie could not retain power unless he adopted some measure of relief to the agricultural and manufacturing classes. I believe it to be the first duty of all Governments to foster and protect home industries and home productions.

"A very effective piece of evidence in this way is to be found in the Director's Annual Report of the East Durham Agricultural Society, published in the *Port Hope Times* of the 23rd inst. The report, by the way, is a very able one, touching in a practical manner on various points of interest to farmers, and giving a clear presentment of the agricultural record of the past year for the district referred to. We copy that portion of it relative to the question of fair play to our own agricultural interests, which is well worth quoting in full:

"But there is a subject of vital importance to the agricultural interest, of this Province especially, a subject which seems to engross the minds of the people at the present time more than any other. A subject which, we think, is quite admissible at a meeting of agriculturalists. It is the subject of 'Protection,' and we think that all parties, whether agriculturalists or not, should look at it fairly and impartially, not with an eye to party politics, but with a view and determination of having justice done in the premises.

"We are aware that the agriculturalists of Ontario have not been agitating this matter as much as some other portions of the community. But this we cannot account for, for if there is any body of men, more than another, employed in industrial pursuits, who should ask for protection, surely it is the farmer, for under the present system he is entirely unprotected and left to his own resources, while the manufacturer is protected under the sheltering wings of the Government by a high protective Tariff.

"You are all aware that our great staple—wheat, when sold to the Americans, is subjected to a duty of 20 cents per bushel, and barley to 15 cents per bushel, while all kinds of American grain are admitted into this Dominion free. Manufactured goods brought into the Dominion are subject to a duty of seventeen and a half per cent. Machinery used for manufacturing purposes is subject to a duty of ten per cent., while on agricultural machinery and implements a duty of 17½ per cent. is charged, making a difference of 7½ per cent in favour of the manufacturer, virtually excluding the American implement and obliging the Canadian farmer to buy from the home manufacturer, and pay him his own price, perhaps for an inferior article, because the American manufacturer cannot compete with the Canadian manufacturer, on account of the high import duty. Thus you will perceive that the arrangement is altogether against the farmer. On the other hand, if the Canadian implement maker sells his wares to a person in the United States he has to pay a duty of 35 per cent., a difference of 17½ per cent. in favour of the American manufacturer, and so it is all through the chapter—almost everything in favour of the United States, and against the Canadian, especially the Canadian farmer, who is saddled on every side.

"We think that every person must admit that the Tariff existing between the United States and Canadian Governments is in a most unsatisfactory state, and calls for immediate remedy."

JOHN FOOT,

Sec. East Durham Agricultural Society, Port Hope, Co. Durham.

1. Decidedly not. 2. The effect has been to increase the prices of corn and oats, and to increase the production; do not see that the price of barley is affected.
3. Wheat is governed by foreign demand, and not affected by the Tariff, unless by increasing home consumption. 4. Prices largely increased.
5. In this part of the country Americans buy many of our horses and pay their own duty on them.
6. Profitable to breed horses to sell to the United States and Manitoba; about half of them go to Manitoba, and the rest to the United States. My experience is that the raising and fattening of cattle pays better at present than horses.
7. Canadian farmers can raise grain enough and to spare to fatten their stock.
8. I think so, by the beneficial effects of Tariff, by increasing industry and improving the trade of the country.
9. Canadian farmers would not be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty.
10. Can't say. 11. None produced here. 12. Farm implements were never better than at the present time and never cheaper. 13. Not increased in price by Tariff.
14. By the increase of profitably paid labour thereby increasing the wealth and number of the population. 15. It has. 16. Farm lands are higher now than in 1878. 17. Condition has improved since 1878. 18. No answer.

JOHN MISENER,

Deputy Reeve, Marshville, Co. Welland.

1. In my opinion it would not.
2. Most beneficial; oats being at least 10 cents more per bushel than before the Tariff came into force; rye has nearly doubled in price; corn has advanced 25 per cent.; peas 10 to 12 cents per bushel; barley about the same.
3. To give the Canadian market more into the hands of Canadians; before the Tariff a good deal of American wheat was ground in Canada, which is not now the case; under the present system the farmer is better paid for his wheat, more especially for the spring variety.
4. When American products in this line, came in free of duty, it did not pay to raise hogs for sale in Canada; during the past three years paying prices have been obtained, and our farmers find large profits in this branch of their business.
5. Yes, in a marked degree; the duties preventing American competition.
6. I am not engaged in the breeding of horses; horses are, however, bought in considerable numbers in this neighbourhood for shipment to Manitoba.
7. In most cases he can; where he has to buy, he would still, I think, find it to his advantage to feed Canadian corn, upon taking into consideration the difference in quality in our corn and American; I would sooner have one bushel of the former than one and one-fifth of the latter for feeding purposes, and the money expended would be kept in the country. 8. I have every reason to believe it has.
9. There is no doubt the Canadian farmers would be benefited by an impartial Reciprocity Treaty. We are unquestionably in a much better position to negotiate for this as we are now, than we were formerly. The Americans sending their produce into this country without let or hindrance, would have little to be desired by them in the way of change.
10. To slightly increase the price, and prevent wool of a similar class to that produced in Canada being imported.
11. I have no personal knowledge in regard to these products.
12. The smaller kinds of farm implements, such as scythes (quality of Canadian scythes, and axes, are, I believe, inferior to American) hoes, &c., are selling at lower prices; mowers and reapers no higher, though much improved.
13. Cottons are a shade higher; woollens remain at about former prices; hardware in ordinary use among farmers costs no more than before the Tariff.
14. Yes, there is a better demand for farm produce and better prices obtained; owing, perhaps, to a great extent, to American competition in the Maritime Provinces being done away with.
15. No doubt it has; from this neighbourhood the City of Hamilton, where large factories have recently been established, giving employment to a large number of men. At this time there is no occasion for men to leave Canada in search of employment.
16. Sales of farm property were never more easily effected, or at better prices; the attractions of the North-West may induce a good many to sell; the present Tariff, a good many to buy.
17. Farmers appear satisfied with their future prospects; labour is unusually scarce, and remuneration largely in excess of what it was in 1878.
18. No change in particular occurs to me, so far as the existing Tariff is concerned, but I would suggest some active measures ought to be taken to prevent the growth and dissemination of noxious weeds throughout the county.

J. W. JARDINES,  
Reeve, Saltfleet, Co. Wentworth.

- 
1. It would for the reason that we raise a large surplus for exportation; the free admission of American corn would give us therefore a larger surplus of coarse grains to sell at a profit.
  2. No effect on Canadian coarse grains in this section, but raised the price of American corn for feeding purposes. 3. No effect whatever.

4. Has increased the price to consumers but not to producers.
  5. Most decidedly not.
  6. Yes, our principal market in the United States for classes Nos. 1 and 2.
  7. Perhaps we could, but it would pay much better to admit corn free of duty.
  8. Not one cent.
  9. Of course we would; we are not in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff.
  10. It has had an injurious effect.
  11. No effect in this county.
  12. Cost increased and less material used in construction owing to the duty on raw material.
  13. Yes, all increased in price to amount of duty imposed.
  14. Certainly not; the increase of prices is due to foreign demand.
  15. No, but has accelerated emigration to the States under the present Tariff, no encouragement to Canadians to return, but the reverse.
  16. Very little; farm lands decreased in value since 1878 on account of emigration to the United States and Manitoba.
  17. Yes. Cause: good crops and high prices for grain and live stock.
  18. No changes required in legislation to make agriculture profitable; for instance, the last tinkering on the Tariff raised land salt to the farmer 50 cents per ton.
- General Remarks* :—I am sorry I had not more space to give you a piece of my mind regarding the National Policy, which is in reality a national fraud on the Canadian farmer, for I am one of many who believe that the four millions of excessive tax now in the hands of the Dominion Finance Minister was taken from the farmers pockets and just nothing in return.

ALEXANDER McLAREN,

Reeve, Cromarty, Co. Perth.

1. I think it would. The markets of the world rule the prices of wheat we have to sell, and our coarse grains are better than American.
2. It has had no effect; American markets have been higher than ours; timothy seed has been higher here on account of duties.
- 3 and 4. Not posted.
5. No, it has not. They are of more value in the United States than here, especially horses.
6. It is profitable to breed heavy draught horses and good roadsters. The United States is the best market for them.
7. No, he cannot. Cheap corn is what is wanted. Our pease and barley are of more value to export.
8. The Tariff has had no effect on this market.
9. This part of Ontario would be greatly benefited by Reciprocity. I do not think the present Tariff would make any difference.
10. We are holding two years clip of wool and cannot get offered more than 24 cents.
11. I do not know.
12. Increased by the Tariff on material; the quality is improving caused by competition and improvement in the way they are manufactured.
13. Cottons have increased. I find cotton bags have increased 50 cents above American prices; when you take sizes into consideration they have been reduced about one-fifth in size.
14. No, it has not.
15. The exciting speculation of the North-West has caught those who are of a migrating nature.
16. There has been no increase in value, but if the cheaper rates of interest to borrowers is taken into consideration, there is a decrease.
17. Good crops are putting our farmers in a very good condition, but as to labourers I cannot see any improvement; they are getting better wages, but it costs them more to live.
18. No answer.

ALEX. DUNCAN,

Brantford, Co. Brant.

1. Corn should be admitted free. 2. Corn has raised in price, others are about the same. 3. There has been little or no effect.
4. The price has been appreciably raised. 5. Have had perhaps, but little effect on prices, as such are not imported except to some extent for breeding.
6. The breeding of horses is profitable here, and the United States and Manitoba divide the market about equally. 7. I think it would pay to import corn.
8. The market for these things remains, I think, about the same.
9. I think a Reciprocity Treaty would be a benefit to the Canadian farmer; and that the prospects for such a Treaty are enhanced by the Tariff.
10. Very little effect. 11. I cannot say. 12. The cost is about the same, and the quality has improved. 13. Have noticed no change.
14. Increased on the whole. Partly due to the development of manufactories and increased investment of capital.
15. Has no doubt increased and diversified employment, and slightly retarded emigration. 16. Farm lands have increased in value the first two years and decreased the past two. The decrease is owing, however, to the increase of interest in Manitoba.
17. It is owing partly to the exceptionally good crops, and partly, no doubt, to the operation of the Tariff. 18. One or two very important changes are in my opinion absolutely essential for the present relief and future prosperity of Canadian farmers.

*General Remarks* :—The Government should issue a National Currency to loan to farmers for improving their farms &c., at a rate of three or four (at the most) per cent. interest, to be given out through the Banks or otherwise as the Government may judiciously arrange. Meanwhile, there should be legislation in the direction of checking the extortion and injustice of Loan Companies before they swallow up one-half the the farms of Ontario.

ALLEN PRINGLE,

Farmer, Selby, Co. Lennox.

1. By admitting American corn free it would advantage the graziers of Canada by enabling them to produce better and heavier cattle for the English market.
2. The imposition of duty on American corn has been the means of making oats, barley and pease sell higher in Canada than formerly.
3. In our local markets it has been the means of making fall and spring wheat sell higher; I can't say much about flour.
4. I can't say much about this question, not in my line of business.
5. Yes, horses are higher than they ever have been in Canada before.
6. I think it will pay to breed horses for a great many years to come, until Manitoba gets settled up. The principal market just now is Manitoba.
7. Farmers in this section cannot profitably raise grain to fatten cattle, especially graziers. 8. Butter sells higher; can't say about the other articles.
9. Yes. 10. I cannot say. 11. I don't know. 12. No, the Tariff has not increased the price of any machinery required on a farm. 13. No. 14. Yes.
15. Yes. 16. Yes. Farm lands in my section have increased in value since 1878.
17. Yes. 18. I think the present Government has done a great deal to advance the interests of agriculturalists; don't want a change; would like they would amend the Municipal Law not to assess personal property, think it would be more fair for all parties concerned.

JOHN STEWART,

Cattle Dealer and Grazier, Springbank, Co. Middlesex.

1. Yes, especially corn. It would afford an opportunity for Canadians to grow more barley for which there is always a sharp demand, and feed on a less expensive grain grown by the Americans. 2. No effect whatever that I can see, other than that we have to grow more coarse grains for feeding purposes, consequently less barley, which is by far our best paying grain.
3. I can't say; consider Liverpool the governing market for wheat and flour.
4. I can't say, as both countries produce a surplus, then Liverpool governs the market (or supply and demand.)
5. Our best buyers of horses are the Americans for the American market; sheep, the American market; cattle, Liverpool. 6. Yes, as good as other stock in the United States. 7. No. Yes. 8. No.
9. Absolute Free Trade would be the very best. It would only take a short time until the natural products of each country would find a profitable market either at home or abroad. When American produce were admitted free.
10. All humbug. 11. I can't say. 12. Yes, increased duties having made raw material higher, the quality is not as good; Canadians having practically no opposition, have grown careless as regards everything, save price alone.
13. I never knew Canadian wool to be so low in price. Manufactured woollens and cottons are increased but cannot definitely state the increase.
14. No. 15. No. 16. No; have not increased in value.
17. Improved, by reason of a good crop here and a good foreign demand.
18. Economy and retrenchment give us a free market for barley, so that we can obtain the same price as if grown in the United States less carriage, and free corn the same to enable us to fatten our cattle cheaply. Horses, cattle, sheep, dairy, and barley, pay by far the best. Anything calculated to increase and produce the above will help the Canadian farmer.

*General Remarks*:—I look on the so-called National Policy as a fraud on the farming community calculated only to raise the fallen fortunes of a disgraced and corrupt band of Political Mountbeanks, and it may better be called Nonsensical Pretense.

A. R. KIDD,  
Reeve, Warsaw, Co. Peterboro'.

1. Corn free would be a great benefit in consequence of the failure of the pea crops. The pea crop is improving. 2. As a matter of course the duty on corn would increase the price of coarse grains. Rye, corn, barley and peas are very high.
3. I cannot say positively, but the prices are higher uniformly than before.
4. Prices have been higher. 5. Demand and price far better.
6. Yes, better. Manitoba now more than the States.
7. I think importing would be the best till good crops of peas are raised again; farmers are raising more corn than formerly.
8. It certainly has improved; good prices are obtained for everything a farmer has to sell. 9. You will infer from my other answers what would be best in this particular. 10. Price of wool is lower. 11. Large quantities of flax are raised around here; there are four large flax mills within five miles of my home; not much tobacco or sugar beet raised here.
12. I cannot say positively, I think the quality is better, I am not posted in prices. 13. I can't say. 14. Increased and improved.
15. There has been considerable emigration to Manitoba and Dakota; but the Tariff has nothing to do with it—it was a spirit that pervaded the atmosphere.
16. The price of land was very high until the Manitoba craze; it will be up again.
17. I am certain the condition of farmers has greatly improved. 18. I know of none.

*General Remarks*:—I laid this paper before our Council and they refused to assist me in the least, so I have done the best I could. Every question has been carefully considered and answered to the best of my knowledge and belief.

C. PROUT,  
Clerk, Hay P.O., Co. Huron.

1. All free but corn. Because we raise a surplus of all grain but corn.
2. The duty (on Indian corn) is not high enough to be of any use to the Canadian farmer. Oats are higher in American markets than here. No benefit on rye as we import none. No good on barley and peas as we raise a surplus.
3. The Tariff had the effect of making spring and fall wheat lower here than in American markets.
4. The price has not been any higher here. The Tariff has done no good on live hogs, &c.
5. Our best horses all go to the American markets from here, so I think the duty has done no good to the Canadian farmer.
6. We find it profitable to breed horses for the American markets, but I think other stock pays better in this section. Principal market United States for horses.
7. I think we can raise all the grain we want to fatten our stock. I think there would be no money in stock if we import our grain.
8. I cannot see that it has had any effect in our neighborhood.
9. Yes; Reciprocity would be a benefit if it did not cost too much. I do not think the present Tariff would be advantageous in bringing about Reciprocity with the United States.
10. It has been no benefit to the wool grower. 11. None grown here.
12. The cost has increased under the present Tariff; the quality is lighter on agricultural implements.
13. Woollens are no higher. It has made cottons higher than they would under a lower Tariff. I think hardware is no higher.
14. The high Tariff has not improved the home market as we have a surplus to sell of all grain except corn.
15. Not in this locality. The emigration is large from here; mostly all go to the United States, and none comes back.
16. No, we can hardly sell farm property in this section at present. Farm property has decreased in value 30 per cent since 1878.
17. There is a little improvement on account of the high prices of all kinds of farm produce; labourers' wages are not much higher than 1878.
18. We are not afraid to compete with the world's markets if we can get fair carrying rates and a lower Tariff on our farm produce.

WALTER TURNBULL, J. P.,  
License Commissioner, North Norfolk, Delhi, Co. Norfolk.

1. We think not; because it would lower the prices in our markets.
2. The effect has been to lower the prices in our markets to a moderate extent. Both on oats, rye barley, corn, and peas.
3. We consider the effect produced to be beneficial, inasmuch as it has raised the price for local consumption both on spring and fall wheat.
4. To raise the price in our markets. 5. We are of the opinion that they have.
6. We find it very profitable to raise good horses at present prices. We find a market both in the United States and Manitoba.
7. We think he can, and that the consumption of our grain to fatten stock is in every way more satisfactory than the importing of American corn.
8. In our opinion decidedly so. 9. We are of that opinion. No.
10. Not any that we can perceive.
11. We are not in a position to judge, none being raised in our neighbourhood.
12. We are of the opinion that the cost of farm implements has decreased, and that the quality is as good. Reapers, mowers, sulky rakes, ploughs, harrows, hoes, axes, shovels, spades, &c., &c.
13. We think that woollens, cottons, and hardware used by farmers have not increased by the present Tariff.
14. Yes, by raising the price of all farm produce.

15. The present Tariff has raised the wages of mechanics and labourers generally in this locality. No one seems to want to go to the States from hereabouts, and some have returned.
16. There is in this locality. Farm lands have increased in value since 1878, perhaps owing in part to the increased facilities for obtaining money at low rates of interest.
17. Decidedly in this location. 18. We think not; the laws are sufficiently good.

JAMES BLOTT, Township Clerk,  
 WILLIAM HAMILTON, Reeve.  
 FRANCIS SPLATT,  
 JAMES LYONS,  
 THOS. EATON,  
 ARTHUR DOCKER, } Councillors.  
 Dunn, Co. Haldimand.

1. It would not. 2. Has raised the price of oats and corn; other grains have not been affected in our locality.
3. I do not think the price of wheat has been affected by the duty. 4. It has to a certain extent encouraged pork raising.
5. The duty does not affect us, as horses do not come from United States to Canada.
6. Profitable to breed horses for the United States market.
7. Farmers can raise all the coarse grain they want and even more.
8. It is not. 9. I think they would with the present Tariff on.
10. It has not raised the price of wool. 11. There is none raised in our section, therefore cannot say. 12. All farming implements are a little cheaper and just as good.
13. Woollen and cotton goods about the same; hardware a little higher.
14. I think there has not been much change. 15. It has somewhat retarded emigration to the United States.
16. I see no difference, as there is always a tendency to invest capital in farming property. Farm lands are about the same in our section.
17. In some cases, yes; in others, no. 18. That the Government give more attention to agricultural interests than has been formerly done.

JACOB H. STRONG,  
 Reeve, Rosedene, Co. Lincoln.

1. No. 2. We don't raise corn; we think our barley, oats and rye are a better price.
3. We don't raise wheat for export. 4. It has increased the value of those articles.
5. Horses are in good demand at advanced prices.
6. Yes. fully equal; United States and the Old Country. 7. Yes; we scarcely ever import feed. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. Yes. 10. Beneficial.
11. Do not cultivate any land. 12. Decreased. Reapers, mowers, ploughs, &c., are cheaper. 13. No. 14. Yes; all products of the farm are in good demand.
15. Emigration is all to the North-West. 16. On account of the tide of emigration to the North-West, farm lands have declined in this County, if there is any change. 17. Decidedly. 18. Protect the farming interests.

JOHN KINNEY,  
 Reeve, Athole, Cherry Valley, Co. Prince Edward.

1. No. 2. The duty on oats is favourable to the price of oats; rye not raised, corn increased in price; barley not affected; duty favourable to peas.
3. The duty on flour and wheat is beneficial to the Canadian farmer.
4. A benefit to the Canadian farmer so far as bacon and hogs are concerned. There should also be a duty on barrelled pork. 5. Yes.
6. Yes. The profit on heavy horses is greater at present than that derived either from cattle or sheep. In both places. 7. He can.
8. The market for butter and eggs has improved by the Tariff.
9. Yes. We are in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff.
10. It has not increased the price. I would recommend a duty on fine wool to encourage production of same. 11. Cannot say.
12. Cannot see any difference either in price or quality.
13. Hardware has not increased in price; cannot say how the other articles may have been affected.
14. Yes. The market for cattle by excluding American, has opened a market at seasons when American produce lower the price; also at certain seasons increased the price of flour in Eastern markets. 15. It undoubtedly has.
16. Land transactions are about the same; prices have not decreased, but would have been higher had it not been for the opening up of the North-West.
17. The general condition has improved.
18. A duty on fine wool and barrelled pork, I believe, would prove beneficial.

Wm. F. SANDERSON,

Warden, St. Mary's, Co. Perth.

1. Certainly not unless we had the same privilege.
2. It seems to have raised the price of oats and peas in this section.
3. From all that I can judge I think it has raised the price of spring wheat about 7 cents per bushel.
4. It has caused a greater demand for live hogs and increased the price considerably in everything connected with them.
5. Horses and live stock generally has greatly improved in price.
6. There is no doubt but it is profitable to breed horses, and Manitoba is the principal market at the present time.
7. They can raise all the grain required for feeding stock, but in this section we imported a good deal of corn before the Tariff came into operation.
8. I think so. 9. I think they would, and I also think we are in a better position, at the present time, to secure it than formerly. 10 and 11. Cannot say.
12. The cost of implements not increased, and I think the quality is as good as ever. 13. I think there is a slight increase in the price of these goods.
14. There is a good market at the present time for all the farmer has to dispose of.
15. There is a great deal of emigration from here at the present time, mostly to Manitoba.
16. There is any amount of capital for investment on farm property at the present time at 6 per cent. here, which is a lower rate than formerly. I think land is not in as good demand because there are so many selling out and going to Manitoba. 17. There is no doubt but they are.
18. I think by having more practical farmers in the Assembly that could assist those that are there, and are willing to do all they can for the benefit of the farmer.

MATHEW ANDERSON,

President Centre Wellington Agricultural Society,

Reeve, Fergus, Co. Wellington.

1. No. 2. It has raised the price of oats and pease.
3. I am of the opinion that it has not affected the price of wheat, as the price of wheat is governed by the English market.
4. It has encouraged farmers to raise more pork.
5. I am of the opinion that it does not affect the price of horses as there were none shipped from the United States to Canada.
6. Breeding is profitable for Manitoba and the United States market.
7. Farmers can raise all the coarse grain that they want for feeding cheaper than it can be imported from the United States.
8. Not sufficiently acquainted with it to answer.
9. I am of the opinion that the Canadian farmer would be benefited by Free Trade with the United States, and I think we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty with the Americans than if we admitted their produce free.
10. Cannot perceive any change. 11. I am not acquainted with it.
12. The cost of farm implements are decreased and are of a better quality. Reaping and mowing machines. 13. Cannot perceive any change.
14. I am of the opinion that the home market has been improved by the present Tariff.
15. Wages are higher than before the present Tariff came into force, and would therefore encourage emigration.
16. Farms have increased in value since 1878, and there is more investment of capital in farm property, money being cheaper than in 1878.
17. The condition of the farmer has improved since 1878.
18. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

WILLIAM LUXTON,  
Township Clerk, Luther, Co. Wellington.

1. No. 2. It has caused a greater demand for rye, barley, oats, and better prices; very few peas raised. 3. Local demand for wheat improved. National Policy giving us home markets free from American competition.
  4. Better prices for live hogs, and encouraged pork raising.
  5. It has helped the market, because it has given us the Manitoba and North-West market competition, causing Americans to pay higher prices.
  6. Yes, the profits are equal to any other stock raised. Markets equal in United States and Manitoba.
  7. Yes. It would not pay to import corn for fattening purposes.
  8. Yes, much improved. 9. I think we would be benefited by Reciprocity, and that we are in a better position now to negotiate.
  10. Very little. 11. None raised in our locality.
  12. Decreased, and much better quality. Reapers, mowers, horse rakes, ploughs, &c.
  13. They are not. 14. Yes, by better markets. 15. Most decidedly it has.
  16. Yes, increased. 17. Improved 50 per cent. 18. None in my opinion.
- General Remarks* :—The answers are given as it affects this township.

REUBEN SHAVER,  
Reeve, South Mountain, Co. Dundas.

1. No. 2. To raise the price, particularly of oats.
3. To raise the price. The spring wheat is in greater proportion than fall wheat.
4. To increase the price. I cannot say. 5. I think it very profitable. In the United States. 6. Yes. On the frontier it pays better, but not here.
7. Not appreciably, I think. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. Yes. 10. I cannot say.
11. None grown here. 12. They have not increased, and the quality is as good as before.

13. I think they must be increased. 14. Yes. Gives us a monopoly of supplies to lumberers who hitherto had their supplies from the States.
15. Do not think so; but certainly has not been the means of causing any to leave this county. 16. Yes. Decreased, in consequence of emigration to North-West.
17. Very much improved.
18. The education of the farming community on a better system of agricultural encouragement to the importation of improved stock. I would not recommend a reduction of the duties on grain unless the Americans reciprocate.

JAMES SUTHERLAND,

Farmer and Merchant, Owen Sound, Co. Grey.

1. It would not. 2. Has raised the price of oats and corn; has had no effect on barley as far as I know.
3. It gives us a steady home market for our wheat. 4. It has encouraged more pork to be raised in the country.
5. It gives us the North-West market for horses. Horses pay well; we have a market in Manitoba and the United States. 6. No answer.
7. Farmers can grow all the coarse grain required for fattening purposes.
8. I do not think it affects the market for those articles.
9. In some things we would, in others we would not. We are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty. 10. None that I know of. 11. I do not know.
12. All kinds of implements are cheaper here. 13. Woollens cheaper, iron and hardware cheaper, cottons about the same. 14. It has.
15. It has encouraged home industries and given more employment to artizans.
16. They have increased owing to the cheapness of money.
17. They have improved a great deal. 18. I cannot think of any at present.

*General Remarks:*—I believe the National Policy has done the country a great deal of good.

WILLIAM PARKER,

Farmer, Stamford, Co. Welland.

1. No, it would not, as I think we can raise coarse grain enough to supply ourselves.
2. Coarse grains are higher these three years in general. 3. Farmers are satisfied with the market these three years.
4. I sold four years ago, four hogs at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents live weight; I sold hams at 10 cents a pound for five years; I sold hams, last years' hams, at 14 cents a pound; this year, 15 cents a pound, and hogs at  $6\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound, live weight.
5. Horses are higher these two years back than since the Russian war.
6. There is a good profit in breeding horses and there is a market in the United States and Canada, according to the class required.
7. I think that farmers can raise all the coarse grain that they want to feed; I think it is better to feed at home than to import it. 8. No answer.
9. I was once in favour of Reciprocity, but as we are now as prosperous with the present Tariff as we were when we had Reciprocity, I would not want to change the present treaty for Reciprocity, as we can live independent without.
10. I don't think there is any. 11. I do not know, there is none raised in this neighbourhood.
12. Four years ago I bought a reaping machine for \$110, the same agent has offered me the same kind for \$100, from the same factory, with some improvements on it.
13. This year my son was building a barn, he bought the nails and hardware last summer cheaper than I ever knew them before.
14. Improved home market for all the produce we can raise. 15. I think it has given employment to the labouring classes of all sorts.

16. Prices are better now than in 1877 or 1878, but a great quantity of land is selling by farmers going away to the North-West.
17. Very much improved, as money is plentiful and cheaper than it was in 1878, labour is higher; boys that could be hired in 1876, 1877 and 1878 for \$12 and \$14 per month, get now \$18 to \$20 per month.
18. I know of none at the present, unless Dr. Orton, "as he is the farmers' friend, can get something that will work the farm without manual labour, and let the farmer do nothing.

*General Remarks*.—I am a strong believer in the present Tariff. I hope as it has done so much for the good of the country, that the Government will show their independence by keeping it in force. I am often amused when I read the speeches of the honourable gentlemen in opposition to the Government. I think they must think that the farmers are very simple people or great fools, when they try to make them believe that the country is not as prosperous now as when they were in power; but the year 1883 will show them what the farmers think themselves about the Tariff.

DAVID WEIR,  
Councillor, Deputy Reeve, Wroxeter, Co. Huron.

1. I think it would be in the interest of farmers to admit all American farm produce free, as the duty has no effect in making prices better.
2. Oats, rye, barley and pease are as low in price as in 1878, compared with the price of American grains.
3. I think it has had the effect of raising the price of flour to some extent, but not wheat.
4. No effect on live hogs; I am not dealing in hams, bacon or lard, and cannot say as to the price of these articles.
5. We sell our horses to the Americans, and I cannot see what effect the duty can have on the price.
6. Our principal market is and always has been in the United States.
7. When corn is low in price it pays to buy corn and sell barley, oats and pease.
8. No, unless it be for potatoes, which are very high in price at present, but we are shipping them to the United States; therefore I think the Tariff has nothing to do with the price.
9. No doubt Reciprocity would be a benefit; I am not aware that we are in a better position than before.
10. The duty has had no effect in making prices better.
11. None cultivated here.
12. The price is increased; quality no better.
13. There is a considerable increase in the price of all the goods in common use amongst farmers.
14. The home market has not been increased, as more persons have left than have come to the country.
15. No; emigration from this part of the country to the United States has been larger than before.
16. No; farm lands have rather decreased than increased, on account of the large emigration to the States.
17. Yes, on account of the good crops and high prices for the last two years; high prices in Europe having the effect of making prices good here.
18. The legislation required to make agriculture a desirable and profitable occupation is, cheap goods and implements, fine balmy and invigorating weather, genial and refreshing showers of rain at the proper season, abundant crops and good prices, a cheap, speedy and effectual method of exterminating the potato beetle and all other obnoxious insects and weeds, and such legislation as will induce Canadians to remain in Canada, and not emigrate to the United States, as they have been doing the last three or four years. Good prices must depend altogether on short crops elsewhere.

J. W. BURT,  
Reeve, Coningsby, Co. Wellington.

1. No. 2. The price of our coarse grains has been increased, oats (rye not grown here or corn), barley and pease sell from 5 to 10 cents a bushel higher.
3. We believe the price of wheat has been enhanced. 4. They have increased in price. 5. Yes.
6. Heavy and draught to the United States, ordinary horses to Manitoba; profits compare favourable with those on other stock.
7. Yes. Not in general as the Canadian farmers would have to sell their coarse grain. 8. Most decidedly.
9. The United States have developed their resources, we have not, and are in a better position under the present Tariff to meet them than formerly.
10. As prosperity increases, the demand for fine wool increases also, and Canada has been hitherto overstocked with coarse woolled sheep; the Tariff has developed a demand for finer woolled animals.
11. None grown in this locality. 12. They have decreased, and quality is as good. Ploughs, reapers, mowers and nearly all. 13. They are not increased in price.
14. Yes; by keeping out American products. 15. Most decidedly.
16. It has not decreased, but the emigration to Manitoba has prevented any increase, otherwise it would have increased. 17. Yes, most certainly.
18. No other, except restriction on exorbitant rates of mortgage companies, or individuals lending money to farmers.

JOHN BLYTH,

Farmer and Reeve, Orchard, Co. Grey.

1. It would, for the reason that we raise a large surplus for exportation; the free admission of American corn would give us therefore a large surplus of coarse grains to sell at a profit.
2. No effect on Canadian coarse grains in this section, but raised the price of American corn for feeding purposes. 3. No effect whatever.
4. It has increased the price to consumers, but not to the producer.
5. Most decidedly not. 6. Yes; our principal market is the United States for Nos. 1 and 2.
7. Perhaps we could, but it would pay much better to admit corn free of duty.
8. Not one cent. 9. Of course we would. We are not in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff.
10. It has had an injurious effect. 11. No effect in this county.
12. Cost increased and less material used in the construction, owing to duty on raw material. 13. Yes; all increased in price to the amount of duty imposed.
14. Certainly not; the increase of prices is due to foreign demand.
15. No; but has accelerated emigration to the States under the present Tariff; no encouragement to Canadians to return, but the reverse.
16. Very little; farm lands decreased in value since 1878, on account of emigration to the States and Manitoba.
17. Yes; cause, good crops, high prices for grain and live stock for the English market.
18. No change required in legislation to make agriculture profitable; for instance, the last tinkering on the Tariff raised land salt to the farmer 50 cents per ton.

*General Remarks* :—I am sorry I have not more space to give you a piece of my mind regarding the National Policy, which is in reality a National Fraud on the Canadian farmer, for I am one of many who believe that the \$4,000,000 of excessive tax now in the hands of the Dominion Finance Minister, was taken from the farmers' pockets and just nothing in return.

ALEXANDER McLAREN,

Reeve, Cromarty, Co. Perth.

1. Sometimes it would, at others not; at the present time American farm produce is higher in the United States than here.
2. When corn and oats were lower in the United States than Canada no doubt the duty increased the price here, as regards oats and corn; but rye, barley and peas are generally higher in the United States than here, and so are oats at the present time.
3. Wheat in the United States, at this time, is higher than here.
4. In some measure to keep them and the other articles from being imported; but this season they are as high in the United States as here, in some places higher.
5. I think not, as the best market Canadians have for good horses is the United States.
6. Breeding good horses is now more profitable than formerly, on account of higher prices being paid for them, particularly in the United States.
7. Yes, at the present, but when corn is very low in the United States no doubt it is a benefit to get it. 8. I think not, as poultry, eggs and butter are cheaper here than in the United States.
9. At the present time Reciprocity would benefit the Canadian farmer. I think so.
10. The United States Tariff is injurious to the Canadian producers of wool.
11. I do not know. 12. Many increased. 13. Yes, increased nearly all.
14. The home market for farm produce has increased in value. I do not attribute it to the operations of the Tariff, but to demand and supply.
15. No doubt the Tariff has given a stimulus to many manufactories, &c., and thereby given employment to many at an increased rate of wages, but it is very doubtful if the high Tariff is beneficial to the agriculturalists.
16. I cannot say that the Tariff causes increased tendency for investment in farm property. I believe the low rate of interest has increased farm property, and capital seeking investment is generally proffered in farms.
17. Yes, in this section, from having had good crops and increased prices for their produce.
18. By removing all burdens of whatever kind upon agriculture. Western Canada is generally understood to be an agricultural country, and every encouragement should be given to have the country made productive, and increase its wealth.

FREDERICK Wm. STONE,

General Merchant, Farmer and Stock Breeder, Guelph, Co. Wellington.

1. To do so would, in my opinion, be very injurious to the interest of agriculturalists.
2. With the exception of rye, which is very little grown in this township, and regarding which I am not prepared to make a definite statement, I find that the price of all grain mentioned has greatly increased since the introduction of the Tariff, and a ready market has been created.
3. The demand for Canadian grown wheat is greater and consequently prices higher, for American wheat being excluded, Canadian millers are forced to depend more upon our product for their supply.
4. The prices of live hogs have increased about 30 per cent.; that of dried hams and bacons from 30 to 40 per cent.; while that of lard has nearly doubled, with ready sales, whereas formerly we were forced to keep large quantities on hand with no market.
5. I know that the price of all live stock has greatly increased, while that of horses has nearly doubled in all cases. I am prepared to name special cases where they have more than doubled in value.
6. So much so that at the present time I believe there will be more horses raised in this section during the coming year than in any previous one. At present prices I believe the raising of horses more profitable than that of any stock, or as good; whereas in former years it was altogether an unprofitable business. Our principal market is Manitoba.

7. It is my opinion that when the farmer is forced to import his grain for feeding purposes the fattening of his stock ceases to be profitable; therefore I would say that the farmer cannot feed cattle as profitably on American corn as on grain raised by himself.
8. I fail to notice any great change, except the demand is more local than formerly.
9. On the whole I think not, so long as prices remain as favourable as at present. However, should it be deemed beneficial, I believe we are not in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty than when American produce was admitted free.
10. Very little, so far as I am able to judge.
11. The cultivation and price of flax has increased; tobacco and sugar beet not raised in this section.
12. Farm implements as a whole are cheaper and better. I do not notice much difference in the prices of ploughs, but the quality is better.
13. The articles named here have not increased in prices, but have in quality, and the great difference perceptible is that mostly all goods of the above description now passing through my hands are of Canadian manufacture.
14. Decidedly so, for the great improvement in factories and the consequent increase in the number of hands employed has caused a much greater demand for home-consumption.
15. It cannot be otherwise, as proved by the statistics of new workshops and increased number of workmen-employed.
16. There is, and farm lands have increased in value, and I know of cases where companies having mortgage on farms pressed very heavily for their money previous to 1878 and 1879, but have lately refused to accept payment in full of their claim.
17. It is shown by the great demand by both classes for the luxuries of life, where previous to 1878 they were contented with the absolute necessaries of life.
18. On the whole I think the condition of all classes and the country generally has been greatly improved since the introduction of the Tariff in 1879, as shown by the greater demand of articles of trade, and the willingness and cheerfulness with which they are paid for and the payment of old standing accounts, and readiness of farmers and others to pay off mortgages and refusal of mortgages, and in fact the whole tone of society appears more cheerful and contented. There appears to be a general demand among farmers for legislation to compel companies holding mortgages contracted at enormous rates of interest in time of depression to either accept payment of said mortgages or conform to the times, and accept a lower rate for the remaining time the mortgage has to run out.

FERDINAND WALTER,

Reeve, Merchant and Farmer, Bamberg, Co. Waterloo.

1. I do not think it would be in the interest of the agriculturalists of this country to admit any kind of American farm produce free of duty.
2. Since November, 1879, the effect of the duty was felt, as the demand for oats, corn and pease increased; not much rye or barley raised in this section.
3. The price of both flour and wheat is a little higher since the duty was imposed, but I hear no one complaining, as I think that money is easier to be had.
4. The result is that the price of Canadian pork increased from \$5 to \$9, so much in favour of the producer.
5. The price of horses has increased 15 per cent. here for the last sixteen months; the home demand is lively.
6. As far as I understand there is more money in other stock than in horses, as the farmer can get a quicker return from the former.
7. The state of the American corn market may influence the importation of corn from the United States; still I do not see any necessity in so doing, as the Canadian farmer can raise pease and oats, which will answer as well.
8. These articles have advanced 10 per cent. in our section.

9. I think the Canadian would stand nearly in the same position as we did during the last Reciprocity Treaty.
  10. I do not think there is 2 per cent. difference in our local market from the price it was in 1878.
  11. I do not know of any of these being raised in our county.
  12. I am aware that several farming implements were bought here in 1877, and a few last year. I do not see any difference in the price.
  13. I have not seen any change whatever.
  14. There is more demand for all farm produce for the last two years, owing partly to the different kind of works, such as the number of lumbering jobbers, and the great number of hands employed at the manufactories.
  15. No doubt it does, there are not so many young men going to the States now from this section as formerly.
  16. There is an indication, even in this small section, of investing in farm property. I have no doubt there is a greater tendency for investment in the older settled districts.
  17. The general condition of the farmers and the labouring classes has improved since 1878.
  18. Agricultural schools, land grants, and increase the number of manufactories.
- General Remarks:*—We did not feel the benefit of the N. P. here, until the winter of 1879 and 1880, no doubt the effect has been felt since.

JOHN McCALLUM,  
Avoca, Co. Argenteuil.

1. It would not, because it would be detrimental to our interests, as farmers in this country.
2. It has had the effect of causing a general increase in the price of our coarse grains.
3. It has the effect of causing our wheat to sell to better advantage.
4. It has caused them to raise in price.
5. Yes.
6. It is profitable to breed horses. In Manitoba.
7. He can. It will not pay to import American corn.
8. Yes.
9. We are now in a better position to negotiate such a treaty than formerly.
10. Wool has fallen in price.
11. We are not prepared to answer.
12. Decreased. Better quality.
13. General decrease.
14. Improved. Because it prevents American competition.
15. Yes.
16. Yes; increased. There is now a better chance to farm, and also better markets.
17. Yes.
18. We are not prepared to say.

THOMAS E. C. MURRAY,  
Reeve, Elora, Co. Renfrew.

1. Except corn, no. Competition would be injurious.
2. To raise their price; but as very little of these grains are raised in this part of the country for anything but stock feeding, the enhanced price of the latter, chiefly through the influence of the Tariff, amply compensates for the extra value of the feed.
3. Farmers in this part of the country raise very little wheat for other than domestic use, and buy a considerable part of their flour; the price of wheat has certainly been increased, but not in proportion to the increase in price of other products on the profits of which they chiefly depend. They can therefore cheerfully afford to pay a little extra for an occasional change of seed.
4. Their effect has certainly been an increase in the market value of the articles; but I am not in a position to state the precise ratio of that increase.
5. The price of both have increased very much; but when sold are chiefly exported to the American market, or rather purchased by American traders, who I am informed again export many of the horses to Manitoba and some to England; I cannot vouch, however, for the accuracy of the information referred to.
6. There is certainly very great profit in raising superior grades of draught and carriage horses; but the great risk in horse raising, as well as the extra care

and expense, necessary forbids the attempt to enter into the business extensively. It is found, on the whole, that other stock pays better. The United States is our chief market.

7. It would pay better to import corn. 8. Considerably.
9. With regard to the first question, so far as the farming interest is concerned, I unhesitatingly say no. Its abrogation has never diminished either the demand nor price of the commodities we export there; on the contrary, it has rather increased the latter, inasmuch as it has brought the American buyer and farmer together; formerly the business was all in the hands of traders and store-keepers who reaped all the profits. The other question I cannot answer.
10. It has greatly improved both price and demand. 11. Very little cultivated here.
12. No; the quality has not deteriorated. 13. Not appreciably; [quality much improved, especially woollen goods.
14. Very much. By home consumption in part, having our own market, and also the general prosperity that enables the operative and other classes to live better and pay liberally.
15. Whether it is owing to the Tariff or not, every man who wants to live here by either farming or labour can find plenty of employment and good wages. There is scarcely any emigration to the States, but there is considerable this year to Manitoba.
16. The transactions in land here have been so few that I cannot speak with confidence; some farmers want to sell, but the prices asked do not invite purchasers. 17. Wonderfully.
18. No changes, unless you admit corn free; but let well enough alone.

E. T. PATERSON,  
Farmer, Kirkdale, Co. Drummond.

1. We think not. 2. Oats, price increased; rye, no change; corn, price increased barley, price reduced; pease, price increased.
3. Prices increased. 4. Average price increased. 5. It has.
6. We do; profits about equal, and our principal market is Manitoba.
7. We think we can fatten our stock with our own produce cheaper than otherwise.
8. Yes. 9. He would not. 10. The price of wool has been reduced.
11. None raised in this section. 12. We do not know.
13. In woollens and cottons, prices increased 15 and 20 per cent.
14. It has; from lack of competition.
15. The present Tariff has given diversity of employment to the various industrial classes, and yet a great many are leaving for Dakota.
16. No; farm lands have decreased in value since 1878. Because you can get land in Manitoba and the North-West free.
17. It is. 18. We do not know of any.

NELSON WESSEL,  
Township Clerk, Carnarvon, Co. Haliburton.

1. Any farm produce that can be raised in Canada would be injured materially by admitting the same from the United States free of duty.
2. No bad effect has followed the imposition of this duty; rye and corn are not much cultivated here; but oats and barley can be raised to perfection, and there is always a demand for them at fair prices.
3. The duty on flour is not felt; spring-wheat has been largely raised of late years; but Canada flour can be obtained in bond in the United States, and admitted here free of duty, so there is no need of buying American flour.
4. The effect upon these articles I believe to be beneficial, as we have the home market for them.

5. I cannot speak of the home market in horses in the North-West. Prices have ruled high with us, and buyers come from the United States and the Provinces, and horses are in demand.
6. It is profitable to breed horses. The greater part of our horses go to the United States; very few, if any, go to Manitoba; but they may direct their course to the latter.
7. Yes; it will never pay to import what can be produced in the country, or a substitute for it.
8. Vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter find a good home market in the towns; our eggs go to the United States. I cannot say that the Tariff affects them.
9. We, in this Province, would be benefited by Reciprocity with the United States. We are in a better position to negotiate Reciprocity under the present Tariff than under the so-called Free Trade jug-handled policy of the Grits.
10. The effect is greater inducement to raise wool to supply the manufacturers in Prince Edward Island.
11. These articles are not raised much here. They could be raised if inducements offered. Manufactories established here might cause them to be raised in large quantities.
12. Farm implements are decreased in cost, but generally believed to be not equal to the Americans. American mowers and reapers said to be more durable and better.
13. They are not increased, and I think farmers on the whole have as little to complain of as other people.
14. Our grain market is in England, and prices at home are regulated by it; but the stimulus which the Tariff has given to trade helps the farm products very materially.
15. Our isolated position and the want of continuous steam communication, winter and summer, has retarded our industries, and many of our people are going to the United States and the North-West.
16. Farm property has decreased, owing, I presume, to the facilities in the North-West to obtain lands.
17. It is, very materially.
18. Branch railroads, a tunnel across the straits, at the capes, the improvement of our harbours and Reciprocity with the United States would make agriculture more desirable and profitable, and this Province trusts the Government will literally fulfil the terms of union to this end.

*General Remarks:*—Before we had competent manufacturers in the Dominion, carriage builders had to pay for axles  $\frac{3}{4}$  patent, \$6.50 per sett, they can now buy them for \$2.85; varnish formerly cost \$4.20, now \$3.00; finishing varnish formerly \$7.50, now \$5.25; spokes and rims \$6.00, now \$4.20. A carriage manufacturer, Wm. Pound, Esq., of Margate, New London, gave me the above figures. The purchasing value of one dollar is greater under the present Tariff by  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. than under the Free Trade Tariff of Mackenzie and Cartwright, and the farmers know it and feel it. Were it not for the heavy bank failure in this Province, on the whole the people are in a more prosperous condition than they were in 1878.

RODERICK McNEIL, M. D.,

Physician, Surgeon and Farmer, Stanley, Co. Queen's, P.E.I.

1. No answer.
2. Corn, immediately on putting on the duty, was raised 10 cents a bushel. In our township the effect on oats, rye, barley and pease from harvest to February is imperceptible to us, as we then have grain to sell; after that and especially in seed time the enhanced price is said to be the effect of the duty.
3. Glamorgan is not at present well adapted for wheat, owing to its want of good cultivation. Fully two-thirds of the flour is imported into the township.
4. These articles are only produced for home consumption in this township.

5. The price of horses is very much higher this year (1832) than for the past three years, but presumably more owing to the general increase of business than any other cause.
6. No horses bred in this township. 7. It pays better to sell barley and pease and import Indian corn. Corn is not a profitable crop with us at present.
8. The potatoes, which are a profitable crop here, are said to be exported to the States, consequently not affected by an import duty. Other vegetables are only grown for home consumption.
9. No answer. 10. Too few sheep yet in this township to make us note the effect.
11. None grown. 12. There was an increase on the imposition of the duty on most implements; but I have not noticed any particular deterioration in the quality.
13. Tweeds and flannels are much dearer than three years ago, and also duck and most cotton articles.
14. I think not. 15. Emigration to the States and other places has been greater in the past year than I remember before; but employment is more plentiful here than of late years, and labour better paid.
16. Land in our township has greatly decreased in value, owing to the high taxes, which are caused in a great measure by a heavy bonus to a railway, which bonus was granted when things looked bright for a speedy settlement of the township.
17. All the improvement has taken place during the past nine months. 18. No answer

STEPHEN KETTLE,

Farmer, Township Clerk and Treasurer, Ursa, Co. Haliburton.

1. At present admit none. 2. The effect has been to enhance the price of all the grains mentioned in this article.
3. We pay dearer for wheat and flour coming from the United States. We are willing to do so as the difference is made up in the increased value of our own products. 4. The increase in value of the articles mentioned here are fully one third of the average price. 5. The market is very much improved.
6. It is profitable, and more so than other stock. The principal market is the United States. 7. Yes. No. 8. Yes.
9. Yes, but at present we cannot get it. While we remain a colony there will be a certain amount of jealousy existing against us, which will be prejudicial to us in all our commercial dealings with the United States.
10. Beneficial. 11. No. 12. There appears to be an increase; I speak generally. Cannot specify. 13. Nothing to complain of.
14. Decided improvement. By increased prices.
15. The good effects of the Tariff is felt in a very sensible manner. We do not expect that the climax is reached. Years will pass over us before the best results are reached. The Protective Tariff is a perennial plant.
16. There is an increased tendency for investment under the present system of Tariff. Increased. The reason why is found in the general confidence that the country has taken a long forward stride on the march of prosperity.
17. Very much improved. The farmer, the basis of society, being prosperous, prosperity will abound throughout the country.
18. This question is answered thus: "Protect all our industries," protect the farmer, protect the manufacturer. This is the true Reciprocity. This will make farming desirable and profitable.

*General Remarks*:—Strictly speaking, the Province of Quebec is not an agricultural country; the same may be said of the States of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, and other New England States, nevertheless these States are far more prosperous than the Province of Quebec. The question arises why are they more prosperous? The answer appears to be, because they are not colonies, and all their

industries are protected. Then if we would arrive at the same result we must use the same means. The Protective Tariff appeared to be a bold stroke of policy. It can have only one logical result—namely, the termination of our colonial existence. Whatever the intention of our legislators may have been this is the light in which we view it.

PATRICK CASSIDY,  
Farmer, Cranbourne, Co. Dorchester.

---

- 1 and 2. I do not think that it would be any injury to the farmers in New Brunswick to admit agricultural produce free. Very little grain of any kind has come from the States for some years back, unless it is Indian corn, and that the farmers cannot well do without, particularly in stall feeding cattle.
3. and 4. I do not see the Tariff has affected the price of wheat, flour, hogs, hams, &c.
- 5 and 6. The market for horses has been very dull here in New Brunswick for some years, until within the last eighteen months, since which time there has been quite a brisk demand for heavy horses, particularly Porcherons for home demand and American market; none going to Manitoba.
7. The farmers could raise buckwheat for feeding purposes as cheaply, but the butchers do not care so much for this beef as that fed on Indian meal.
8. The market for vegetables remains unchanged.
9. The farmer would indisputably be benefited by Reciprocity. Nearly everything we raise in this section of the Province finds a market in the States. We are in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff.
10. Very little wool is raised for the market in this neighbourhood, so I cannot say much about that article. 11. None raised here.
12. I think the cost has decreased on nearly all farm implements, but do not think the quality is as good as those of American manufacture.
13. Decreased, but I cannot say it is on account of the Tariff.
14. Our home market has not improved as far as prices are concerned, there may be a little brisker demand, and that is no doubt owing to the American markets.
15. The Tariff, or some other cause, has driven all the labouring class out of the country. It is hardly possible to get a man or woman to labour on the farm.
16. Land has decreased in value very much since 1878, one reason why the farmers cannot procure labourers to work on the land.
17. Condition of labouring classes has improved as you have to give them whatever wages they ask to work for you.
18. Free trade for agricultural produce would benefit the farmer better than any kind of legislation. The Tariff I have no doubt may benefit manufacturers, but we want Free Trade for farm produce.

JAS. A. CAMPBELL,  
Kingsclear, Co. York.

---

1. It would not. 2. The effect has been trifling with the exception of corn.
3. Makes flour about 50 or 75 cts. higher, very little effect on spring and fall wheat.
4. I think it would be better to have the duty off live hogs for breeding purposes, as the Americans have a better and larger lot to select from.
5. Yes, in my opinion it has. 6. Not very profitable to breed horses; we don't require any other market than our own for all the horses we raise.
7. I think not. It would pay better to import American corn.
8. It is immaterial. 9. I think he would. My opinion is we would be in a better position when American produce is admitted free.
10. I do not see any difference. 11. None.

12. About the same, the quality is just as good, and I think superior in small implements. 13. I think not. 14. I cannot see any difference.  
 15. I think it has encouraged the industrial classes and induced Canadians to remain at home. 16. No, I think there is very little difference.  
 17. I think their condition has somewhat improved. 18. Larger grants to the Agricultural Societies.

JAMES H. BROWN,  
 Councillor, Lunenburg, Co. Lunenburg.

1. No. 2. Effect not felt here, as no American grain of any account is imported.  
 3. No effect on flour; might make a little difference on cornmeal. 4. None here.  
 5. Should improve the home market to the extent of the duty, especially in the North-West. 6. Very few raised in this section for export.  
 7. Yes, by energy. 8. Not felt. 9. To some extent. Better position now.  
 10. None. 11. Good, protective. 12. Not increased; quality good.  
 13. American prints and cotton, flannels, English shoddy.  
 14. Helped to create a home demand generally. 15. Undoubtedly.  
 16. Appears so in the North-West at present. 17. Yes; miners especially.  
 18. Establish Agricultural Colleges, &c., and model farms.  
*General Remarks*:—Fishing bounties and the duty on coal, work well here; not much farming done.

R. McDONALD,  
 Postmaster, Lingan, Co. Cape Breton.

1. No. 2. It has improved the market for pease and oats. 3. It has enhanced the price of our wheat flour. 4. It has raised the price of pork one-third or 34 per cent. 5. It has increased the price of horses 25 per cent.  
 6. If prices continue as good it will pay to breed horses. Principal market, Manitoba. 7. He can. No. 8. Not much change. 9. They would. We are.  
 10. No visible change. 11. None. 12. Decreased. They are. 13. Not increased.  
 14. It has. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Yes, until Manitoba fever commenced.  
 17. A great deal. 18. Cannot recommend any change.  
*General Remarks*:—I consider any change of Tariff would be an injury, excepting Reciprocity.

ANDREW MCGIRR,  
 Reeve, Osprey, Feversham, Co. Grey.

1. Decidedly not. The duty keeps American grain out of our markets.  
 2. Oats, pease and rye improved in price, particularly rye.  
 3. All classes of wheat greatly improved in price. 4. Hogs and all kinds of pork improved.  
 5. Draught horses much higher in price, but attribute it to demand for lumbering purposes, any surplus stock goes to Manitoba. 6. Yes, heavy draught.  
 7. Can raise all the coarse grain required; it would not pay under any circumstances to import American corn to our locality for feeding purposes.  
 8. Prices are better for those articles; attribute it to increase of manufacturing population in towns and villages.  
 9. Yes, and of course we are in a better position with the present Tariff.  
 10. In my opinion none. 11. None cultivated in this section.  
 12. Ploughs, mowers and reapers cheaper and better. 13. No change of any importance.  
 14. Considerably increased by the increase in all kinds of manufacturing interests.

15. Wages of all classes greatly increased.  
 16. Farms in our locality are being sold readily at good prices, that two or three years ago could not be sold at any price. 17. Most decidedly. 18. Cannot say.  
*General Remarks* :—The whole country and every one in it seem to be in a prosperous condition, and the majority do not want better times, certainly none want the hard times lack again.

A. T. WHITE,  
 President P. S. & A. Agricultural Society,  
 Farmer and Lumber Merchant, Pembroke, Co. Renfrew.

1. Yes, corn; because farming cannot be carried on to the best advantage without it and other grains, because the more of them come into Canada the lower our own freight rates will be.
2. The price of corn is increased by the amount of the duty. The price of other coarse grains is lower than in Chicago or Buffalo, and lower than the average under the old Tariff.
3. The price of wheat has been depressed below that of Buffalo and Chicago, and the price of flour has been raised almost or quite to the amount of the duty.
4. Live hogs are lower in price than in Chicago; dried hams, bacon and lard are dearer by the amount of the duties imposed, but pork remains at same price as before, compared with American prices. The duty on pork was not raised according to promise.
5. Certainly not. We export horses to the Western States and the purchasers pay a duty of 20 per cent. on them. How could they afford to send their horses to Manitoba against us? Horses must remain high in Manitoba, as the demand by settlers will necessarily exceed the supply for years to come.
6. Breeding horses is very profitable, more thanks to the revival of the American demand. The United States is our principal market.
7. He cannot, if his stock is to compete in a neutral market against American stock fed on untaxed corn. It would be far better to import corn, and in fact it is better now, paying the duty, rather than going without it. 8. Not in the least.
9. Yes, a Reciprocity Treaty would be beneficial. No. A retaliatory spirit has been aroused in the States, and the American railroads have been shown that it is their interest to oppose Reciprocity in every form in order that grain may go to the sea over American routes instead of Canadian.
10. The price of wool is about 30 per cent. cheaper than it was on the average under the old Tariff.
11. I do not know of any increase in the production of flax or tobacco. As to sugar beet I understand the Government charges very heavy duties on beet-sugar machinery to the discouragement of the industry.
12. Implements are lighter and the prices of most of them have been slightly increased.
13. Very much increased in comparison with the price of raw material.
14. No, it has not. 15. Not here. Emigration to the States has been unusually large from this section, and very few return.
16. Decidedly not, but distinctly to the contrary. Farm lands have decreased in value, and at the low rates they are offered, the buyers are very scarce. This is owing to the increased expense of farming and the consequently diminished profits, and because of the opening up of the North-West.
17. Of the labouring classes, yes, but the increase of wages is more than counterbalanced by the increased cost of living. Of farmers, no.
18. Return to a Revenue Tariff, and create a Railway Commission to prevent discrimination and over-charges on freight.

R. KENNEDY, Reeve, }  
 P. L. ROGERS, Town Clerk, } B.th, Co. Lennox.

1. No, because the Canadians want the market for themselves.
2. It has raised oats, rye, corn and pease, not barley.
3. In my opinion it has no effect on wheat in this section of the country.
4. It has made live hogs, ham and bacon higher, not lard.
5. In my opinion it has had no effect on horses.
6. No, better to breed other stock. The market for horses is the United States.
7. Farmers can raise all the grain required to fatten their stock.
8. It has improved. I can't say it is the effect of the present Tariff.
9. I can answer this question better after it has been tried.
10. It has no effect. 11. No effect in this section of the country.
12. In my opinion, all kinds of farm implements are cheaper and better.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware used among farmers are cheaper.
14. In my opinion it has been increased by the present Tariff. 15. I think it has.
16. Farms are about the same value in this section of the country.
17. I think they have improved since 1878, very much in this section of the country.
18. I think if Sir J. Macdonald would make the Canadian duties equal to the American, by increasing them 5 to 20 per cent., the Americans would be willing to negotiate another Reciprocity Treaty with the Dominion, and this would be very beneficial to Canadian farmers.

E. K. SILLS,  
Township Clerk, Sillsville, Co. Lennox.

1. I think not. 2. It has increased the price of oats, corn, barley and pease, and encouraged the farmers to raise more coarse grain.
3. I think that it has increased the price of wheat as millers pay more for it especially when wheat is scarce in summer.
4. It has increased the price of live hogs and pork.
5. I think it does not affect the price of horses much.
6. It is profitable to raise horses. The principal markets are the United States and Manitoba.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock. 8. Very little change in price.
9. We would be benefited by Reciprocity on fair terms. Our chances are better now than before the N.P. 10. It has increased the price of wool.
11. I don't know what effect it has on the cultivation of flax, tobacco and sugar beet.
12. The price of reapers, mowers and ploughs is less, and the quality is better.
13. Woollens and cottons not much affected by the Tariff; hardware cheaper.
14. The home market has been improved by the Tariff.
15. The Tariff has given diversity of employment to various industrial classes, and encouraged Canadians to stay at home.
16. On account of money being cheap, there is a tendency to invest in farm property. Farm land has not increased much on account of cheap land in the North-West.
17. Yes, very much improved since 1878. 18. I don't know of any.

ROBERT WEBSTER,  
Farmer, Lucknow, Co. Huron.

1. It would, and especially corn, because we cannot raise what we require; of other grains we have a surplus, and the country would be benefited by the carrying trade.
2. Extra cost of living to the poor man, and extra cost of raising pork with corn. I do not see that other grains are affected by the N. P.
- 3 to 5. No answer. 6. No. 7. No. Yes. 8. No; it is decidedly worse.

9. Yes. 10. Not beneficial. 11. No answer. 12. Increased; I see no difference in quality so far. 13. No answer.  
 14. I cannot see that the Tariff has improved our home market.  
 15. No. Over a hundred men left this neighborhood last fall for the United States, making a scarcity of men and thereby increasing the expense of getting out lumber. 16. No answer.  
 17. The exodus of labourers made it better for those who remained.  
 18. Repeal the N.P. and return to a Revenue Tariff.

*General Remarks* :—I have not seen a single farmer that thinks he is benefited by the present Tariff; it is generally considered bad.

A. C. FLETCHER,  
 Township Clerk, Housey's Rapids, Muskoka.

1. No. 2. It has had the effect of enabling the farmers in our part of the country to get a better price for oats, rye and pease.  
 3. Both classes of wheat have advanced in price since the duty has been imposed.  
 4. Cannot give an opinion on this subject. 5. Cannot say.  
 6. It is profitable to raise horses, but we find it more so to raise sheep. Principal horse market is the United States at present.  
 7. We can. As the Tariff stands it would not pay to import corn.  
 8. I am not informed on this subject. 9. No. 10. It has enabled us to get a better price for our wool. 11. More than I am aware of.  
 12. Not informed on this matter; we use no machinery in this section worth mentioning. 13. Cottons are advanced from 1 to 2 cents.  
 14. It has, by keeping out the American grain. 15. It has in some instances.  
 16. Cannot say. 17. The general condition of farmers improved since that date.  
 18. I think the present state of affairs is entitled to a little more trial.

*General Remarks* :—We have not had a sufficient experience of our legislation as it stands at present to form an opinion of its effects on agriculture.

JAMES LANE,  
 Reeve, Denbigh, Co. Addington.

1. None whatever. 2. Increased prices and more buyers. We get at least 10 cents more on oats, 25 cents on rye, and 15 cents on corn and pease.  
 3. We do not feel the difference so much, as we sell more of coarse grain.  
 4. There has been an increase of at least \$2 per hundred in the price of hogs, and a great increase in demand for them.  
 5. We have much better prices for cows this spring, and more American buyers than we have had for a long time.  
 6. We find it pays well to raise a good horse, but the most of us do more in stock. Not many horses have gone from here to Manitoba as yet.  
 7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain that is needed in Canada; in the western part of Ontario they can raise wheat more profitably than we can, but we can raise coarse grain and exchange for their wheat.  
 8. Certainly it is. In Cornwall, our nearest town, there is a great difference in those articles, also in wood.  
 9. We are of the opinion that we are doing well now, and are very doubtful that any change would be for the better. 10. A slight increase, but not much.  
 11. Very little done; some raise a little flax and tobacco for home use; no sugar beet is raised.  
 12. The prices remain very near the same, but home competition is strong, and the articles are better.  
 13. We can buy cottons and woollens both better and cheaper than we ever could before the National Policy.

14. It has; when we used to go to the grist mills to sell our coarse grain we would find them full of western corn, now we have the market to ourselves; the same thing applies to hogs, we get the money now that used to go to the Americans.
15. It has to a very great extent.. 16. There is a great increase; the price of land has increased about 25 per cent., because we can make money now at farming, and we hear nothing of hard times now.
17. Very much improved, both of them; we pay much higher wages, but find it much easier done, as we have the money that used to go to the United States.
18. None, we are contented and happy.

*General Remarks* :—The farmers are satisfied with the Tariff; the politicians or Grits are not. Unfortunately there are farmers who are led by their party to object to the Tariff, but they are getting fewer, and have less to say than they used to. They cannot deny that we are better off now, and they try to show that it is not because of the Tariff.

DUNCAN McDERMID,  
Ex-Reeve, Avonmore, Co. Stormont.

1. I think not, as our money would go to benefit another nation.
2. It would be better to have it free, as we do not raise it here to any extent; oats and other coarse grains have been low for the last three years.
3. None that I know of. 4. Cannot say. 5. All heavy draught horses raised here find a market in the States and with our lumbermen at good prices.
6. They sell high in the States from here. 7. Corn is not much imported, and as corn meal is not much raised here, it would pay better to have it free of duty.
8. Yes. 9. We are surely in the best position with the Tariff to negotiate such a Treaty. 10. Wool sells as low as ever it did.
11. Cannot say; there is not much raised here.
12. No; the cost is not increased, and our own implements are of the best material; mowers, reapers, &c., &c., with rakes and harrows.
13. No, they have not increased. 14. The home market has not improved, nor won't under the present lumber truck system here.
15. Employment is much better now, and people are stopping more at home than formerly. 16. Not here, the winter is too long for good farming.
17. The improvement is slight, as the system of local trading is bad.
18. There should be a law that when a man buys wilderness land of the Crown, that it would belong to him and his heirs for ever, and no one be able to take it for debt and turn it into a wilderness again; this is what has made emigration to the United States from here.

*General Remarks* :—Legislate that merchants who are crying out against the Tariff shan't charge a poor man \$8 and \$9 a barrel for flour, when he buys it for \$5 and \$6; regulate trade so that a lumber merchant can't take a 100 per cent. off a poor man.

JOHN STYMAST, J.P.,  
Secretary Alwrick Agricultural Society, Stymast Settlement,  
Alwrick, Co. Northumberland.

1. No, because such products can be obtained cheaper and in general of better quality in our own Province than they would be from the United States. Only spurious or adulterated articles of that kind could be brought in cheaper and these are excluded by the Tariff.
2. It has enhanced the price of meal, as the greater part, if not all, that is use in this part is imported from the United States. With regard to oats, rye, barley and peas I might say there is no change.

3. Flour obtained from the United States is higher in price by reason of the Tariff, and Canadian flour brought here from Boston is nearly as high, much higher last year than when obtained at Halifax. The Tariff affects this place therefore, because the greater part of our flour passes through the United States and comes here *via*. Boston.
4. Nil, as there are none imported in this locality. 5. No effect here.
6. Nothing of that sort carried on here. 7. Whatever Canadian farmers can do in a more favoured locality than this it is impossible to do here, corn and meal have to be imported, Tariff or no Tariff. 8. No.
9. I do not think we should be in a better position than we now are to obtain a Reciprocity Treaty if the Tariff were abrogated.
10. It has no effect. 11. None cultivated, the majority of the people here being engaged in the fisheries.
12. Not materially, except when it is necessary to import American goods, but the most of our implements are of Canadian manufacture.
13. I should think that the prices are enhanced as the home manufacture of such goods is as yet on such a limited scale.
14. Not in this locality. 15. Not here. The people who pass over to the United States from here cannot be styled emigrants but simply migratory fishermen, who go over in the summer and return in the autumn.
16. Not here, as farming, especially in this county, is in a backward state.
17. No. Many of the labouring classes from this part have to go over to the United States to obtain employment.
18. Legislation alone would never improve the agricultural prospects of this place. If the Government would adopt measures for the removal of the immense quantities of rocks that exist here, and drain some of the extensive marshes that abound here, and then furnish us with a copious supply of the fertile soil from Manitoba, success in agriculture might be obtained. Otherwise the people will remain as they are, fishermen, and when sufficient inducement does not present itself at home they will continue to pass over the border in search of employment.

WILLIAM A. SNOW,  
Master Mariner, Upper Port Latour, Co. Shelburne.

1. It would. It would incite competition, hence better tillage of the soil.
2. All the grains mentioned are consumed in the district; there are none to export to my knowledge.
3. Flour is dearer to the amount of duty levied thereon. 4. I do not know.
5. I do not know. 6. There are none bred for export trade in this district that I know of.
7. It would pay better to import American corn, if free of duty, as it cannot be profitably raised or grown in Ontario.
8. The market is not improved. 9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty. We would be in a better position if American produce was admitted free. 10. None that I know of. 11. I do not know. 12. The cost is increased on all articles. The quality is no better.
13. All woollens and cottons are increased in price, and the quality is not so good. All hardware is increased in price.
14. No; for our markets are ruled by the market in England. 15. No; it has sent all classes to the United States. It gives no encouragement to return.
16. There is no increased tendency; they have decreased very much in value since 1878. Because breadstuffs and all implements, &c., are so high.
17. The general condition is not. 18. Do away with the National Policy, and use a reasonable Revenue Tariff.

NEIL McLEAN,  
Farmer, Turtle Lake, Muskoka.

1. Whatever hardship it might be to some classes to impose duties on American farm produce, every sane man must know that it would be in the interest of Canadian agriculturalists to levy an impost duty.
2. The duty on cornmeal means just 40 cents extra per barrel. I cannot say for corn, for there is very little imported here. The duty on other coarse grains have hardly affected the prices here.
3. I do not think we have felt any effect from the duty on wheat and flour; the effect has been more imaginary than real.
4. Answer to question 3 will, in my opinion, apply here also.
5. The export or import of horses in this neighbourhood is a rare thing. Other live stock, I am not prepared to say whether it is beneficial or not. I just manage to raise a colt when I want one for my own use.
7. I do not think there can be any difference of opinion on this question. Certainly every Canadian farmer can raise with profit all the grain he requires for his own use, and often to spare.
8. I deal considerably in this particular class of articles, and I certainly must say that my experience is, that there has been a wonderful change for the better lately, from whatever cause. No doubt the present Tariff. I do not see what the farmer has to gain from a Reciprocity Treaty. If such were desirable, it is a well known fact that we are in a better position to obtain it under the present Tariff. The Americans would never consent to a Reciprocity Treaty while their produce was admitted free.
10. I cannot say; wool was 30 cents per pound, and is still. 11. I cannot say; I would require to study this question before replying.
12. I do not find any difference in what farm implements I purchase.
13. Woollens and cottons appear to be improved in quality without being increased in price, especially cottons; hardware in use among farmers never was as cheap, partly, I judge, from the Tariff, and partly from a more lively competition in the trade.
14. Certainly, thanks to the coal duty. The miners are the principal consumers of our farm produce. Every farmer can sell at good prices all he can produce.
15. Of course it has. 16. The better times have enhanced the value of everything raised on the farm; the tendency therefore must be to encourage increased outlay; as a consequence of the above, farms must be increased in value since 1878.
17. Most decidedly it has. The very question appears absurd, considering the notoriety of the improvement in all branches of business.
18. Considering the wisdom of our present rulers, it would be rash on my part to suggest any improvement on the fiscal policy of our Government. What the Government does not know is scarcely worth knowing.

DANIEL J. McISAAC,

Farmer and Trader, McAdam's Lake, Co. Cape Breton.

1. No. 2. Oats, rye, barley and pease bring better prices since the duty on Indian corn.
3. Not much wheat or flour coming from the United States to this section of the country. Better prices have prevailed for spring and fall wheat since the Tariff. 4. They command a higher price. 5. Yes.
6. Yes; these few years. The United States. 7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. No.
10. Good. 11. Not much raised. 12. Price decreased, if any; quality just as good. Reapers and mowers and implements of all kinds.
13. As cheap now as before the Tariff. 14. Yes. Better prices for all kinds of farm produce. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—The National Policy works like a charm.

M. MELVILLE, Township Clerk }

JOHN COXE, Ex-Reeve, } How Island, Co. Frontenac.

1. In my opinion it would not, as it would give the American farmer a decided advantage over the Canadian—also affect our revenue.
2. It has a tendency to increase the price of our coarse grain.
3. It has given us the advantage of supplying our own market, and compelling the American to pay ocean freight to Liverpool, &c.
4. It has greatly increased the prices of these articles, and more especially as it gives us control of trade in the North-West.
5. It has for reasons already given. 6. A thrifty farmer ought to breed profitably all kinds of stock. Our principal markets for horses are Manitoba and the North-West. 7. Certainly he can.
8. Yes; it gives control of the market, and an increased demand, in consequence of more numerous manufacturing establishments.
9. Yes; and we are in a much better position to negotiate than when the Americans had the free use of our market.
10. It has increased the quantity and reduced the prices of the better qualities of tweeds. 11. Cannot say. 12. Decreased—quality quite as good.
13. Very little change, except nails, which are very much reduced in price.
14. Yes; by our having better control of it. 15. Yes; it has done both.
16. Yes; increased, on account of general prosperity. 17. Yes; greatly.
18. The interests of the farmer, manufacturer and mechanic being identical, any judicious legislation in behalf of the agriculturalist must necessarily benefit all other classes.

N. CURRIE,  
Reeve, Glencoe, Middlesex.

1. It would not. 2. The price of oats and corn has been increased, but rye, barley and pease have not been affected in price by the duty.
3. If any effect has been produced in this part of Canada, it has been to enhance the price of both wheat and flour. Very little spring wheat is produced by our farmers. 4. The price has been increased in the Canadian market.
5. No doubt of it. 6. They are in good demand at good prices and profitable to breed, but not so much so generally as other stock. Principally in Manitoba.
7. The Canadian farmer can generally raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock. In exceptional years it might pay better to import American corn. 8. The effect is probably slight in this part of Canada.
9. I think our Canadian farmers were never in a more prosperous state than they are at present, and that to change their position by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would be a doubtful benefit. At all events there can be no doubt of the fact that we are now in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty than when American produce was admitted free.
- 10 and 11. Cannot say. 12. A manufacturer should answer this.
13. Woollens have not increased; hardware has slightly; cottons, 2 cents per yard.
13. It has, by securing the home market to our people.
15. It certainly has in all these particulars. 16. Capital is freely invested in land by way of mortgage, when offered. Farm lands have increased in value since 1878, because the business of a farmer is more profitable. 17. Very much so.
18. Not any changes required, nothing but improved culture.

JOHN ELLISON,  
Reeve, Port Stanley, Co. Elgin.

1. No. 2. It has improved the price of coarse grains of all kinds.
3. Grain and flour has been affected particularly by home consumption, but it has had no effect on the times.

4. Dried hams, bacon and lard have increased considerably and gives encouragement to the raising of pork; live hogs have been increased in price more than equal to the extra duty.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, favourably; our market now is the North-West; on account of the absence of duty, the North-West gives us as great a market as we can supply.
7. Yes; in the raising of coarse grains it encourages the rotation of crops and thereby benefits the soil; we can profitably raise and get a market for all the coarse grains we can produce. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. Yes.
10. Woollen goods come in competition with cotton goods, consequently affect it somewhat. 11. It encourages the growing of these articles.
12. It has decreased the price and improved the quality on account of home consumption. 13. Can't see much difference in price.
14. Yes, much, so we have now more competition. 15. Undoubtedly so.
16. Yes, cheap money and safe investment has made farm lands a favourite investment; has decreased on account of emigration. 17. Beyond all question.
18. Pork and wool should be protected by duty especially. Protection has been a great advantage to farmers in general.

*General Remarks*:—The National Policy has been in the interest of the agriculturalists of Ontario.

T. H. McQUADE,  
Farmer, Township Councillor, Omemeo, Co. Victoria

1. Decidedly not. 2. Corn increased in price from 10 cents to 15 cents, and the rest increased to the amount of the duty imposed. 3. Equivalent to the Tariff.
4. A decided improvement in price. 5. Certainly.
6. It is more profitable to raise horses than any other kind of stock. The United States is our market.
7. Yes, in this municipality more than sufficient for home consumption.
8. Undoubtedly so. 9. As we are on the borders, Reciprocity would be an advantage. We are in a better position under the present Tariff to negotiate.
10. It has no effect, there is no importation here. 11. None.
12. Little or no change in price; and quality improved. Reapers and ploughs.
13. In woollens and cottons there is no perceptible change. Hardware has decreased.
14. There is a marked improvement in all farm produce, by preventing American goods from entering into our market. 15. It has.
16. Increased according to the improvements made on farms. 17. Yes.
18. The present legislation gives general satisfaction.

LOUIS LAFFERTY, Reeve, Sandwich,  
DENIS ROÇHELEAU, Township Clerk, Cunard River } Co. Essex.

1. Yes, corn for feeding purposes. 2. Not much effect, if any.
3. It has depressed the price of wheat, as witness the fact of wheat being higher in Chicago than in Toronto. 4. Cannot say that it has any.
5. No, they have not; were it not for the duty present prices would be higher.
6. It is fairly profitable to breed heavy horses for the United States; common horses go to Manitoba, and they never pay. 7. No. Yes, if the duty were removed.
8. No, the market for eggs, butter, &c., is improved, because beef is a good price, and that, owing to the new market opened up in the old world.
9. Yes. We are not in as good a position now as when American produce was admitted free.
10. It certainly has not raised the price; wool is lower than it was prior to the advent of the National Policy.

11. I cannot say, as to flax and tobacco and its fostering influence; the cultivation of the sugar beet has been a signal failure.
12. Increased; quality not so good. All implements into which iron has entered and for the manufacture of which coal is necessary.
13. Everything the farmer needs is increased by the Tariff, excepting perhaps tea and coffee; the sugar tax is an outrage.
14. On the whole there has been no change. 15. No, there are as many people leaving as ever.
16. I do not think there is a much greater tendency in that direction, but even if there is it cannot be attributed to the Tariff. Were it not for the Tariff the price of wheat would be higher.
17. The condition of the labouring man is not one iota improved, his wages may be a trifle higher but the purchasing power of the dollar is not as great as it was before the advent of this National Humbug, consequently the condition of that class is worse than ever.
18. Return to a Revenue Tariff as soon as possible, tax the silks and broad-cloth of the rich man in place of putting the burden, as at present, upon the tweeds, &c., of the poor man. Remove the duty on Indian corn, and generally revise the present iniquitous Tariff.

A. M. FISHER,  
Clerk North Easthope, Shakespeare, Co. Perth.

1. Yes; because in many instances barley and other coarse grains could be sold, and corn purchased for feeding purposes at a profit to the farmer; and as we have a surplus of nearly all our agricultural products for export, a duty on American farm produce cannot increase the value of our produce.
2. As little or no corn is grown here, the price of that article has been increased by the duty which has been a loss to the farmers who feed cattle, as they formerly sold barley and bought corn. Oats are lower when compared with American prices than before the duty was placed upon them.
3. Wheat of all kinds is lower when compared with prices in the American market since the imposition of duties on wheat and flour from the United States.
4. I do not think prices have been materially affected; but the duty on corn has increased the cost of fattening Canadian hogs.
5. No; all our best horses and cattle are sold to go to the United States and England, and prices there rule our market entirely.
6. Yes; the profits on raising good horses are probably better than on other stock, but much more risk attends breeding them. The United States is the principal market for all our good horses.
7. It would generally pay better to import American corn and sell our barley or other coarse grain.
8. No; nearly all of them; the surplus is exported, and the price here is governed by the foreign market. Eggs are free, hence in a better position than the other articles.
9. Yes. We were in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty when American produce was admitted free, because nations as well as individuals are more amenable to reason than to coercion.
10. Canadian wool has been lower since the adoption of the Tariff than for many years before.
11. It has not affected the cultivation of flax, and there is no tobacco or sugar beet grown in this locality that I am aware of.
12. Not much change in price, but many of the implements are made much lighter, and hence should have been cheaper. Reaping machines, mowing machines, &c.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware have increased just about in proportion to the increase in Tariff, or if the price is not increased the quality is depreciated.

14. No. 15. No; emigration from this locality is larger since the adoption of the Tariff than ever before. 16. No; farm lands are probably 15 per cent. lower now than previous to the adoption of the Tariff.
17. Not materially. Farms and town property have decreased in value and wages have advanced very little, while a great many of the necessaries of life have advanced very much in price. Any improvement in their condition has been caused by the general prosperity throughout the world, not from the Tariff.
18. Adopt a Revenue Tariff only; agriculturalists only desire a free field and no favours.

*General Remarks:*—In answering your questions, I have endeavoured to get the most correct information that I could from those engaged in the sale of the various kinds of goods mentioned, and from those engaged in the breeding and disposing of the various kinds of animals, and producing and disposing of the various kinds of agricultural products.

D. D. WILSON,  
Reeve, Seaforth, Co. Huron.

1. Most decidedly not. 2. It has raised the price of oats, rye and corn, and encouraged farmers to grow coarse grains.
3. I am of the opinion that wheat is not affected by the duty, since Liverpool is our real market. 4. It has benefited farmers and encouraged pork-raisers.
5. The duty does not affect us, since horses do not come from the United States.
6. It pays well to raise good horses for the United States market.
7. Farmers can raise all coarse grain for fattening purposes. It would not pay to import American corn to where I live, as I always could buy pease cheaper, and they are better. 8. Very little change.
9. Reciprocal trade is advantageous; our chances are better through the National Policy. 10. Very little change. 11. I do not know.
12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper and better.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are unchanged. 14. Home market is improved by the present Tariff.
15. It encourages emigration to Canada. 16. No answer. 17. It has improved.
18. I am not aware of anything more than Sir John has done.

JOHN BAILEY,  
Reeve, Head Lake, Co, Victoria.

1. It would not. We produce more than we consume, and have a large surplus annually to find a market for and to be disposed of.
2. It has had the effect of directing the attention of our farmers to growing large crops of corn, which has paid well, increased the prices of oats, rye, corn, pease, and an increased home consumption for all coarse grains and more especially barley. All dealers can sell at less margins, and at the same time have more profits.
3. We produce a much larger quantity of fall wheat than we require for home consumption. Before the Tariff was imposed, small dealers in the United States sent their flour into our markets and sold it at reduced rates, in order to realize ready money, and forced our dealers to sell at the same prices. Spring wheat has been a failure for the last two or three years, and consequently our farmers have obtained larger prices for the quantity grown.
4. It has been increased to the full extent of the Tariff, if not more, and ready sales to our own lumbermen and merchants.
5. It has. The prices of horses have been materially increased and large numbers purchased and sent to Manitoba and the North-West.

6. Farmers find it profitable to raise horses. It pays well. The better class of our horses are mostly bought by American buyers and taken to the United States. The more common and coarse grade of horses are purchased for the Manitoba and North-West markets at good paying prices to the farmers.
7. Yes, the Canadian farmer can raise all the different kinds of grain required to fatten his stock, with more profit than to buy it from the United States.
8. It is much improved, and ready sale for home consumption for the use of the increased employees of our manufacturers.
9. The Reciprocity Treaty at the time it was in force, was, no doubt a benefit to the Canadian farmers, but now their producing power far exceeds their consuming population, therefore, I do not think Reciprocity would be beneficial to the Canadian farmer; but if so, we are in a much better position to obtain it with the Tariff than without it.
10. I am not prepared to say that it has materially affected the price of wool, but it has materially increased the price of sheep and mutton.
11. The cultivation and growth of flax, tobacco and sugar beet, have been largely increased since the Tariff, and produce a good profit to the farmers, and find ready markets.
12. Prices have not increased. Great improvements have been made in all farming implements, the quality is much better. Reapers, mowers, horse rakes, ploughs, drills, cultivators, harrows, &c.
13. Not increased. Can be purchased even cheaper, and our merchants say a much better quality; and farmers are satisfied that they are cheaper now than they were before 1878.
14. Largely increased by the large numbers employed in and about our manufacturing establishments, and the large number of new buildings erected for manufacturing and otherwise in our cities, towns and villages, through the increase of trade as protected by the present Tariff.
15. Yes. It has given employment to every man, woman and child that will accept work in our country, and has been the means of causing thousands to return from the United States, and increased immigration from other countries, who are now getting ready employment at remunerative wages.
16. Yes, farm lands have kept up prices beyond our expectations, taking into consideration the large emigration to Manitoba and the North-West.
17. Yes, materially improved. Farmers are getting remunerative prices for grain of all kinds and stock of all descriptions, and ready market at their doors for stock especially. All labourers find employment at good wages.
18. The policy of the present Administration has worked beneficially to the farmers, but I believe the present system of Government is too expensive for a new country like ours. If the Local Governments were done away with, and more power given to our County Councils, I believe it would not only be beneficial to the farmer, but to all classes in our Dominion, and would be a saving to the tax payers of millions annually.

JAMES R. CURREY,  
Farmer, Drumbo, Co. Oxford.

1. No, it would not. 2. On the whole the effect] has been to our interest, it has raised the price of these grains.
3. The price has been raised, thereby benefiting the farmer.
4. It has been to our interest satisfactorily. 5. Yes, most assuredly.
6. Yes, it is profitable to breed horses, but not much in excess of other stock. Formerly in the United States, but now the demand in Manitoba causes competition, and thereby raises the price.
7. Yes, we can raise all the grain required independent of the American grain.
8. Yes, most decidedly. 9. Yes. We are in a much better position now.

10. To the general interest of the country. 11. Good.
12. The price now is less on all agricultural implements than two years ago.
13. No. Cheaper and of a better quality.
14. Yes. By keeping out foreign produce, and thereby causing a home market.
15. Yes. 16. The tendency to invest has increased on account of the cheapness of money, but the price of land has not increased, on account of the opening up of the North-West. 17. Yes.
18. Our people are well satisfied with the present legislation.

JOHN ABERCROMBIE,  
Farmer, Picton, Co. Prince Edward.

1. No. Not unless in case of Reciprocity, and then it is doubtful, except for corn.
2. An increase in the price, particularly oats and corn; don't grow rye, and the price of barley is generally affected by the crops in Canada and the U.S.
3. Our farmers benefit by the home market, particularly when we have a short crop or during the summer.
4. I cannot say much about these, but on general principles it is not right to admit American produce when they will not grant us the same privilege.
5. I think so; at all events, prices for both are much better than formerly, and doubtless will continue as long as we hold to the National Policy.
6. I cannot say. 7. I cannot get the farmers to agree upon this point. The Tories think we can do without the American grain, but the Grits think not, because the *Globe* tells them so, and this is accepted as gospel. 8. Yes.
9. Might be benefited by Reciprocity, but would never ask the Americans for it, as we can live without them. We are certainly in a better position to negotiate than formerly, and if we prosper as we have been doing I have no doubt the Americans will make the first advances for Reciprocity.
10. It has not raised the price, but this low price is probably due to large crops in other countries. 11. Cannot say, as we grow neither.
12. Generally decreased, or about the same prices at all events. I know of no implements that we use to any great extent that are higher in price.
13. Goods bought by the farmer as a rule are as low or lower than they have been for many years. It is possible some particular line might be selected which may be higher, but others are lower, and altogether the farmer has nothing to complain of in this respect.
14. Increased, by our farmers having to supply the increased population, manufacturers, &c. They must be fed and must have our stuff when they cannot get the American. 15. Yes.
16. I cannot say that there is. Lands have decreased, but this is due to the opening up of the North-West and not to anything in the Tariff. 17. Yes.
18. Cannot suggest any, but would advise adhering to the present policy a few years longer and see what will be the result. I have every faith in the policy pursued by the present Government. At all events it is deserving of an extended and fair trial at the hands of the people.

G. P. MCKAY,  
Reeve, Innisfil, Co. Simcoe.

1. Yes, except hogs and pork; we raise a surplus of everything else, except corn, and no duty can raise the price to the farmers.
2. It has raised the price of corn and thereby increased the cost of feeding beef and pork. Before the National Policy American corn was largely used by farmers in this section for feeding cattle. I don't think it has made any difference on the other coarse grains.

3. Some of the millers say that they pay about 3 or 4 cents per bushel more for fall wheat on account of the National Policy. I hardly think so, spring wheat is dearer on account of scarcity; we cannot grow it to advantage in this section, and the millers want it to mix to make baker's flour.
4. I think it has raised the price of all of these products, as we have to import some to supply the demand.
5. It may have for the lower grades of horses,—horses worth from \$30 to \$70. It makes no difference on the best class, as we find a foreign market for them.
6. Yes, the profits compare favourably with other stock. We find a market for first-class horses of any kind in the United States, and for poor ones and medium, in Manitoba. A number of horses, worth from \$150 to \$250, have been bought by Americans here this winter.
7. I think it would pay better to get American corn and sell peas, &c., as they generally bring more per pound, and corn makes good feed.
8. I hardly think it is, the foreign demand rules the price of butter, potatoes, turnips, and some other articles of this class.
9. Yes. I cannot see that we are in a better position to make such a Treaty than we were five years ago.
10. None at all on coarse wool; it may have helped the price of fine wool a little. I never before sold wool as low as I did last year. 11. I do not grow any, therefore cannot answer this question. 12. A little; I should think about 10 per cent.
13. Cottons, a trifle higher; woollens, about 10 per cent, or more on some classes; hardware has increased a little but not much, I think about 10 to 12 per cent. on some articles, others about the same price as before the National Policy.
14. The home market is better, but it is on account of better times, not the N.P.
15. It has made labour scarcer and dearer, the men all seem to have gone away to the United States and North-West; men cannot be got to do the work in this part of the country. If the National Policy has done it, it has hurt the farmers very much.
16. No. Farms are about the same price, I think a little lower. More farms for sale in this country.
17. Yes, on account of good crops and good prices; beef for export is now sold for from  $5\frac{1}{4}$  to 6 cents per lb. live weight. No Canadian duty could raise the English market.
18. Nothing the Legislature can do can make the crops better, or the prices for our principal products better. If we had Free Trade with the United States it would help us a little. Parliament could help us by inducing more labourers from Europe to come here.

*General Remarks* :—I do not think I have any more remarks to make, except that I think the National Policy, so far as the farmers are concerned, a "humbug." I always thought so and have not changed my mind a bit. As long as we have a surplus of any product, our prices are ruled by the world's demand and not by the National Policy. I hope to see a change in some things before long.

THOS. A. GOOD,  
Farmer, Brantford, Co. Brant.

1. Not by any means. 2. Rye before 1878 was worth from 40 to 60 cents, since 1878, from 85 cents to \$1; oats, from 5 to 10 cents better; corn, from 10 to 15 cents better; and farmers are encouraged to grow more coarse grain.
3. I think very little difference. Our wheat generally goes to foreign markets.
4. They have benefited farmers to the extent of about 15 per cent., and encouraged pork raising.
5. We do not import any horses from the United States, but it may be a benefit by leaving a market open for our horses in Manitoba.
6. About in proportion to other stock; both in Manitoba and the United States.

7. We have no trouble to raise all the coarse grain for fattening purposes we need.
8. Yes, a very perceptible change for the better.
9. The principal grain exported from this country is barley. I think we are in a much better position to ask for a Reciprocity Treaty under the present Tariff.
10. I do not notice much change in prices, wool is cheap.
11. We do not raise either in this country, but use plenty of tobacco.
12. Farming implements are cheaper and of better quality than they were in 1879.
13. Woollen goods and hardware about the same.
14. We think the home market very materially benefited by the present Tariff.
15. I think the present Tariff has, and will encourage a large emigration to this country, and many Canadians are returning from the States.
16. Yes, I think a very great deal, on account of cheap money. 17. Yes, very much so; the labouring classes live better, because they have more to do and get better pay.
18. I do not know that Sir John and his Government could do a great deal more for the benefit of the agriculturalist, unless to give him Free Trade.

*General Remarks* :—I would be pleased to hear from you at any time convenient. I have not had the time to give your questions as much thought, perhaps, as they are worthy of, but I beg to submit the enclosed answers to you.

H. A. McFAUL, J.P.,  
Deputy Reeve, Hillier, Co. Prince Edward.

1. Yes, because foreign markets rule the price; it would cause extra labour and freight. 2. Its effects are injurious to the farmer for feeding purposes. We depend on the Americans to a great extent for our barley market.
3. The effect has been to reduce our price by shutting out foreign buyers.
4. It has increased the price to the consumer. The farmers in this section do not make a business of fattening hogs. 5. Not improved.
6. United States until to within the last year. 7. No, it would be better to import American corn. 8. No, we have to export. 9. No answer.
10. To reduce the price, it being 25 cents here and 35 cents in the United States.
11. No answer. 12. Increased and quality not as good.
13. Increased both in woollen and cotton goods. 14. It has not increased.
15. It has not retarded emigration. 16. No; the value of land has decreased 25 per cent. 17. Not on account of the Tariff, but from foreign demand.
18. Retrenchment in public expenditure, which would lessen taxes. Take the duty off raw material and put it on manufactured articles that are brought in, by so doing we can obtain a better article. It would be better to take the duty off sugar and other necessary articles used by the labouring classes and put a heavy duty on tobacco of all kinds, pianos and organs, and stop the country from being flooded with inferior articles. Put ten times the duty on liquor or give us prohibition and save our country, and we care not for the evil effects of the Tariff.

HIRAM RAWLINGS, J.P.,  
President East Lambton Agric. Soc., Yeoman, Ravenswood, Co. Lambton.

1. It would not. 2. I am not in a position to give a definite answer to this question.
3. I can only reply to this as to the above. 4. I cannot say. 5. I think so.
6. It is profitable to breed a good class of horses, for which farmers find a ready sale at good prices. The bulk of the horses go to the United States.
7. My impression and experience is that it is more profitable for a farmer to raise grain for feeding purposes than what it is to buy. 18. Most decidedly.

9. I think it would be very much to the interest of the Canadian farmer to have a Reciprocity Treaty, and I think that under the present policy we are in a better position to negotiate. 10 and 11. I cannot say.
12. Implements are as cheap under the present Tariff and the quality as good. This applies to agricultural implements of a general character.
13. There is no marked increase in the prices charged for any of the commodities in general use among farmers. (Since writing the above my wife says that cotton and woollen goods are a good deal cheaper.) And she is a good Grit.
14. Most certainly. 15. Yes.
16. At present the North-West fever has in some measure diverted the tendency to purchase farm property. 17. Very materially.
18. I am somewhat at a loss to answer this question.
- General Remarks:*—I might very briefly say that the present Tariff is giving very general satisfaction.

GEORGE LEVERSAGE,  
Reeve, Fullarton, Carlingford, Co. Perth.

1. It would not be fair or just to do so, in the face of their heavy duties on all our farm produce seeking their markets, and it would give them the choice of either their own or ours—which ever offered the best prizes, while we would be shut out, unless we paid their duties.
2. It has caused a more steady demand for our coarse grains, and at better prices, by at least the duty which the present Tariff has imposed, and also has stimulated our farmers to grow more corn than formerly.
3. The price of spring wheat has been better by at least from 10 to 15 cents per bushel, and with a good demand for all good samples offered. Fall wheat not much grown in this section, but of late years many farmers are again trying fall wheat. As the price of wheat has so materially increased of late years, farmers are willing to run the risk of even failure; it generally does well in this section.
4. The price of live hogs has been unusually good within the last two years, but more especially last year; and also pork, in all its various modes of preparation, has been in good demand, and at better prices than have ever been in this market.
5. The price of horses has been better than it was since the American Rebellion, and the demand for any kind of good to medium horses is on the increase; a considerable number of horses have been shipped to the North-West during the past twelve months.
6. Good horses are profitable to raise, like every other good breed of animals, as it costs no more to raise a good colt to three or four years old than to raise a poor one, that would barely bring half the price of the other. Our principal market here is the United States.
7. Generally he can; if he farms skilfully, and only fattens the stock of his own raising, and sends the product of his farm to market in the shape of beef and mutton, and thereby lessening the cost of hauling his produce to market, and increasing the fertility of his farm from his own products.
8. I think that the market for these products of the farm is better than it has been for a long time past; ready sales at fair prices.
9. A fair Treaty for the natural products of the soil would benefit the Canadian farmer, as he would then have a choice of markets, and could avail himself of whichever suited best. We are in a better position, as we have something now to offer to them for any concession they might give us.
10. There seems but little as regards the price; but there are various causes to account for the price of wool not being much changed by the present Tariff. American farmers have been buying largely, of late years, our long wool

sheep, and now have in their own country large flocks of the class that we formerly supplied to them.

11. Not to any extent in this section, but very little being grown of any of the products named, unless a little flax for the seed and beets for cattle feed.
12. If anything they are now cheaper than they were formerly, unless some special thing that is covered by a patent right. The quality is generally better, the keen competition amongst manufacturers rendering it almost useless to compete unless the article produced is first rate.
13. Not to any appreciable extent; taking into account the cost of the raw material that has to be used in making, and where any increase does exist it is more than counterbalanced by the better demand for all the products of the farm.
14. Undoubtedly it has been increased by the greater numbers of skilled workmen employed at remunerative wages, which circulate into the farmer's hands for the commodities that he has to sell.
15. It has given diversity of employment, and has created a home demand for our own people, and therefore prevented them from going abroad to seek the labour that they wished to work at.
16. There is an increased tendency to invest in real estate, money being more plentiful and not commanding such high rates as formerly. Men invest in real estate now more readily, considering it the safest in the end. While many are selling out and moving to the North-West, it is seldom that a farm remains long without a purchaser at a fair price, and generally more cash paid down than is usual in buying land.
17. They are improved to a very considerable extent, the farmers having better markets and the labouring classes having better wages and constant employment.

18. Not prepared to say just now.

R. J. DUNLOP, J.P.,  
Farmer, Pittsburg, Co. Frontenac.

1. No, it would not; better as it is.
2. It has raised the price of oats, and encouraged the farmer to grow more coarse grains.
3. I am of opinion that wheat is rather at a better price at this time of the year from the fact of having home consumption. Liverpool is the ruling market, so long as we raise more than we consume.
4. It has been good, and encouraged pork raising.
5. I think it has helped us by opening the North-West, which we supply with horses that otherwise would have been supplied from the States.
6. Yes, to raise good horses is profitable—heavy horses for the United States and lighter horses for Manitoba.
7. He can raise all coarse grains for fattening, and more too.
8. Do not know; I think not affected.
9. We might be benefited in some ways, and we are in a better position to negotiate under the N.P. than ever we were before.
10. The Tariff on cotton has a tendency to raise the price of wool.
11. Tobacco and sugar are greatly on the increase through the N.P.
12. No, the price has not increased, and the quality is better, with more improvements than before.
13. No, they are not increased in price. I think those in common use are cheaper under the present Tariff.
14. Decidedly it has benefited and increased. By the present Tariff.
15. It has given employment to all classes, and encouraged immigration.
16. Yes, on account of cheap money. Land has decreased in price a little on account of the North-West fever.
17. It has very much improved through the N.P.
18. Keep the men in power that we have in at present, and the country will prosper, and we will be a happy people.

JOHN ROBINSON,  
Ex-Reeve, McGillivray, Ailsa Craig, Co. Middlesex.

1. It would not be to the interest of agriculturalists in Canada to admit American produce free.
2. The duty on American Indian corn has raised the price of oats, peas and other coarse grain; oats are now worth 40 cents, before 1878, 26 cents; barley now 75 cents, before 1878, 55 cents to 60 cents; no rye raised in this section; peas now 75 cents, before 1878, 60 cents.
3. No spring wheat raised in this section, fall wheat worth on an average 25 cents per bushel more, since 1878, than previous; to duty being imposed on American wheat.
4. Live hogs have averaged \$1 per 100 lbs. more since the duty was imposed, dried hams, bacon and lard have been increased in the same proportion.
5. At no time in the past twenty years have horses brought such high prices, Manitoba is our best market for horses, cattle are bringing better prices since 1878 than previous.
6. No stock pays better than good horses, ready sale at good paying prices, Manitoba is our best market for horses.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain required to fatten his stock, I do not think it would be better to import American corn; still some feeders of stock of both sides of politics are of opinion that it would be better to admit corn duty free.
8. I think vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter are bringing better prices; as all meats raise in price it affects these also.
9. A fair Reciprocity is what we want and no doubt we are in a better position now than previous to 1878, when American produce was admitted free.
10. As I do not keep sheep I am not in a position to say.
11. These articles are not raised here, some sugar beet only for feeding purposes.
12. Farm implements are not raised in price, quality just as good if not better; improvements are made in machinery for the same price. Reapers, mowers, drills, spades, shovels, forks, waggons, ploughs and all edge tools are better and at a lower price.
13. Woollens and cottons are not increased in price; I never remember when board nails were as cheap as to-day; farmers have no reason to complain of the price of these articles.
14. The home market has been increased; American oats are never seen in our market; we are not told now if you do not take 25 cents per bushel for your oats we can buy American oats for that price, and corn does not take the place of our coarse grain.
15. Yes, all industrial classes are benefited; farmers can afford to improve the farm and farm buildings and pay the workman better prices, and so all classes are in a more prosperous condition.
16. Farm property was very low previous to the present Tariff; it has risen in price, and in my opinion would still increase. Cheap lands in Manitoba and the North-West will keep down the price of land in Ontario.
17. Yes; most decidedly. 18. I am opposed to sudden changes. Give our present Tariff a good and fair trial before making changes.

*General Remarks* :—The people in this section are thankful for free tea and coffee, and all classes are thankful for the repeal of the stamp tax.

BENJAMIN HOPKINS,

Reeve, Bowmanville, Co. Oxford.

1. It will not. 2. The general effect has been beneficial.
3. No material effect. Not much American flour imported here.
4. Beneficial in general. 5. No material effect, if any beneficial.
6. We find it profitable, compares favourably with other stock. Home market generally. 7. We require American meal. 8. It has. 9. He would not.

10. No effect; none imported. 11. No effect here.  
 12. Cost decreased, equally as good. All farming utensils.  
 13. They have not increased. 14. It has been.  
 15. We require more enterprise in factories to give the mechanical class labour.  
 16. Increased in value. 17. They have.  
 18. Perfectly satisfied with the present legislation.

*General Remarks* :—I have not personally answered the above questions, but have consulted the farmers of the section, and been governed by their opinion.

W. H. YOUNG,  
 Municipal Councillor, Belle Isle, Co. Annapolis.

1. Yes, as farmers do not raise sufficient for their own consumption, excepting beef and apples. 2 to 5. No answer.  
 6. No; the raising of horses compares unfavourably with other stock.  
 7. He can; I do not think it pays better to import corn. 8. No.  
 9. Yes; the position at present seems better than if there was only a Revenue Tariff. 10 and 11. No answer. 12. Increased.  
 13. They are increased in price. 14. Slightly if any, and it appears to be caused by the opening up of better and easier communication with Great Britain.  
 15. There never was a greater "exodus" of young men and women from this valley than there has been for the last year or more, and increasing to the United States.  
 16. Very little tendency to invest in farm property, although there has been a slight increase in value owing to the reason given in answer to question 14.  
 17. Farmers slightly since 1880. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—Some of the foregoing questions do not apply to this locality and are therefore not answered, and others I feel incompetent to answer; but such as are, I think, will apply to this county.

GEORGE KENNEDY,  
 Warden, Granville Ferry, Co. Annapolis.

1. Yes; there are none imported of the kind produced here of any account except for transshipment.  
 2. Corn is of course dearer, other grains are not affected; our common market is the Eastern market. 3. To raise the price by the amount of duty.  
 4. To increase the cost to the consumer. 5. No; the American market has been and is unlimited; Manitoba is limited yet.  
 6. It has always been profitable to those who understand it to raise horses for the United States, they pay good prices for suitable horses.  
 7. If convenient to a railway—not holding a monopoly—it pays well to get American corn. 8. No, no, no.  
 9. Yes. No; because the Tariff affect us, not the Americans. 10. None.  
 11. It must increase cost of production and manufacture.  
 12. Increased in price; quality same. All. 13. They are dearer. All used by farmers.  
 14. The home market is improved, but that is altogether owing to the better condition of the lumbering.  
 15. They greatly complain here; and those who are not able to work at lumbering leave for the States.  
 16. No; farm lands are cheaper than ever, many anxious to sell (but can't) to go to the States or Manitoba. 17. Yes; lumbering and good crops account for it.  
 18. Revenue Tariff, or better still Reciprocity or Free Trade.

HENRY H. SEAMANS,  
 Farmer, Otter Lake, Co. Pontiac.

1. No. 2. Very little Indian corn imported here, consequently the duty does not affect the price of oats, rye, barley and pease.
  3. The duty has not affected the price of wheat and flour here.
  4. Has stimulated the price. 5. The increased duties have not affected this market.
  6. Yes; and consider the profits compare favourably with the profits on other stock. Principal markets the Lower Provinces and United States.
  7. Yes; and don't consider it will pay better to import American corn. 8. Yes.
  9. In the Maritime Provinces farmers would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. Under the present Tariff we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty.
  10. It increases the price and demand. 11. None. 12. The price of implements has decreased. It is claimed the quality is not as good. 13. Not increased.
  14. It has. By giving our miners and mechanics better employment. 15. It has.
  16. Yes; increased. 17. Yes; very materially. 18. Could not suggest any.
- General Remarks* :—Cornmeal is the only American farm production that is imported to any extent, and the general impression is that the duty on it is too high.

W. H MOORE,  
Merchant, North Sydney, Co. Cape Breton.

1. No. 2. Good. Oats and barley in particular. 3. Favourable. As far as the classes are concerned I have no idea. 4. Good effect. 5. Certainly.
6. In my opinion it is not so profitable to breed horses as other stock. We send more horses to Newfoundland than elsewhere. 7. Yes.
8. Undoubtedly it is. 9. No. 10. Good. 11. Cannot say.
12. Decreased, and quality superior. Mowing machines and horse rakes, cultivators, and thrashing and fanning mills.
13. Decreased in general. Too numerous to enumerate. 14. Yes; through the effect of the National Policy. 15. Certainly, in all respects.
16. Yes; They have increased considerable owing to the increase in the home market.
17. Yes. 18. By imposing more duty on foreign coal.

ALLAN McADAM,  
Farmer, Eskasoni, St. Andrews, Co. Cape Breton.

1. I don't think it would. 2. I suppose it has increased the price of Indian meal 40 cents per bbl. It has not affected in the least our oats, rye, corn, barley or pease.
3. Not any in this locality, because we can get enough flour in our own country.
4. It has encouraged the farmers of Canada to be more enterprising in raising for their own consumption.
5. I should think it has. 6. We have no market for horses in either the United States or Manitoba, only the home market.
7. I think he can; some say it would be cheaper to buy corn.
8. It is about the same here as before the present Tariff was imposed.
9. It is supposed by many that it would. I think we are.
10. Don't deal extensively in wool here. 11. None, as tobacco or sugar beet is not cultivated here.
12. I don't deal in many farm implements; the price has decreased under the present Tariff, and the articles are good. Rakes, scythes, mowing machines, &c.
13. If they are it is not felt, as such articles can be bought here as cheap as before the present Tariff was imposed. 14. I think it has.
15. It has, but as yet retarded emigration only to a very limited extent to the United States. 16. I dare say that land has increased in value since 1878.

17. A little improved, but the good times are beginning to be felt from this out.  
 18. To imbue the minds of the agricultural population of the Dominion to stay on their farms and work them, in order to make them more remunerative.

*General Remarks* :—I filled the enquiries in a very incomplete way. You are, it appears, of good understanding and know the best methods to be devised to meet the requirements of the public at large in the Dominion.

STEPHEN McNEIL,  
 Trader and Farmer, Beaver Cove, Co. Cape Breton.

1. Nothing but Indian corn, because this section of country is not rich enough without using too much manure.
2. To throw us on to our own resources; we have to raise our fodder, oats, barley, pease, and buckwheat, corn we cannot have because we cannot raise it profitably and it is too high to buy. It has raised the price of all coarse grains.
3. It has not affected us here at all, for we raise about enough for our own use and none to sell. 4. It has raised the price of pork.
5. I do not think it has any effect on our market; our horses go to the United States market from here.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, but more profitable to breed cattle and sheep.
7. Farmers can raise all the grain to fatten their stock but it would pay better to buy corn, if the duty was off, for part of their feed.
8. I don't think it has any effect. Butter goes to the Old Country mostly from here. 9. I think we are well enough the way we are.
10. It has a tendency to raise the price of wool.
11. On flax and tobacco no effect here, for there is very little raised. As for sugar beets, I got beat very bad last year, the frost in this section of the country was too much for me.
12. Mowing machines and horse rakes, ploughs and cultivators; all other farming implements are cheaper and quite as good. 13. No.
14. It has, because it keeps our folks at home and we have more to feed.
15. It has, and is a benefit to the working classes and encourages emigration.
16. There is; farm lands have increased in value, principally because money is plentiful. 17. Very much so. 18. Not any, it is good enough.

*General Remarks* :—But I do not give the whole credit to the National Policy. I think we are living in a time of general prosperity, for I see our neighbours across the line are equally as prosperous, money plentiful and everything lovely. I hope it may long remain so.

WILLIAM HOOKER,  
 Councillor, Bishop's Crossing, Co. Wolfe.

1. Yes, some kinds, notably Indian corn thus lessening the cost of raising stock by supplying cheaper food.
2. Not sufficient quantities of either kinds of grain named raised in this section of the country to affect price; all we have we import.
3. The effect has been upon the price of flour to raise it to the extent of the duty imposed; no wheat of any consequence raises in this locality.
4. Average price has been higher on their products; owing doubtless to the heavy duties being increased. 5. and 6. I don't know enough about the United States to give an intelligent answer.
7. In my opinion it would pay better to import American corn, if the duty remained. (See answer, question one.)
8. Prices in this locality rule about the same; very little produced here.

9. Yes I think he would; my opinion is that this Dominion is in a better position to negotiate for a Reciprocity Treaty than under the old Tariff.
10. Wool here is cheaper than it has been for the past twenty years.
11. Not any cultivated in this section.
12. Cannot give an answer here, as this is not an agricultural district; I think the present Tariff increases the cost without improving the quality.
13. Prices increasing, woollons, horse blankets, about 70 per cent., cottons, common sheetings, about 15 per cent., hardware, farming implements, about 10 p. c.
14. I cannot say that it has. This I know however, the operation of the Tariff cannot increase the market, but only increases the manufacturers gain.
15. The effect in this section of the country of the Tariff on the industrious classes has been to discourage them, and lead to quite an exodus of mechanics and lumbermen to the United States.
16. Not here.
17. Not with us.
18. Remove the burden of taxation imposed on this industry by the present Government for the protection and enriching of the classes already in the enjoyment of sufficient legislative aid.

**JACOB LOCKE,**  
Merchant, Lockeport, Co. Shelburne.

1. No, I think it would not.
2. It has given a steadier market, and better prices for oats.
3. We cannot discover any difference.
4. We do too little in that business here to determine any effect.
5. Slightly, if any.
6. From good stock we find horses as profitable as any other. The United States is our market.
7. I am doubtful whether our farmers can either grow or import grain to fatten at profit.
8. It is.
9. He would, and I think we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff.
10. It has given us a better price and a cash market.
11. None of such is grown here.
12. The cost is but little affected either way; the quality is as good.
13. Woollens are, if anything cheaper, and the difference on cottons and hardware is not discoverable.
14. It has, and that by more home consumption.
15. It has given diversity of employment, and no doubt retarded emigration to the United States.
16. There is but little increased tendency shown here; owing to the emigration of our farmers to the North-West; there is no increase in the value of farm land.
17. It is greatly.
18. To make it more profitable, it would be of great assistance if the Government would legislate a Bill to encourage or assist farmers to drain the land with tile or otherwise.

**COLIN R. FRUTER,**  
Municipal Councillor, South Pictou, Co. Pictou.

1. Certainly not.
2. Oats, barley and pease are extensively raised, and find a ready market and a better price. Rye and corn not grown in this part of the county.
3. Neither wheat or flour has come here from the United States for years.
4. A higher price and ready sale. Before the present Tariff, hundreds of barrels of pork passed my door for the mines and lumber camps from the United States, now not a barrel comes, they get a better article at home.
5. Formerly horses came from Ontario to Nova Scotia, now we get them at home.
6. Yes, it is more profitable than any other stock, our market is principally at home.
7. Yes, and it pays much better than buying corn.
8. Yes.
9. I think so. We are in a much better position now, we have something to offer in exchange
10. The factories buy our wool at our own doors and pay the cash for it.
11. None.

12. Mowing machines, horse rakes, ploughs, forks, thrashing machines, waggons, &c., are all cheaper and just as good as imported ones.
13. No increase as far as I know. The home-made factory coat takes the place of the American shoddy.
14. It has increased. Factories, mining, and lumbering have been stimulated by the Tariff, these make a better home market.
15. It has, the emigration still goes on.
16. Not in this part of the country. Lands have decreased owing to the wish of so many people to emigrate to the North-West.
17. Yes.
18. A higher rather than a lower Tariff on all farm produce, more encouragement given to emigration to settle in these older Provinces, the resources of the country better opened up. Good farms with buildings on them can be bought for a few hundred dollars.

CHARLES R. SPRATT,  
Farmer, Middle Musquodoboit, Co. Halifax.

1. Not without Reciprocity, excepting corn. 2. Probably to raise the price of oats and barley. Hardly any rye, corn or pease raised here.
3. Do not think any. 4. But very little. 5. I cannot say they have in this vicinity. The Manitoba and the North-West market not felt here.
6. Fairly so when the breeder understands horses. I think it just as profitable, with less risk, to raise other stock. The United States is our principal market for horses.
7. The Nova Scotian farmer cannot. It would pay him to import corn to fatten cattle with his abundant hay which must be supplemented with grain or roots to produce fat.
8. It is. 9. Yes; we are in an infinitely better position now. The Americans respect us now that we have had sense enough to adopt their policy, and would be far more likely to grant Reciprocity than if they were allowed to send their produce in free.
10. The Tariff has made a home market for our wool, which formerly went either to the States or the Upper Provinces to be manufactured and sent back to us.
11. No perceptible effect, for we raise hardly any flax, no tobacco, and only a few sugar beets as an experiment, which we feed to cattle.
12. I think it is increased. The quality of Canadian implements has materially improved of late years; but American mowers, reapers, and thrashers are thought better.
13. Woollen factories are springing up; and are making very good articles. I think woollens are quite as cheap as before the N.P.; cottons probably a little higher; hardware has increased, but not through the effects of the Tariff.
14. It has; manufactories of various kinds are building up, and those in operation before the N.P. are doing far more work, consequently the farmer has a better home market, which is the best market.
15. It has, most decidedly. 16. Yes; I think the value of farm lands has increased generally, in some districts in a most marked manner. Because prices are better for surplus produce.
17. Without doubt. First-class agricultural schools; but this may be considered *ultra vires*. Continue the present times for fear a change would be for the worse, excepting the remission of the corn duties.

HIRAM BLACK,  
Farmer, Amherst, Co. Cumberland.

1. Yes; to the people of this county. Our people are altogether engaged in fishing and lumbering. The duty on all farm produce increases the price. Our natural market is the United States.

2. The duty on Indian meal has increased the price to the consumer. Neither oats, rye, barley or pease are imported into this county.
3. The price of flour is increased by the duty; American flour can be landed here now after paying duty, as cheap as Canadian; no wheat imported.
4. Live hogs are prohibited; American lard principally imported; prices increased under the present Tariff. No. 5 to 7. No answer. 8. All these articles used for home markets; prices as usual.
9. It would be more to the interest of this county that a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States be made. The present Protective Tariff makes the Treaty more difficult of adjustment.
- Nos. 10 and 11. No answers. 12. Horse-rakes, shovels and forks have increased in price. The American goods are generally preferred.
13. But few woollen goods except Canadian are used now; but much cotton goods come from the United States; the high duty bears heavily on the consumer.
14. No answer. 15. Emigration to the United States has increased since 1879 to the present year, and emigration from this county, is largely in excess of any other. Many families and young persons become permanent settlers there.
16. Land has decreased in value; unoccupied houses by the score may be found in this county. 17. Not in any way improved. 18. Free Trade to every man of the necessaries of life.

*General Remarks* :—Our natural market is the United States; our products find a ready sale, and all we require in exchange are profitably supplied.

GABRIEL ROBERTSON,  
Receiver of Wreck, Barrington Passage, Co. Shelburne.

1. No answer. 2. Raised the price generally and operates as a curse to the poor of this Province as much so as the thorn and thistle.
3. Caused the price to be 50 cents per bbl. more than it should be.
4. We have to pay that much now, as we continue to import from the United States; the Canadian goods being generally of poorer quality and higher prices.
- 5 and 6. No answer. 7. This Province (Nova Scotia) cannot produce grain for its own purposes, and must import American, or suffer for want.
8. Not in the least; we have to depend largely on the American markets.
9. Yes, that is the very thing we want. Admit American produce free; then (in my opinion) we will be in a better position to negotiate.
10. I don't know of any benefit to us from such Tariff. 11. No answer.
12. The costs are no less. The quality not improved. In most kinds of implements lots of inferior articles.
13. Most all kinds of common cotton and woollen goods are increased in price from 15 to 35 per cent. 14. I fail to notice any benefit derived from it.
15. If there is no change for the better (in the Tariff) the labouring class will all leave the country and go to the United States. Hundreds are leaving and going there for employment every week.
16. Lots of farms allowed to run down, and now not worth one half they were in 1878. The people have gone and left them.
17. No; they are ruined and burdened to death by taxation. 18. Sweep away the N.P. and give Free Trade.

*General Remarks* :—What is good for the farmer is good for most all other classes in this Province. The fisherman, lumberman, miners &c., all depend on each other largely, and what would be of most general interest to all—Free Trade—we would under such a change soon see our men and women returning home and making things look cheerful again.

WM. SMITH, J.P.  
Barrington, Co: Shelburne.

1. It would be against Canadian agriculturalists.
2. It has had a good effect.
3. No winter wheat sown in this section of the Dominion; had a good effect on spring wheat.
4. A good effect.
5. It has improved the market in Canada.
6. The profits on horses compare favourably with other stock United States.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all required, without American.
8. Yes, it has improved.
9. Yes, a Reciprocity with the United States on a fair basis would be best. We are under the present Tariff in a better position to get Reciprocity.
10. I cannot answer that.
11. A good effect.
12. Not increased, lower if any.
13. Increased, nothing to my knowledge.
14. It has increased on the whole.
15. Yes, it has greatly increased employment in Canada.
16. On the whole increased in value.
17. Yes, well improved.
18. To carry any fertilizer for farm purposes as cheap as possible on steamboats and railways, in the way of manure, such as lime, muscle, mud, &c.

*General Remarks:*—On the whole since the inception of the present Tariff Canada seems to prosper.

PETER DUFFY,  
Farmer and Miller, County Line Station, Co. Prince.

1. Not at all.
2. Has made a very material change in this section of country.
3. I am of opinion that the duty has not affected us in any way.
4. It has given farmers better prices for pork.
5. The duty does not affect us here as horses do not come from the United States.
6. It is considered profitable to breed horses here. The principal market is in the United States.
7. The farmers can raise all the grain required to fatten stock, without importing American corn.
8. There is a decided improvement.
9. A fair Reciprocity would be beneficial.
10. Has raised the price.
11. Sugar beets have improved.
12. Farm implements are cheaper and better.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware remain about the same as before the Tariff here.
14. The home market for farm produce has improved very much. The National Policy has opened up factories and other home industries.
15. It has.
16. There is; farm lands have rather increased in value.
17. The condition of the farmer and labourer is very much improved.
18. Do not think there could be any change for the better at present.

R. C. WELDON,  
Penobsquis, Co. King's, N.B.

1. No, no, no.
2. A raise in price on oats, rye, corn and peas since the Tariff (I cannot say upon barley) and a lively market in our own country.
3. The price of wheat is much better here since 1878, and a livelier market for fall and spring wheat.
4. I am not in a position to say to what extent, but we get better prices for all those articles under protection than formerly.
5. The market for horses is better now than formerly, also for all kinds of live stock. The principal buyers around Kingston are from the United States.
6. At present prices, any kind of live stock will pay well. The principal market is the United States. Some are being sent to Manitoba.
7. It would pay Canadian farmers to raise their own grain for feeding stock much better than importing corn.
8. Yes.
9. I think we would be benefited by Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. We are in a better position now than when they had Free Trade with us.
10. Cannot give an opinion, I am not in a position to know.

11. Cannot say, never gave these articles a thought.
  12. No; we get our farm implements just as good a quality and fully as cheap as formerly.
  13. No increase in price that I can perceive.
  14. We get a better price for all kinds of coarse grains, and the farmers on the whole are more prosperous and have more encouragement to raise grain, as they know that Canada is not a slaughter market for the surplus coarse grain of the American.
  15. It has decidedly so.
  16. There is more confidence among the farmers, that the Government they are under feels an interest in their welfare, and farm land is firmer in price than in 1878 because of the reasons I have assigned.
  17. Very much improved, farmers and farm labourers as well.
  18. I do not know any.
- General Remarks*:—May Heaven's choicest blessings rest upon the Government that instituted and established the protection of the interests of the farmers of Canada, should be and is the sincere prayer of every honest Canadian.

DAVID JAMES WALKER, J.P.,

Reeve, Inverary, Co. Frontenac.

1. No.
2. Raised the price at home, especially oats, rye, barley and pease.
3. No answer.
4. Price better.
5. No difference.
6. Yes. Principal market in the States. Raising horses pays best just now.
7. Certainly he can, it pays best to raise it at home.
8. The market about the same as before.
9. We are all right under the National Policy.
10. Very little difference.
11. No answer.
12. The cost is decreased, quality just as good. Any machine used on a farm.
13. No.
14. Altogether better under the new Tariff.
15. Yes.
16. Yes, increased because of better times and money more plentiful.
17. Greatly improved.
18. None, we are as near right as possible.

WILLMOT VANDERVOORT,

President Rawdon Branch Agric. Soc., Wellman's Corners, Co. Hastings.

1. Decidedly. Not any.
2. Price of all coarse grains increased from 10 to 16 cents per bushel, except barley.
3. It is considered fall and spring wheat have been at better prices since duty imposed.
4. All of these articles improved at least one-quarter.
5. The demand for the North-West has increased and with better prices.
6. It pays to breed good horses, and the demand for the States and Manitoba makes competition, and farmers realize better prices.
7. Can raise enough; want no American corn, our own corn is better.
8. A good deal with improved demand.
9. The opinion prevails, let us be satisfied with the present Tariff.
10. Can't say if any.
11. Very little raised in this section.
12. The quality of farming implements of all kinds improving and at less prices.
13. Just as cheap as before the Tariff.
14. Greatly increased by more local demand and home industry.
15. Certainly there is a demand for labour in all branches of industry under the present Tariff, also farm labourers.
16. Capitalists are more willing to invest in farm property and price of land is better than before 1878; lots of money at 6 per cent.
17. Farmers and labouring classes seem satisfied, except a few grumblers that will not acknowledge while in reality they know better.
18. Educate farmers' sons to the proper cultivation of the soil with necessary qualifications for Parliament and have fewer lawyers.

*General Remarks* :—Tariff takes well except with Annexationists and Free Traders who are few and far between. The demand for farm labor is good in this section. In general, farmers seem satisfied, a good home demand for all kinds of farm produce with good prices; in short, the country is prospering since the Tariff came into force

EDWARD LEE, Reeve,  
Post Master and Farmer, Marshville, Co. Welland.

1. Decidedly not. 2. The duty on American corn has raised the price of oats and peas in this locality; we grow no rye here.
3. The duty on American wheat has given us a better market for all kinds of wheat, as we have the whole of the home market now. We chiefly raise spring wheat.
4. The duty on American meats has had the effect of raising the price of pork to nearly double to what it was previously. Farmers can now raise and fatten pork at a good profit.
5. There is a splendid market now for heavy horses for the American market, and also a good demand for Manitoba; in fact all stock are at least one third higher now than previous to the N.P.
6. It is very profitable to breed heavy horses for the American market. The principal market for heavy horses is the American market. The lighter grade of horses chiefly go to the North-West. It pays well now to raise all sort of stock.
7. The farmer can fatten cattle now on home-grown grain at a greater profit on account of the enhanced value of beef than he could previous to the National Policy, on grains admitted free from the United States. 8. I think it is.
9. It is my opinion that a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would be a great advantage to the Canadian farmer. We are decidedly in a better position now to negotiate such a Treaty. Previously we had no inducements to offer them as they had all the privileges that they required.
10. It appears to me that the Tariff has not increased the price of wool.
11. None grown in this locality.
12. Farming implements have not increased in value, in fact ploughs, reapers, &c., and all farming implements are cheaper now than before the inception of the Tariff, and of equally good quality as previous.
13. I cannot notice any increase in the articles specified.
14. It has most decidedly, as it has given the producer the whole of our own markets for the disposal of his produce. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Lands have increased in value since 1878.
17. There has been an unprecedented improvement in the condition of the farmers in this section since 1878, and the labouring classes are much better off now than in 1878, as they receive nearly double the wages now that they did then and constant employment.
18. If the duty on American pork, beef, cattle and hogs was increased, and also the duty on foreign wool imported into this country, I think it would have the effect of still raising the price of the above specified articles to the farmers.

*General Remarks* :—I beg to return you my sincere thanks for your effort in behalf of the farming community of this country. I read with regret of your intention of giving up politics, I hope you will reconsider your determination and still continue to champion the cause you so nobly have taken up.

PHILIP MORÆ,  
Reeve, Mara, Co. Ontario.

1. No change required; it would be against our interest to admit it free of duty.
2. Our oats and pease are in better demand by excluding American corn; we can grow as good Indian corn as the Americans can.

3. Our wheat is in good demand, and red winter is much dearer on account of keeping out American spring corn. 4. About \$1 on the hundred on live hogs; hams are dearer. 5. Horses are selling well, as so many are shipped to Manitoba.
6. Breeding good horses pays well; better than breeding horned cattle; we anticipate that the demand for Manitoba will continue for years.
7. We are well able to grow all we require for feeding cattle; do not like importing feed stuff. 8. Yes; as our surplus population is now earning good wage.
9. We are now in a better position to negotiate with the Americans than before, and would like a Reciprocity Treaty so as to get our barley to the States free of duty. 10. Don't know. 11. Probability better for flax growers.
12. Farm implements are about the same. 13. We are paying about the same at the retail stores. 14. Yes; we are supplying our increased town populations, which causes better prices.
15. Yes: our present Tariff has caused better employment for the industrial classes. No beggars now, as in 1877 and 1878. 16. No dearer, as so many are going to Manitoba.
17. Yes. Never better prices for years, or more prosperity than at the present.
18. Cannot better our condition by any better legislation unless that you could have fewer Local Governments.

*General Remarks* :—Keep the present Tariff in force and present Government in office, and we will be well satisfied.

WM. H. RYAN, J.P.,

Ex-Reeve and Farmer, Elginfield, Co. Middlesex.

1. Yes, because everybody could buy what they cannot raise themselves; we cannot raise enough of coarse grain for fattening purposes. By fattening stock we enrich our lands.
2. The duty on Indian corn has stopped the feeding of stock nearly one-half; in our section of country barley has brought 75 to 80 cents; oats, 30 to 38 cents; pease, 75 cents; Indian corn, 75 cents; no rye raised here.
3. The effect of the price on fall wheat did us no good, the price of wheat has ruled in Liverpool, \$1.20 has been the price; it has raised the flour for home consumption which has been favourable to the millers. Spring wheat we cannot raise, the price here is about the same as at Chicago.
3. The increased duty on hogs and dried hams is about 2 to 3 cents a pound in a retail way. We cannot raise pork now at the same rate, pease have failed, the bug eats them up. The pork packers complain and say they have no profit; I see no profit in it to anybody.
5. The North-West makes a demand for horses, but they buy cheap, so they buy according to the duty and other expenses incurred, and keep it off the farmer; they buy only low priced horses, all the good horses are bought for the States. If the States market were closed, we would have no market; for a good horse the farmer has to pay all expenses of transportation.
6. It would be profitable to raise good horses if you had always good luck with them, and would pay as well as any other thing. We find our best market in the United States. Manitoba is no market for good horses.
7. There is no farmer in Canada that can raise enough grain to fatten all his stock; he wants to fatten, because he wants to raise all the manure he can. American corn would not pay at the price it is now, the duty puts that beyond our power at the present time.
8. People say butter and eggs are not much affected by the Tariff, that is for consumption at home; there is no doubt but they are higher according to other things.

9. If both parties were willing, it would be a good time, just as good as when produce was admitted free. Reciprocity means justice and freedom of trade, that should please every right thinking man or country.
10. The effects of the Tariff on wool is a done thing altogether; the price of wool is only one-half the price it used to be, but the cloth is much higher, our wool they say does not suit; 20 cents is about the price we get, we should get 40 cents according to the price of cloth.
11. Flax, tobacco and sugar beet are not much affected by the Tariff. I think it does not affect sugar beet much, tobacco it did a while ago. The flax business is in the hands of a few men and they are getting rich. It has done good to the country.
12. All farm implements are dearer, but the construction of a good many of them is better, machinery is made light and better to suit their customers. All implements made of iron are dearer. I can't see much difference in the material, they are all dearer, it could not be otherwise.
13. Woollens are higher by 15 cents a yard, cotton is about 3 cents a yard higher on working men's ware; hardware is dearer, but not so much as on some other things. I do not know the operation of the Tariff on all these things.
14. We sell most everything to go home to the English market; if the markets there are good, that is all we think about. The grain buyers here and merchants keep watching the English markets. The Tariff has no effect there. If our population was greater, we might speak about a home market. All things are bought here on speculation to send home to the Old Country.
15. There has been nothing done to bring them back. Wages are a great deal higher there than here; other things are a little dearer but they are better. I cannot see anything done to restrain emigration, you cannot keep them from going there.
16. No, there is no demand for farm lands in Ontario, the price of land is down \$1,000 on every 100 acres of land since 1878, and cannot be sold readily at that, but it is the best security that can be got by money lenders. There are more that want to sell than buy.
17. The farmers and the labouring man are left without any protection, and have to pay all increased duties. We have to pay every man what he asks and take what we get and no rebate.
18. To give no man any advantage over another and make all pay alike to the welfare of the country; protect no industry over another; to sell all the land to actual settlers, and give to the poor man what cannot be sold and fill up the country; give no large tracts to speculators to be locked up for a century to come.

*General Remarks* :—I would remark that our Government is too expensive for a new country like this, our Government is too dear for the resources of the country, the half of the men would govern it better and cheaper. I see that our members work more against us than for us, and sometimes one we do not know does us more good than our own members that we have worked hard to send there. I confess I am not able to answer all the questions asked of me, but have done the best I could to serve you.

WILLIAM RANNIE,  
Farmer, New Hamburg, Co. Perth.

1. There would be little difference with the exception of corn. Corn would be largely used as cheap feed if admitted free.
2. It has not increased the price of coarse grain; no rye or corn grown; the price of oats, barley and peas has not been increased.
3. No effect so far as we can see. 4. Nothing done in this line.
5. No; all the best stock goes to the United States and the poor stock to Manitoba.

6. Heavy draft horses are profitable and the market is the United States.
7. Would pay better to import corn from the United States if free of duty.
8. No change. 9. Yes. I do not think the Tariff would make any difference in negotiating a Reciprocity Treaty. 10. None.
11. No effect so far as we can judge. 12 The cost is increased and the quality not quite as good. All agricultural implements.
13. Woollens and hardware are materially increased in price; cottons not much changed. 14. None.
15. Emigration to the States has been as great under the present Tariff as before, and much larger.
16. Increased about 25 per cent. under the present Tariff. No increased tendency to invest.
17. Farmers were in a better condition before 1878 than at present. The labouring classes are more affected by the Tariff by increased prices, while wages are all about the same or less.
18. Free Trade except a necessary Revenue Tariff.

**HUMPHREY SNELL,**  
Farmer, Clinton, Co. Huron.

1. It would so long as the Americans keep their market closed against us.
2. It has the effect of increasing the value of all our coarse grains.
3. I think it has not materially affected the price of wheat and flour, but at some seasons of the year gives the producer and miller the benefit of our own market.
5. It has increased the value of our Canadian bred hogs and bacon.
5. I cannot say that it is the duty that has increased the value of horses but they are very high at present.
6. If present prices should continue it would be very profitable to raise horses. think good markets could be found both in the States and Manitoba.
7. Yes, some seasons feeders may find it profitable to import corn.
- 8 to 11. No answer. 12. I am not aware of much change in the value of agricultural implements. 13. Very little change in value.
14. I think it has as the farmer can readily sell anything they raise at good prices.
15. There can be no doubt that the new Tariff has wonderfully increased the manufacturing interest and therefore caused an increased demand for labour.
16. The demand for farm property is not as good in this neighbourhood as it was some years ago, owing, I may say, entirely to the emigration to Manitoba.
17. Very materially. 18. No answer.

**F. C. STEWART,**  
Merchant, Orangeville.

1. It certainly would not. 2. To very materially increase the price of our oats and barley. I consider we get at least 10 cents more per bushel now than before the imposition of the duty.
3. The effect of the duty has been to very much improve the market for spring wheat. I cannot say that it has much effect on fall wheat.
4. To very much improve the price of all these articles.
5. The duty imposed has very much improved the home market for horses and other stock.
6. Breeding heavy horses pays better than any other stock by 20 per cent.; and our principal market is Manitoba.
7. He can raise his own grain profitably. We don't want American corn.
8. I cannot say that it has any. 9. We would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty. By retaining the Tariff we will get it sooner. 10. I cannot say.
11. I don't see as it can have any effect.

12. I can buy all farming implements as cheap, or cheaper, than at any former period, and they are of better material.
13. All these articles are as cheap here now as at any former period.
14. It has improved the market, by not allowing the Americans to compete against us in our home market.
15. It has. All the various industrial classes are getting good wages and steady employment.
16. Farm property increased from 1878 to 1880. Since then land has not increased, owing to emigration to the North-West.
17. Very much improved.
18. I cannot say that any are required.

JAMES HAYS,

Reeve, Seaforth, Co. Huron.

1. No. 2. A higher price has been obtained for all coarse grains.
3. At times during the season millers are enabled to pay from 5 to 7 cents more per bushel to supply the home demand, than if they depended solely on the foreign market. Cannot say as to spring wheat.
4. Live hogs, dried hams, &c., are bringing a very high price; to ascertain correctly I would have to refer to the market prices during past years.
5. I believe if it were not for the duty the whole North-West and Manitoba country would be supplied by the United States; nearly all our inferior horses have gone out of this country to supply that country.
6. I am not breeding horses; but many farmers are going into breeding heavy horses; there will be a good demand for such horses in the North-West.
7. Ontario is capable of producing coarse grain sufficient to fatten all her stock.
8. The market no doubt is affected to some extent by the Tariff, but employment to her artisans increases the demand for such products.
9. I wished for a Reciprocity Treaty at one time, but we are prospering so much under the present Tariff that I feel like turning a cold shoulder to those who refused to neighbour with us on equal basis.
10. Coarse wools are very low and have been. Farmers would be benefited a little with a higher duty; but I doubt if the country as a whole would be benefited.
11. All raw material not produced in this country, or which cannot be produced to supply the demand, should be admitted free, or at a low rate.
12. I believe every article (or nearly so) is 20 per cent. cheaper than they were a few years ago, and of better quality.
13. These articles are not higher.
14. The home market has been increased and improved. Our millers supply the Eastern Provinces, and they say they can pay more for wheat when shipping there.
15. It has given employment to our artisans who were fast leaving us for the United States; and the rapid development of the North-West has caused a scarcity for farm hands.
16. The present Tariff has given an impetus to manufactures, and caused capital to come into the country, hence general prosperity. Farms are selling 20 per cent. higher in this country than they were before the Tariff was raised.
17. All classes are improved immensely.
18. No changes, unless to lower the duty on some raw material, which cannot be obtained in this country for manufacturing purposes.

*General Remarks:*— It will be most essential to retain the vast North-West country for the manufactures of Ontario and the East, and give Ontario the right to supply that country. The Tariff will be the only means to accomplish it.

THOS. LLOYD-JONES,

Farmer, Burford, Co. Brant.

1. No, unless our farm products were allowed the American market on the same footing.
2. Oats have ruled higher; rye, corn and peas are not raised to any extent; barley, as long as we continue to export, cannot be affected by a home Tariff.
3. As long as we have a surplus of wheat, a duty on American wheat will not affect ours very materially. On the whole the prices on wheat and flour have been better maintained. 4. Better prices. 5. Yes.
6. There has been a great demand for horses in this section; big prices are paid. With few exceptions, all for the Manitoba market.
7. Our farmers as a rule are not successful in raising corn. I think it would be in the interest of the farming community generally to admit corn free.
8. Owing to the Manitoba market and a better local demand, butter, eggs and poultry are bringing better prices.
9. Feel confident a Reciprocity of farm products would be advantageous to our farmers. Present Tariff enables us to grant favours as well as ask them.
10. The two last seasons' coarse wool have declined in price considerably, owing to certain fabrics in which coarse wools were considerably used becoming unpopular.
11. The cultivation of these articles has been considerably stimulated.
12. Better implements with no material advance in prices.
13. Woollens in certain manufactures are cheaper. In all grades there are excellent values. Owing to a healthful competition Canadian cottons monopolize the market, they being better goods. No advance only as affected by raw material. Hardware and staples fully as cheap.
14. Yes. The stimulus given to industries of all kinds by the National Policy has given an increase of labour with higher wages, the result being a larger demand for farm products and better prices. 15. To a very great extent.
16. There is a very great demand for farming lands in this section; higher prices are being paid than in 1878, notwithstanding the large immigration to Manitoba and North-West Territory.
17. Yes. Never in the history of our country have the farmers enjoyed so great a degree of prosperity as at the present time; higher prices for everything they have to sell. Money cheaper; staple goods of all kinds as cheap as they have been for years.
18. The opening up and fostering of trade relations between the Dominion and foreign countries, whereby our farm products may have the advantage of the best markets.

W. VAHEY,

Reeve, Arkona, Co. Lambton.

1. No. 2. To raise the value of oats, barley and pease. Indian corn and rye are not grown here.
3. To increase the price of both spring and fall wheat. 4. To enhance their value.
5. Yes. 6. Yes. 7. Yes; it pays best to grow your own feed. 8. Yes.
9. Yes; we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff. 10. It has increased its value. 11. There is none grown here.
12. All kinds of implements are better and cheaper. 13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are lower.
14. Yes; by keeping American produce from coming in free. 15. Yes. 16. Yes; farming pays better. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

R. GORDON,

Farmer, Kenilworth; Co. Wellington.

1. I think it would. Admit all the produce free, as we send all our saltpetre to the United States, and if corn came in free we could fatten cattle cheaper.
2. No difference in oats, rye, barley or pease, but corn is better, and we have to buy it.
3. There is no difference in fall wheat and spring wheat; don't raise any worth mentioning.
4. I do not think live hogs or dried hams, bacon and lard are, as we have a surplus to export; the price has been a little higher, on account of the feed being scarce.
5. We are sending our best horses to the United States; our worst to Manitoba; we find the best market for sheep in the United States. Our best cattle go to Europe or to the United States.
6. Good horses pay better than cattle, but poor don't pay. Our principal market is the United States.
7. It would pay better to import American corn; it pays better to sell our own coarse grain to the United States.
8. Our market has not improved for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter. We send our surplus to the United States.
9. We would be better with a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I don't know that we have any better chance now than before the Tariff was put on. 10. Wool is cheaper. 11. It has no effect on these articles here.
12. The cost is about the same, but they are lighter and inferior.
13. They have all increased a little according to quality; the nails are better and are at the same price. 14. It has not increased. Had no effect.
15. It has given no encouragement at all; there are more leaving.
16. There is no increased tendency to purchase farm property around here, but dearer in value. 17. The condition is no better.
18. Reciprocity or Free Trade, or otherwise Annexation.

*General Remarks* :—Of course, I am no extremist, but in our part of the country we trade a great deal with the Americans, and Reciprocity would be a great advantage to us. I think it is a great disadvantage to us farmers to overlook our interest for a few manufacturers.

HAM. HIND, J. P.,  
Farmer, Hagersville, Co. Haldimand.

1. I do not think it would be in the interest of farmers that any kind of American farm produce should be admitted free of duty, except perhaps barley and pease, in which they cannot compete with us. For cattle feeders for the English market who I believe are exclusively agriculturalist, except brewers, distillers, &c., who feed the refuse of their own manufactories, would find an advantage in feeding duty free. Corn, cotton and seed meal, as they must compete with the United States who get these articles without duty.
2. Has had the effect of increasing the price of oats, corn and feeding barley.
3. I do not think it has increased the price of ordinary grades of flour that we can make, but think it has the price of the finest grades that are not much produced in Canada. 4. Has increased the price somewhat, as we do not produce enough of them for our own consumption.
5. The price of horses in this Province is higher than four or five years ago, which I attribute to increased demand in the United States. A demand for the North-West has hardly reached this Province.
6. Do not find it as profitable to breed horses as stock. The principal market for horses from this Province is the United States.
7. Yes, he can, and I think that the Tariff on corn has had the effect of inducing farmers generally to till their land better and produce for themselves the grain they had formerly got from the United States. The Province of Quebec is well adapted for raising coarse grains.

8. Do not think the Tariff on these products has affected the price, the advance I attribute to the greater home demand created by the starting up of new and re-opening closed up manufacturing industries.
9. I think the Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, and that we are in a better position to negotiate one than when American produce was admitted free.
10. It has advanced the price of our domestic wools.
11. It has been an incentive to the production of all these products.
12. It has not increased the price of farming implements generally, and the quality we get at home in nearly all lines is as good as those formerly brought in from the United States. Can name only axes as being inferior.
13. Not materially increased in price with the exception perhaps of cottons.
14. Yes, by the duty on corn, which generally rules the prices of other coarse grains. 15. Undoubtedly.
16. Yes. Yes. The Tariff has increased the home consumption for all farm products; while the duty on corn has made it more remunerative to raise coarse grains, consequently farming pays better, and the investment of capital in farms promises to be a good and a safe investment.
17. Yes both; perhaps more especially the labouring classes, who, although paying more for living than four or five years ago, get better wages and steady employment. 18. Cannot suggest any.

*General Remarks* :—The answers given to the above questions are given after interviews with many of the leading farmers in this vicinity, and I think is upon the whole a fair expression of their views upon the questions asked. They, as a rule, believe that the operation of the present Tariff has been well for them, although when first inaugurated seemed to think it would be their ruin:

J. W. WIGGETT,

Mayor, Sherbrooke, Co. Sherbrooke.

1. To admit corn would be a benefit for fattening stock. We formerly could sell our coarser grains and buy corn for this purpose at good profits. The duty has closed many stables here. Other grains admitted would make no difference, as our market is Britain. To admit live stock would injure us in our home market.
2. A small increase on oats, corn and pease, which injures the stock feeder to that extent. 3. None to the agriculturalist. The British markets rule the price.
4. A fair increase of production and demand for such as is not wanted for export.
5. Yes, on horses alone. 6. Breeding good agricultural horses brings larger profits than other stock. Manitoba for good horses; United States for common.
7. No; too costly for feeding. Yes, if admitted free. 100 pounds of barley would buy 140 pounds of corn, which is better food for fattening.
8. Perishable produce of these kinds are more saleable.
9. Yes. Our Members of Parliament ought to know: we do not.
10. None that we know of. 11. None in our opinion. 12. The cost is increased, and the quality is not as good. Our manufacturers seem to increase the price in accordance with the Tariff. Reaping and mowing machines, plows, seed drills of all kinds, and all metal machinery.
13. Yes; the manufacturers take advantage of the Tariff, and raise the price just sufficiently below the price which Americans could take to compel us to buy from them. 14. Yes, for perishable articles, but not for any other produce.
15. We can see no change. 16. No. Decreased since 1880, by the "boom" in Manitoba. 17. Yes, on account of good harvests.
18. Reciprocity with United States, abolishing of the assessment upon personal property by the Local Legislature, legislation whereby the local railway

freight may be fair and no monopoly by railways. Also, some arrangement to make the shipping of live stock to Britain more safe, by ordering the steamship companies to have their stores inspected by a Government official before they leave port, in order that the live stock may be shipped in proper order as to convenience, sufficient room, &c.

THOMAS SHIPLEY,  
Farmer and Reeve, Falkirk; Co. Middlesex.

1. Not while Americans tax ours.
2. Oats rye and corn have been increased in price.
3. Our wheat is increased in price.
4. It has increased the price of these articles here.
5. Yes.
6. It is profitable.
7. He can raise all the grain he needs with better profits.
8. Yes.
9. The Reciprocity Treaty would be a great advantage to us.
- 10 and 11. No answer.
12. There is little difference in the price of these articles.
13. Hardware is not increased.
14. The home market is better.
15. No answer.
16. Farm lands have increased in value.
17. Yes.
18. A change that would make the salaries of our officials lower.

WM. ANDERSON, J.P.,  
Reeve, Mountain View, Co. Prince Edward.

1. It would not. The reason why is, he can produce it in Canada.
2. Indian corn might be admitted free. Rye, barley and oats should be subject to duty.
3. I find our wheat and flour market has improved.
4. Our market has decidedly improved.
5. It has improved the market price, and has had the tendency to secure the North-West for our market.
6. It is profitable for the farmer to breed horses. A good horse is always a ready sale, with a remunerative price. Our market is Manitoba and United States.
7. We can raise all kinds of grain profitably except corn.
8. It has; they were never better than on the present occasion.
9. I think they would, and decidedly we are in a better position to obtain Reciprocity with the present Tariff.
10. I am not able to answer.
12. Some flax is grown here, but no tobacco. Sugar beet is not grown here, therefore I am unable to answer.
12. Farm implements have not increased in value, but the quality has improved.
13. I think it has not. My opinion is the remedy is found in the competition of our own manufacturing establishments.
14. It has increased; the cause, in my opinion is the Tariff.
15. It has no doubt given increased demand for labour in the various branches of industry, consequently mechanic and labouring men would find profitable employment at home.
16. There is, and farm lands have increased in value.
17. The general condition has improved.
18. I am not prepared to make any suggestion at present.

*General Remarks*:—I beg to state that I have carefully examined the question submitted to me, and have endeavoured to answer them to the best of my judgment.

DANIEL LUTON, ex-M.P.P.,  
New Sarum, Co. Elgin.

1. It would, from the fact that we raise a surplus, except Indian corn.
2. The duty on Indian corn has been injurious, and has not raised the price of the coarser grains.
3. It has not affected the price of wheat and flour.

4. It has not been of any benefit to the people of this locality on any of the articles referred to. 5. It has not improved the price; the Americans are our best customers and they rule our markets.
6. It is profitable to breed horses, and compares favourably with the profits on other stock. The United States is our principal market.
7. It would pay better to import American corn.
8. The market has not improved under the present Tariff.
9. It would be better to have Reciprocity with the United States; and I do not consider we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff. 10. It has no effect on the price of wool.
11. Those commodities are not cultivated in this locality. 12. The price of implements has not been increased, and some of the articles are lighter in their construction.
13. They have increased in price, except Canadian made nails, they are much inferior under the present Tariff; we use the American nail on account of their quality, paying the difference rather than use the inferior quality.
14. It has not, why should it when we have a surplus.
15. It has not given diversity of employment, nor retarded emigration to the United States.
16. Farm property has decreased in this locality since 1878, 20 per cent., I am sorry to say that is my experience.
17. They have to some extent, at least the farmers have. 18. No answer.

BENJAMIN PARKER,  
Reeve, Glasgow, Co. Ontario.

1. If we had cheap corn we would be better able to compete with other countries in the meat markets.
2. It has made no difference in either. 3. No difference. 4. It has had a good effect.
5. I think not. 6. We find it more profitable to raise other stock. The principal market for horses is the United States.
7. It would pay better to import American corn. 8. I think not.
9. Yes. Do not know. 10. Bad. 11. None.
12. About the same price, and the material is better, though not so much of it. Mowers, reapers, seed drills, ploughs, cultivators and harrows.
13. Yes. Cottons, ducks and tickings about 20 per cent.; and material not so good as it used to be. 14. I do not think so. 15. Neither one or the other.
16. No; decreased in value. So many are selling out and going to the States and Manitoba. 17. Yes. 18. Corn free, coal free, sugar free, cottons free, and a larger duty on American salt pork.

JACOB H. ROBLIN,  
Reeve, Adolphustown, Co. Lennox.

1. We think it would not, as it would injure the sale of our products.
2. It is injurious as regards corn and other coarse grains, but favourable as to oats; rye, pease and barley immaterial.
3. It affects flour, spring and fall wheat but slightly. 4. It increases the sale and enhances the price of these articles, and helps the producer.
5. It increases the price of horned cattle, but does not affect the raising of horses much in this locality.
6. We do not raise horses in this locality for exportation. 7. We cannot profitably raise grain to fatten stock, and believe it would pay to import American corn.
8. The market has materially improved. 9. We think we would be benefited by Reciprocity, and are in a better position.

10. To raise the price. 11. No effect in this Province. 12. Cost on mowing-machines, rakes and ploughs decreased.
13. Cotton and woollen goods have increased to some extent. 14. It has on the whole been increased; cannot say how much.
15. It has to some extent encouraged industry and given employment, but it has not retarded emigration.
16. It has not increased the value of farm property, but farms have decreased in value since 1878, owing to the tide of emigration flowing outward.
17. The general condition of farmers has somewhat improved since 1878.
18. Tariff on goods that are injurious to farming interests.

*General Remarks:*—The above answers chiefly apply to Nova Scotia. We are not enough acquainted with Ontario and Quebec and the Far West to suggest anything in regard to their farming interests.

SAMUEL MOORE,  
Councillor, Goose River, Co. Cumberland.

1. No, it would not do; we do not see the prosperity of the country under the Protective Tariff. 2. It might not injure the Canadian farmer to admit Indian corn free, but other grains it would.
3. It has improved the market and not made bread any dearer to the consumer.
4. I could not make an estimate on these articles, as prices always raise according to demand.
5. I do not think it affects horses down here. 6. What few horses we send abroad are sent to the States, as we cannot ship to the North-West from down here.
7. I should suppose he could unless it would pay better to raise wheat and import Indian corn for feeding stock.
8. Yes; much improved. 9. No; it would not benefit the farmer to have Reciprocity; better have Free Trade than Reciprocity.
10. The market is improved and the demand is good. 11. An improved demand for home consumption. 12. The cost is not increased, and rakes, forks and scythes are equally as good as the American goods.
13. Cottons have increased about one cent per yard, or 10 per cent.; door locks probably 10 per cent; other wares not perceptible.
14. Yes; it has been increased and improved, inasmuch as the Americans cannot afford to ship to our market, and that leaves our own market for our own produce. 15. It is making employment at home for our own people, and encouraging much immigration.
16. There is an increased tendency for investment of capital, and farm lands have increased in value on account of the increased markets and the tide of emigration.
17. One glance at the country will show that its condition is improved.
18. I do not know as there can be much improvement made, as it has been carefully arranged by abler statesmen than I.

*General Remarks:*—As I do not reside in a farming district, I could not tell the exact advantage or disadvantage to Canadian farmers, but I should think that the present Tariff is a great benefit to the Canadian farmers in general, only Indian corn. As the country does not raise enough for its own consumption, it cannot be much gain to the farmer to have a Tariff on corn:

S. S. SANGSTER, J.P.,  
Shipbuilder, Merchant and County Councillor,  
New Harbour, Co. Guysborough.

1. Not in the interests of agriculturalists.
2. Perhaps a slight increase in the price of Indian corn; all other coarse grains maintaining their usual relative prices, with more active market.
3. The cost of flour has not been increased. Not competent to specify.
4. Not to increase price, but to secure a more extensive home market.
5. Not competent to answer. 6. More profitable in this locality to raise dairy stock, sheep, swine, &c. Our horses are raised principally for home use.
7. Can raise profitably all required grain except Indian corn, which is only used in some cases as an auxiliary.
8. Much improved especially in the articles of poultry, eggs and butter.
9. I believe a true Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would affect other interests more favourably than that of agriculture, but I believe from an agricultural point of view it is not desirable, but think should it be considered in our interests we are in a much better position to negotiate now than under the previous Tariff.
10. A slight increase in price with better demand to meet the requirements of factories newly in operation. 11. Not competent to answer.
12. Prices for farm implements rule about the same as formerly, the quality of the articles manufactured being equal. Mowing machines, hay cutters and rakes are here specified.
13. There is a slight increase in the price of plain cotton textures, but whether it is caused by the operation of the Tariff or not I will not venture an opinion. There has not been any increase in hardware in common use amongst the farmers so far as I am aware.
14. Certainly increased and improved by affording more extensive home markets.
15. It has to an appreciable extent with prospect of more extensive results in the near future. 16. Cannot give a reliable opinion. 17. It is doubtlessly improved. 18. None that I am aware of.

*General Remarks*:—In submitting the above answers I beg leave to say they will be found accurate and reliable so far as my observation and experience goes. I think the operation of the policy pursued by the Government is already effecting a prodigy in developing the latent and active resources of the Dominion at large.

CHARLES FENESTY,  
Dairy Farmer, Sackville, Co. Halifax.

1. No. 2. It has given us a better market for our own grain.
3. No answer. 4. We do not think it has affected the market here.
5. It has improved the market price, not so much in horses as other live stock.
6. The United States is our principal market for horses; however, we find it more profitable to breed other stock.
7. He can. It would not pay to import American corn.
8. Not in this section of the country as the market price in the United States for those articles is much higher than here.
9. No. We think not. 10. It has raised the price of wool here.
11. No answer. 12. They cost less, but quality is not so good.
13. Woollens have increased in price. Cottons and hardware not any.
14. Yes. 15. It has, but still they go. 16. Farm lands here have decreased in value since 1878, perhaps owing to the rush to the North-West. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

JOHN R. McDONALD,  
Municipal Councillor, New Larig, Pictou.

1. It might be in the interest of our farmers to let in corn as we cannot raise it as cheaply as we can purchase; see no advantage in letting in other grain.
2. Coarse grain has risen in price; oats higher; corn higher, also pease.

3. I don't think there has been any. 4. Higher. 5. Most decidedly yes.
6. Yes. In both, latterly in Manitoba and North-West.
7. Yes; it often pays to import corn. 8. The North-West has assisted materially in improving the market. The Tariff has been the important factor.
9. Not now. We are in a better position. 10. Lower since the Tariff, do not know.
11. Cultivation of flax on the increase; do not think the Tariff has effected it; the others not grown here.
12. Decreased in some cases, and all superior. Reaping machines, horse rakes, ploughs, harrows, &c.; seed drills much cheaper, very few manufactured formerly.
13. Woollen factories developed; cottons dearer and woollens improved and cheaper; flannels much cheaper and better quality; general improvement.
14. Prices have increased materially in everything raised by farmers. The business centres encouraged; Tariff helps.
15. Yes. I don't think any have returned around here, but we are peculiarly situated, farmers too poor to go to Manitoba have gone to the United States; most of those now removing go to Manitoba.
16. If anything decreased on account of North-West Territories, not increased around here. I think it would materially affect us materially but for the movement to the North-West. Farmers, however, are doing better since 1878. Prices are kept down by farmers going to the North-West, otherwise land would be higher. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—Owing to the confusion connected with a fire of which my office was cleaned out, I am not able to give the matter my personal attention, but the answers above were given by a gentleman living here, who is a clear Grit. As he is a moderate man and a supporter of the National Policy, though not a supporter of the Government, I have thought his replies would be of more use than that of a prejudiced Tory like myself. Personally I think that the policy of Sir John Macdonald has been the salvation of this country. The National Policy has done wonders and the contract with the Syndicate has been the most statesmanlike and far seeking act that has been performed by any Government in Canada.

KENNETH GOODMAN,  
Reeve, Parkhill, Co. Middlesex.

1. It could do no possible harm; Liverpool prices fix our prices. The National Policy has depressed prices of wheat and oats below Chicago prices.
2. Prices have not been benefited by the duty. We export more oats than we import, and hence foreign markets will fix the price. The quantity of rye raised is very small; corn with barley and pease are raised largely and the prices fixed by foreign markets.
3. The duty has done no good. Since its imposition our prices have been almost always lower than Chicago prices.
4. We sell surplus hogs to a firm in Bowmanville, who cure, pack, and sell in England, and prices are entirely fixed by English prices.
5. Not in the slightest. The Americans are our best buyers.
5. Yes; profits about equal; United States almost exclusively.
7. No. It would. In 1876-77 and 1878 farmers could sell pease at 70 to 80 cents, barley for about 80 cents per bushel, and buy American corn at 45 cents per bushel, for fattening purposes and save money. 8. Not at all.
9. Yes. It is stupid to suppose that a duty imposed by 5,000,000 people will coerce 50,000,000 into the adoption of a Reciprocity Treaty. 10. Slaughtered it.
11. It has not started their cultivation here.
12. Under the old Tariff the cost of farm implements was constantly coming down through competition and improved methods of manufacture; under the present Tariff prices have not come down. 13. All are increased, stoves, bolts, wire, &c.

14. How can it be increased, since the population has diminished ?
15. It has not. Every week almost some of our citizens are going to the Western States. 16. No. They have decreased 20 per cent, because it is a more expensive country to live in now.
17. Farmers condition is improved by good crops; the cost of living taken into consideration, the labourers condition has not improved.
18. Free corn, free salt. Plaster, coal, implements, and all the necessaries of life free.

S. T. FERGUSON,  
Farmer, Cartwright, Co. Durham.

1. Yes, for we export \$1,421,222 more than we import, hence the foreign markets must fix our prices, and the National Policy is of no use whatever.
2. Not to raise our price in the least; without it rye may have come up a little; but not much grown in Ontario. Corn grown only for home feed.
3. The duty has done no good, prices being lower here than in Chicago.
4. Not any, for we look to Europe for prices; our packers send their hogs to Europe. 5. Not in the least.
6. Yes, both about equal. Our market for horses is the United States.
7. It will pay better to buy American corn and sell our barley and peas, and save from 25 to 30 cents per bushel, if the duty was off the corn.
8. No, not in the least, for we export. 9. Most assuredly they would. I think 5,000,000 of people cannot drive 50,000,000 by putting on the National Policy.
10. It has had the effect to bring down the prices. 11. It does not affect us at all.
12. It has increased the price for the farmer some, and mostly decreased the price of raw material to the manufacturer, compelling them to use poorer quality.
13. All are increased by the National Policy. I do not need to specify.
14. No, population has decreased, and how could the home market be increased.
15. No, it has not, but drove hundreds into the United States, and had the effect of closing a good many factories. Three or four gone up in our country.
16. No, but it has decreased about 20 per cent. The cause is the National Policy.
17. Yes. By providentially having better crops, the farmer's condition has improved. The labouring classes get better wages; the cause is that so many have gone to the States for work.
18. Free trade with England and the United States. Free corn, free coal, plaster, salt, implements, sugar, &c.

*General Remarks* :—The National Policy is a humbug from beginning to end. A few more of these deceptions and we had better leave this for a better land.

HENRY MIDDLETON,  
Farmer, Newcastle, Co. Durham.

1. I do not think it would. 2. The imposition of duty on Indian corn has had a bad effect; as this section needs to import it for the feeding of stock, but not other grains.
3. The duty on flour and meal has been very disadvantageous to this section; particularly as this section has to send its produce, fish, &c., to that market, and its young men and women to labour in that country, and have to take flour and meal in return. 4. I do not think it has had any bad effect.
5. I cannot say whether it has or not, as our market for these is St. Johns, Newfoundland, principally.
6. I do not find it very profitable, not so much as other stock. St. Johns, Newfoundland, and sometimes profitable sales are made to persons from the United States.
7. The farmers in this section cannot always profitably raise all the grain required for fattening their stock, and in many cases it would be better and more profitable to import American corn. 8. I cannot see any improvement.

9. I think if flour, meal, kerosene, furniture and cotton goods were admitted duty free in these sections, and coals, fish and potatoes from these sections into the United States, it would be as advantageous as Reciprocity.
10. It has no effect to my knowledge. 11. None that I know.
12. I do not think it has made much difference here.
13. I do not think these have increased any by the Tariff.
14. I do not think the market has improved any by the operation of the Tariff.
15. I do not think the Tariff can have done much in that way, as almost all classes of our people are moving into the United States as fast as they can, and if it continues for another year at this year's rate, you had better not send any questions as I do not think there will be anyone left to answer them.
16. No increase whatever, on the contrary, a farm can be got here almost for a song. 17. I think not.
18. This question is rather difficult to answer, as I do not think that legislation made to suit Ontario can be profitably applied to agriculture in this Province.

THOMAS FITZGERALD,

Municipal Councillor and Farmer, Big Tracadie, Co. Guysborough.

1. No, not for the majority of agriculturalists. 2. It has raised prices. 3. In this section wheat is not grown. We find flour higher in price.
  4. It has raised the price of pork. 5. Horses from this part all go to the States.
  6. It is profitable to breed horses. Market, United States.
  7. In general, yes, but not here, where lands are of a bad quality.
  8. I find no change of note. 9. It would be advantageous in my opinion.
  10. I find no change. 11: None grown here.
  12. For farming implements, I consider they have decreased in price.
  13. I find no change to note. 14. The home market improved.
  15. There is considerable more employment, but the youth of this section go to the States and few return.
  16. There is no material change in lands here, except for good wood lands. 17. There are signs of improvement.
  18. With good crops and good weather, farmers have no great reason to complain.
- General Remarks:*—This section of the country of Two Mountains is poor, the soil sandy, and rocks to any amount, therefore, we are as a rule consumers and not exporters.

M. PHELAN,

Farmer, St. Columbin, Co. Two Mountains.

1. It would not be in their interest to admit American farm produce free.
2. It has raised the price of oats 5 cents per bushel, corn and rye not so much; barley and pease not much raised in this section.
3. It has not raised the price of flour or wheat. 4. It has increased the price to the farmer. 5. I think it has not.
6. I think it profitable to breed large horses, and that the profits compare favourably with other stock. Principal market in this section is the United States.
7. I think they can, and that it would be more profitable to raise their own feed.
8. Yes, the market has improved. 9. The Canadian farmer would not be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, we are in a much better position under the present Tariff to negotiate. 10. I don't know that it has any effect.
11. Not prepared to say, not cultivated in my section.
12. Cost decreased, quality equally as good especially ploughs.

13. I do not consider the price increased any under the present Tariff.  
 14. It has improved. 15. It certainly has. 16. There is generally, and farm lands have rather increased in value. 17. Yes, much improved. 18. I don't know of any change required.

WM. McKELL,  
 Coroner and Commissioner of Parish Circuit Court,  
 Greenwich Hill, Co. Kings, N. B.

1. Yes, all kinds; because the duty does not affect the price. 2. None.  
 3. It has not increased the price of wheat. It has increased the price of flour slightly. 4. None. Hams and bacon slightly increased in price.  
 5. No, but the great Manitoba boom has slightly increased prices here this season.  
 6. Yes; profits are about equal; markets formerly in Great Britain and United States. This season the Manitoba boom has given us a market there temporarily. 7. In general it is an advantage to import American corn. 8. No.  
 9. Yes. When admitted free. 10. None. 11. None.  
 12. Cost increased slightly, quality not so good, the additional cost of raw material having reduced the quantity of material used in all farm implements.  
 13. Yes, increased nearly every article used by farmers, especially Scotch tweed by two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) on a suit of clothes worth twenty dollars (\$20.00). 14. The market has not been increased by the Tariff.  
 15. No, the Tariff has increased cost of living, and thereby induced people to emigrate to the United States.  
 16. No. Farm property has decreased in value 20 per cent since 1878; cost of living increased, and people emigrating to United States and Manitoba.  
 17. Not in consequence of the Tariff; good crops and a good demand in foreign markets have increased prices and benefited farmers and labourers.  
 18. Free Trade (or as near it as possible) and legislation that will benefit the masses instead of the few.

*General Remarks* :—I am of the opinion that the increased rate of duties has injured the farmers generally by increasing the price of nearly every article they have to buy, and has not given a corresponding increase upon the products of the farm.

J. F. COHOE, J.P.,  
 Farmer, Ronson, Co. Norfolk.

1. For Eastern Nova Scotia flour and cornmeal would be of a slight advantage if admitted duty free. 2. It has increased the value of oats and barley.  
 3. Flour is about the usual price. The price of wheat has increased this season.  
 4. The prices of those articles has been very fair for the last year.  
 5. The price of horses have not increased, but other live stock bring a fair price.  
 6. At present I understand, some agents are buying up for the American market.  
 7. The farmers here seldom import any grain for fodder.  
 8. I think there is a slight improvement, at least these articles are in fair demand.  
 9. Most people here consider it would be better if the same could be accomplished; no doubt Canada is in a better position now to negotiate than when American articles were admitted free.  
 10. No answer. 11. None of those articles are sold in this county by the producer, consequently no effect.  
 12. A slight decrease in some articles; quality as good, some rather better.  
 13. About or near the usual price. 14. The market price for farm produce is high at present,

15. In portions of Nova Scotia quite a number of men are employed in home manufactories under the National Policy; and a number of our young men are going to Canada and the North-West, and some are going to America.
16. None whatever in this county. 17. Most undoubtedly, the general condition of farmers and labourers has improved since 1878.
18. I am not quite prepared to say at present.

*General Remarks*:—It is the candid and unbiassed opinion of all those that are not prejudiced against the present Government, that things in general have taken a very important change for the better, since the Protective Tariff has been introduced.

THOMAS C. NEILL;  
County Councillor, Salmon River Lake, Co. Guysborough.

1. It certainly would. 2. No answer.
3. As New Brunswick is dependent on other countries for a large amount of the flour consumed, it has increased the price thereof. 4 to 6. No answer.
7. American corn is too dear at present to feed. 8 to 11. No answer.
12. Yes. 13. Yes. 14. I think not. 15. No. 16. No. 17. No.
18. Free Trade with the United States.

THOMAS COHUN,  
County Councillor, Upper Keswick Ridge, Co. York.

1. Yes; and because we can buy them cheaper to fatten more stock by which to keep up the fertility of our soil.
2. The effect is that whatever is the price of barley, oats and peas, we have to feed them to our own stock, when, if we could get corn cheap, we would have them to sell. As for oats there are none imported only once in ten years for oatmeal; rye, none raised or imported; corn, none imported since Tariff put on; barley and peas sacrificed to feed stock, no matter what the price is.
3. No advantage by present Tariff. 4. We have felt neither advantage nor disadvantage. 5. No.
6. To a limited extent. No comparison with other stock. United States for good horses, Manitoba for plugs. 7. No. Yes. 8. No. 9. Yes. No.
10. No effect. 11. None. 12. Price the same, but articles inferior. Everything.
11. Woollens and cottons higher; hardware same price, but made up by inferior manufacture. 14. No. 15. No. 16. No; decreased.
17. Not by the Tariff but by the drought in England for grain and in the States for potatoes and turnips. 18. Taxes for Revenue purposes or Free Trade or Reciprocity.

THOMAS WATER,  
Reeve, Eramosa, Co. Wellington.

1. Certainly not. 2. A steadier market.
3. A steadier market, and better in the early season.
4. A much better price to the Canadian producer. 5. They have decidedly.
6. Manitoba is drawing largely from Ontario. 7. Yes. As to the American corn I have had very little experience with it. 8. It must be improved.
9. I do not approve of reciprocal Free Trade with the States. If such a Treaty was desired by Canadians, yes. 10. Nil. 11. To encourage their production.
12. The cost has certainly not increased, and the quality continues to improve.
13. I do not find any. 14. Yes, by reserving to Canadians their own market and extending the same. 15. Most decidedly. 16. Yes, decreased. 17. Largely.
- 19

18. Give us fair play. We do not want class legislation, such as the Traders' Insolvency Act, and more, we are not going to stand such legislation.

*General Remarks* :—What we have most to complain of is that railway and trust and loan companies secure special legislation to the detriment of the farmer and producer.

WM. BRADLEY,  
Reeve, Greenock, Paisley, Co. Bruce.

- 
1. No. 2. It makes a surer market and better prices for oats, corn, peas, barley, rye, and buckwheat—the barley I mean is only fit for feeding purposes.
  3. If the duties were taken off the Americans would supply our markets; the Americans would change duties just the same if we wanted to supply any of their markets, the consequences would be the stoppage of most of our mills, cooper shops, and other business connected therewith, and deprive the farmers of the best wheat market.
  4. Better prices for farmers. 5. and 6. No answer. 7. Yes. 8. Yes.
  9. We are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty if the Americans want to negotiate. 10 to 13. No answer.
  14. Yes by the N. P. giving plenty of employment to mechanics and the labouring classes generally, thereby enabling them to purchase what they require.
  15. Yes. 16. No answer. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

JOHN SHAW,  
Miller, Normandale, Co. Norfolk.

- 
1. No, Canada can supply all the farm produce that is necessary for home consumption.
  2. It has caused farmers to sow larger quantities of coarse grains than formerly, especially oats which previously were only grown for the farmer's own use, as the markets were supplied at a cheaper rate than we could grow them with corn and oats from the Western States.
  3. The effect has been to cause millers to enter into closer competition with those who buy wheat for exportation bringing the price of wheat in the local markets to within from 2 cents or 3 cents of that in cities, which previously was from 8 cents to 10 cents higher, spring wheat is now 5 cents to 6 cents higher than fall wheat where previously the reverse was the case; the millers are now compelled to buy it to supply the Canadian markets.
  4. The average price is no doubt increased, besides the consumer has a healthier and better quality of meat. 5. A large number of horses have been bought this year for Manitoba at increased prices. By all means hold the Fort.
  6. It is my opinion that breeding horses for a few years until the demand is lessened will pay better than other stock. The United States and Manitoba have about divided the market for the last year in this locality.
  7. Yes, formerly the land was run to death, growing wheat and thistles; the growing of coarse grains is a benefit to the land, and I say that the farmer who cannot grow coarse grains profitable for his own use, had better quit the business. 8. Yes, there are a larger number of mechanics to eat them.
  9. The way we stand we are as well without it. Yes, we are now on more equal terms than when the late Mr. Brown tried for it. 10 and 11. No answer.
  12. No, I can get reapers, mowers, seeders, ploughs and other implements as cheap and as good as before. Watson, of Ayr, wrote to the *Globe* paper a year ago contradicting that paper as to the rise in price.
  13. I am not aware of any increase in those things, nails are cheaper.

14. Yes, I have explained in question 3 with regard to wheat if the local markets are supplied with foreign cheap grain it must certainly prevent the production as in the case of oats *vide* No. 2; or cause the surplus to be exported to foreign markets which cheap grains will not bear.
15. In wages I am paying \$3 per month this summer more than I ever paid before, it will no doubt have a tendency to keep our population at home, indeed quite a number have come back to this place this spring.
16. The opening up of the North-West has caused a less demand for farms at present. The price will not decrease in this locality. 17. Decidedly.
18. Let things stay as they are; if any change is made, increase the duty on pork and oats.

*General Remarks:*—The effect of the Tariff on produce this year is not as observable as it would be if there had been large crops in the States especially of coarse grains; this is the reason that prices at Chicago are so near the prices at Toronto. The Tariff has caused the production of a greatly increased quantity of oats in Canada, if this were not the case oats would now be over 50 cents in Toronto. The increase in the price of the spring wheat produced on an ordinary farm would more than pay all the duties upon all the goods they use throughout the year. If I had space and time I could prove and give you figures. I can give you further information, write to me. I take this opportunity of thanking Dr. Orton for the care and pains and perseverance he has taken in looking after the interests of the farming class.

JAMES JOHNSTON,  
Municipal Councillor, Auburn, Co. Huron.

---

1. No. 2. It has had a tendency to increase the price of oats, peas and rye; price of barley is slightly affected; corn not grown here.
3. The price of fall wheat and flour not much affected. Very little spring grown in this section. 4. The average price increased from 10 to 20 per cent.
5. No. 6. Yes, it is profitable to breed horses. United States. 7. Yes. 8. No.
9. Yes. 10. Price not affected. 11. Not grown in this section.
12. Price not increased or decreased, quality as good.
13. Price of woollens, cottons and hardware increased. 14 and 15. Yes.
16. No answer. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

J. G. OWEN,  
Reeve, Streetsville, Co. Peel.

---

1. I think it would be to the interest of agriculturalists to admit all kinds of produce, and I don't think it would affect the price here in any way, we would get just as good prices here. 2. I think we would get just as good prices without the duty as with it on all kinds of grain.
3. I can't see that it affects the price of wheat at all here, but through the duty on wheat our mills are shut down half the time. 4, 5 and 6. No answer.
7. It would pay better to import Indian corn, for farmers don't raise enough coarse grain to fatten their stock. 8, 9, 10 and 11. No answers.
12. The prices is increased, the quality not as good. 13. No answer.
14. It has not. 15. It has not. 16. No answer. 17. It has not. 18. Free Trade.

*General Remarks:*—On the whole I think the country would be better with Free Trade.

F. S. MABEE,  
Beachville, Co. Oxford.

1. Not all. 2. It has raised the price of oats and peas; corn not grown in this county; barley not much changed.
  3. The farmer receives the most benefit on wheat by having the home market.
  4. I am of the opinion that the price is that much better on all the produce of the hog. 5. I think it has to some extent. 6. Yes, good horses pay for breeding, but I think hardly as well as cattle. Both in the United States and Manitoba.
  7. He can raise all he needs and some to spare. 8. Yes.
  9. Yes, certainly. Much better with the Tariff. 10. None as far as I can see.
  11. Not grown in this country except flax which is not changed.
  12. The cost has decreased in almost all lines; quality generally better than in 1878. Such as reapers, mowers, ploughs, rakes, as well as all small tools.
  13. Not increased in any line and in some lines lower.
  14. Yes, considerably by the exclusion of foreign produce and increase of factories.
  15. It has to a very large extent. 16. There is not much in these parts, the emigration to the North-West has retarded the rise in lands here.
  17. Yes, very much. 18. I have none to propose only to keep the Tariff well up.
- General Remarks:*—The present policy of the Government has given more encouragement to a struggling people, as they found us in 1878, than anything that ever was done by any Government since Confederation.

GEORGE THOMPSON,  
Reeve, Elderslie, Parsley, Co. Bruce.

1. Not by any means. 2. Better prices are obtained; farmers grow more oats, pease and barley, and less wheat, which is no doubt a good thing, as the land has suffered in consequence; little or no corn grown in this section.
3. I cannot see that the duty on wheat affects the market much, although the millers ground large quantities of Western wheat prior to the duty being placed upon it.
4. Has benefited farmers to a considerable extent, and encouraged pork raising.
5. It certainly has given us the Manitoba market. Our own home market is not affected, as few, if any, horses come from the States to this section.
6. As the market is at present it is profitable to raise horses; the market has been principally in the States, but now it is somewhat divided as a good many are bought up for Manitoba.
7. Farmers can certainly raise sufficient coarse grain for fattening stock, and a great deal more. I have no faith in importing Indian corn, as farmers can raise all the coarse grain they require.
8. I cannot see any change, the market is certainly no worse, and it may possibly be better.
9. Reciprocal trade is without doubt of great advantage. I also think that our chances are better with the present Tariff. 10 and 11. No answer.
12. Farm implements are cheaper, and I think better; every farmer knows that to be a fact. 13. I am not aware of any change. I think about the same.
14. The home market has been improved without a doubt, and it is acknowledged to be improved by every farmer of any intelligence.
15. The present condition of the various industrial classes is certainly very good at the present time, and many are returning home to Canada, attracted by the prospect of good wages and steady employment.
16. Since 1878 farm property has raised in price some, but not to any great extent; the advance in price is held in check by the great rush to the North-West.
17. The general condition has improved very, very much, all are agreed as to that. The N. P. has contributed its share to bring about the improved state of things.

18. I am not aware of dissatisfaction among the farming class with the operation of the N. P. Consequently, there is no change wanted, unless Reciprocal trade can be secured.

*General Remarks*.—There is no act of any Government that can be more commendable than the act of this Committee to enquire, in order to find out if this very important industry is suffering in consequence of any act of the Government. There is no doubt, but the farmers as a class are well satisfied with the operations of the N. P., next to Reciprocal Trade it is the best thing. A home market is very desirable, and this we have now. Taking it all together the present Government have done all they could do to legislate for the good of all classes.

JOHN SMITHSON,  
Graystock, Co. Peterboro.

1. It would not make any difference. Since the duty was raised American markets have been higher than ours, excepting corn:
2. It has kept out corn altogether. It has not affected any change in prices of our coarse grains; we have to depend on a foreign market.
3. Since the imposition of the duty, wheat and oats have been higher in Chicago than our own market.
4. We dispose of our surplus hogs to a firm in the town of Bowmanville, who kill, pack, cure and ship to England; hence the English market regulates our prices.
5. It has not. None of our stock has gone to Montreal. 6. About the same. All the horses exported from this section go to the United States.
7. He cannot. In 1866, 1867 and 1868 our average price for barley was 80 cents, pease from 75 to 80 cents; in those years we bought American corn for 45 cents, which made feeding profitable.
8. No; not any improvement. 9. He certainly would; I cannot see any effect it can have, as 5,000,000 of people cannot force 50,000,000.
10. It has nearly destroyed it. 11. It has not started the growth in this locality.
12. Owing to the improved facilities of manufacture, farm implements were decreasing in price every year before the duty was imposed on them, but have not done so since.
13. Those articles have all increased; cotton very. In hardware, nails, wires, bolts, stoves, in fact nearly all the articles required for farm use.
14. It has not; how could it when there has been a decrease in our population?
15. It has not; a great many have gone from here to the United States, and others are still going.
16. No; farm lands have decreased 20 per cent. 17. The farmers condition has improved much from the effect of a good crop last year; the labourers' has not, when the cost of living is considered.
18. Take the duty off corn, salt, coal, implements, and all the necessaries of living.

JOHN G. RENWICK,  
Farmer, Orono, Co. Durham.

1. No. 2. The price has increased 8 cents on corn, and on oats 5 cents; no peas and no rye raised; on barley I cannot say.
3. It has raised the price of flour and wheat, and has given us our own market.
4. It has raised the price of all the articles mentioned, and has given us our own market. 5. Yes.
6. Yes. About equal; principally to Manitoba, a few to the United States.
- 7 to 9. Yes. 10. Cannot say. 11. None raised here.
12. Cost decreased and quality better.

13. Hardware cheaper; woollen and cotton goods no dearer, but of better quality.  
 14. Yes, by having our own market. 15. Yes. Cannot say.  
 16. Yes. Increased 25 per cent. 17. Yes. 18. None except Reciprocity.

DAVID COUGHLIN, Reeve,  
 JAMES McMULLIN, First Deputy Reeve,  
 JOHN VESTER, Second Deputy Reeve,  
 DAVID A. HUTCHISON, Councillor and Farmer.

Signed by all the members present who are farmers.

W. R. FELLOWS,  
 Clerk, Harwich, Co. Kent.

1. Certainly not, unless the Americans admit ours free. 2. It has raised the price of oats, barley and all coarse grains.  
 3. I have no knowledge of any difference in price, England being our market.  
 4. It has stimulated the Canadian farmer to pay more attention to this branch of industry, which was almost ruined by American competition.  
 5. It has done so greatly, giving us the markets of Manitoba and the North-West.  
 6. There is more profit in breeding horses of a good stamp than any other stock which find a ready sale in Manitoba and the United States.  
 7. The Canadian farmer can profitably raise all the grain necessary to fatten all his stock, independent of American corn.  
 8. I think it has; at least, those articles command a better price since the N.P.  
 9. It would give us a larger market and better prices for some articles. I should think we were in a better position to negotiate a Treaty now, under the present Tariff. 10. Can't say that it has made any difference in price of wool.  
 11. None grown in this county for commercial purposes.  
 12. I consider that farm implements are better and cheaper since the present Tariff was placed on them.  
 13. There is a slight increase, owing to an advance in price of labour.  
 14. It decidedly has been improved. 15. The N.P. has greatly improved the condition of the mechanics of the country, every man who is willing to work finding steady employment at good wages. There is little or no emigration to the United States, all those leaving Ontario are bound for Manitoba.  
 16. There is a tendency to investment in farm property, owing to cheap money under N.P. 17. It is very much improved, prices being much better since 1878.  
 18. I do not think that any change would be advisable without giving the present Tariff a fair trial; but, above all things, no change back to Grit rule, which nearly ruined the country during the four years they held office.

E. MCGILLICUDDY,  
 Warden, Watford, Co. Lambton.

1. No, admit nothing free of duty, better as it is. 2. Oats and pease are now selling well; home consumption the cause as there is no foreign market to compete with.  
 3. Wheat, a splendid price. The millers are paying 5 cents per bushel more for red Scott than for white, they say that the home demand for flour is the reason.  
 4. About a cent a pound dearer for live hogs.  
 5. Something has made horses very dear, the demand for Manitoba the principal cause. 6. All kinds of stock pay well to breed, especially good horses, as we expect the Manitoba demand to continue.  
 7. Yes. Of corn, pease, and oats we grow large crops which are better to feed than imported corn.

8. Yes. 9. I think that if we had a fair Treaty it would be advantageous, but much prefer to remain as we are than have a one sided one, but we are in a better position to negotiate than formerly, as we have something to offer.
10. Cannot express an opinion. 11. Not much grown around here except flax, whether dearer I do not know. 12. Farm implements cheaper and equally as good quality. 13. I do not notice any alteration in prices.
14. The home market is very much improved because there is plenty of money among the poorer classes.
15. All classes are employed that are willing to work, the surplus population going to Manitoba instead of to the United States.
16. It is a better investment to buy land here than formerly. Yet Manitoba will lessen the demand. 17. Yes, wonderfully.
18. All that is required is to keep the Right Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald and his colleagues in power.

*General Remarks* :—The country is in a very prosperous condition, and we would not like any changes of the fiscal policy of the Government.

JOHN DAGG,

Councillor, Lucan, Co. Middlesex.

—

1. I cannot say. 2. No difference in this neighbourhood. 3. None here.
4. Pork is dearer than last year. 5. No horse-buyers here, except lumbermen. Prices nearly the same as they used to be.
6. Yes. We find a market at home with the lumbermen. 7. Yes.
8. Cannot say. 9. We think he would. We think our M. P's. should be the best judges of this question. 10. None that we can see.
11. Grow none here. 12. No change in price. Not so liberal in terms.
13. Perhaps a small increase; hardly noticeable. 14. No.
15. We notice no change here, except a few families going to Dakota and Manitoba.
16. No change. 17. Yes. 18. A subsidy to a railroad through the new country to join the Canada Pacific Railway.

SAMUEL ARMSTRONG,

Reeve, McKellar, Muskoka.

—

1. Yes. If we have a surplus, it will fix the price for the whole, and if we are short our people want cheap bread.
2. It has not raised the price of oats or barley, but it has been a loss to those engaged in raising improved stock and fattening cattle for the English market. We do not raise rye or pease, the latter on account of the weevil.
3. As compared with the American prices, wheat is lower since the imposition of the duty. We do not raise spring wheat.
4. The price of live hogs has raised so much since the increase, that I cannot say what the effect has been.
5. A great many horses have been taken to the United States and the North-West by emigrants, but the trade has been mostly with the United States.
6. Horses are not so profitable as cattle except in special cases.
7. It would pay to allow American corn to come in free of duty, as it would, in a measure, take the place of oats which is an exhausting crop.
8. I think not. Potatoes are dearer in the United States than with us, and in the summer butter and eggs are as low as ever.
9. Yes. The Americans, like ourselves, are exporters of grain along our whole borders, and a curtailment of trade that would ruin us would not be much felt by them.
10. I cannot say whether the duty is to blame for the low prices of wool or not, it certainly has not helped the wool market. 11. We raise none.

12. I think that most of them have increased ; quality the same but lighter.
13. All coarse woollens are absolutely dearer, and, as compared with British and American goods, very much dearer. The same may be said of cottons and cotton warps. 14. I think not for the reasons before stated.
15. We have lost more good men by emigration during the last two years than at any other similar period in my recollection, and I do not know of a single returned Canadian.
16. No. Farms are now lower than in 1878, notwithstanding that cheap money is such an inducement to purchase. The numbers desirous of selling is no doubt the cause.
17. The farmers are better off owing to the better wheat crops, but the labouring classes are no better off.
18. Such changes as will enable the farmer to both buy and sell in the most favourable markets, and by making living cheap, enable him to get labour at rates which will afford him a margin.

M. McGUGAN,  
Reeve, Caradoc, Hendrick, Co. Middlesex.

1. No, nothing that can be grown in the Dominion. 2. It has created a better and steadier market.
3. It protects the farmer at particular seasons when he cannot market his grain, and gives a better and more uniform price and better grade of flour to the consumer by excluding American wheat.
4. It has increased the price to the Canadian farmer. 5. Yes.
6. Yes, about equal and better if you breed heavy and roadsters. Manitoba.
7. Yes, on an average some localities would benefit by free corn.
8. Yes, there are more in the country to purchase.
9. We might, but we had better go cautious. Better position as we are.
10. To raise the price on our wool and eventually on all wool.
11. Promotes it in this country. 12. Decreased cost and a better quality.
13. They have not increased. 14. Yes, but by the increase of manufacturing interests in the country.
15. Yes, most certainly, the prodigals are coming home to eat the calf.
16. Yes, money is more plenty, interest is lower, and farming pays better.
17. Most certainly, what makes you ask such an absurd question.
18. You can't better it, stick to the N.P., keep a stiff upper lip, and we will get along bully.

*General Remarks:*—We are now for the first time placed in a position to talk business to the United States in regard to Reciprocity on certain articles, and thanks to the N.P. for it, and here in one of the greatest Reform counties in the Province, we have five American factories on the St. Clair branch of the Canada Southern railroad as an evidence, and to-day there are two to one in favour of the N.P., but they are afraid of party and dare not say what they really believe by voting for the supporters of the man whom the people delighteth to honour. Yes, gentlemen, our children and our children's children, shall rise up and say, blessed be the names of Macdonald, Tilley and Tupper and all supporters of that glorious National Policy.

ALEX LUCAS,  
Reeve, Alvinston, Co. Lambton.

1. No. 2. Oats, barley and pease have raised 20 per cent. in price.
3. Spring wheat raised about 20 per cent. in price. 4. An advance of about 30 per cent., with good demand and ready sales. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. 7. Yes.
8. No. 9. Yes. Yes. 10. No effect. 11. None. Flax seed has advanced in price.

12. They have not increased in price; and quality better. Such as reapers, mowers, thrashing machines, ploughs, &c., &c. 13. No increase whatever.  
 14. Yes, it has. 15. Yes, under the present Tariff there is work enough for our people and immigrants.  
 16. Yes; and farm lands have increased in value since 1878.  
 17. The general condition of all classes of people is improved since 1878.  
 18. By establishing farmers' Institutes.

J. L. KROETSCH, General Merchant,  
 IGNACE OFFHOLDER, Township Clerk, } St. Clements, Co. Waterloo.

1. No. 2. The effect of the imposition of a duty on American grain has been to increase the profits on all coarse grain raised in this Canada of ours.  
 3. No answer. 4. The effect is that we now get a better price for ours; four years ago I sold hams at 8 cents per lb., now I can get 12 or 13 cents per lb.  
 5. Yes. 6. No answer. 7. We can raise all the coarse grain we want. Keep on the duty until the Americans give us a free market. 8. Yes.  
 9. We would accept Reciprocity, but shall never get it if you reduce the Tariff and admit American produce free.  
 10. It is causing farmers to improve their sheep, so as to raise a finer grade of wool.  
 11. I don't know. 12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper and better, being made of better material. 13. The price is not increased. 14. Yes.  
 15. Yes, of this there can be no doubt. 16. Yes, yes, yes.  
 17. I know they are in this section of country. 18. No answer.

ELIJAH STORR, J.P.,  
 Ex-Warden, Leinster, Co. Lennox.

1. It would not be to the benefit of Canadians to admit American farmers' produce free of duty. 2. It has raised the price of oats and corn, and encouraged farmers to grow more coarse grain. 3. Wheat is not affected by the duty, as we send it to the United Kingdom for market.  
 4. It has the effect of raising the price of hogs, which must be a benefit to the farmer. 5. Yes; it improved our home markets.  
 6. Breeding horses is profitable for United States market.  
 7. Yes. There is no necessity for importing American corn.  
 8. I cannot answer this question. 9. Give us a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States if you can; if not we are safe with the National Policy.  
 10. Wool has been rather low in price for the last two years.  
 11. The Tariff has improved our home markets for tobacco and sugar beet.  
 12. Farm implements are cheaper through the Tariff.  
 13. Woollens, cottons and hardware about the same price. 14. The home markets have improved through the Tariff.  
 15. The N. P. encourages immigration to Canada and keeps Canadians at home.  
 16. I think there is. 17. Improved a great deal.  
 18. There is no change wanted at present. Keep John A. Macdonald at the head of affairs, and he will legislate for the benefit of the farmers.

DONALD REID,  
 Township Clerk, Skipness, Co. Bruce.

1. It would not generally speaking, but in the case of barley Canada is a large exporting country of that grain, so that it would not alter the position of the Canadian farmer to admit barley free.

2. The effect has been to increase the price of oats, corn, inferior barley and pease, paid to the farmer by lumbermen and those keeping horses in cities, towns, &c., and in the case of rye the distiller has paid higher prices than formerly.
3. The prices have been higher, more especially for spring wheat flour which is extensively used by mechanics and labouring men; their constant employment giving the means to purchase more freely, a mutual gain to both farmer and consumer.
4. A confidence that no extensive competition existed stimulated farmers to produce more pork, &c., and consequently more peas and other feeding produce were grown instead of wheat, thereby giving variety of crops and enriching the land by the change of crop and production of manure; the average price has no doubt been higher also.
5. The duties imposed have no doubt given the farmers a greater demand from the North-West by partially shutting out the American, thus increasing the price; but the settlers there have had the extra price to pay; however, money expended thus has been, on the other hand, a benefit to other parts of the country.
6. I find it profitable on lands suitable, such as new cleared lands and rough ground not adapted for grain without too much labour, and where machinery cannot be worked advantageously, a mixture of stock I consider best, in proper proportions to suit the locality; the best market is to the United States.
7. Every farmer should grow more feeding produce than at present in the shape of coarse grain, turnips, &c., and a judicious farmer might buy feeding stuffs occasionally; by this system land would be improved yearly by extra manure.
8. The effect of giving stimulus to manufacturing has been a greater demand for these articles for consumption at the farmers door, instead of shipping it to other markets where losses continually occur either to buyer or seller.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty with proper safeguards might be beneficial, but Canada is fast progressing toward a dignified position and need not be in a hurry; by properly attending to our own interests at home is the surest way to command respect from your neighbours.
10. Could not give an opinion, but I find woollen goods as cheap or cheaper than before.
11. I have had no experience in these three articles of produce.
12. The cost of waggons and other vehicles is less now than three or four years ago. Reaping machines, mowers, horse-rakes, ploughs, harrows and seed drills are sold now for less money, and the cash left to circulate in the country.
13. I think all these articles cost less than before the Tariff went into operation; there was a temporary rise at first, but this soon subsided, and now they are both cheaper and better.
14. The operation of the Tariff gave confidence to capitalists and manufacturers, and more machinery and material for producing goods was set in motion and used, giving employment to the mechanics and labouring classes, who thus earned more money, and had means to purchase more freely for the use of their families.
15. No doubt in this matter every city, town and village can testify to the benefits resulting from the operation of the Tariff.
16. There is more confidence felt in the stability of the electors and their judgment; since 1870, it is evident that the masses think for themselves on matters affecting the country's welfare, consequently more money is now invested, and it is considered safe.
17. Most decidedly so; the labouring classes were never in a better position than at present.
18. Encouragement to shipping and manufactures and the development of the mineral resources, more especially iron and coal mining, thereby creating an extensive home market, and cheapening of farm implements and manufacturing machinery.

JOHN FELL,  
Farmer, Bury's Green, Co. Victoria.

1. From the fact that we grow more grain than we consume, the value of the whole is fixed by the prices we receive for the surplus; the removal or imposition of a duty would not affect us in any way, excepting corn, on which there should be no duty. 2. No perceptible effect.
3. No effect on wheat; cannot speak with certainty as to flour.
4. The effect of the increased duty on hogs has been to raise the price of hogs and their products. 5. The increased duty on horses has benefited us by giving us a market for our inferior horses in Manitoba.
6. Equally profitable with other classes of stock. Our market for good horses is the United States, and Manitoba for inferior.
7. That depends on circumstances. If our own coarse grains are dear, and American corn cheap, it would pay to feed corn. If corn is dear and our own grain cheap, then we would feed our own grain. 8. No.
9. Reciprocity would be beneficial, but I do not think that the present Tariff as against the former one would be much of a lever to that end.
10. Better demand for fine wool, caused by a change in the class of goods manufactured. 11. Not grown in this section. 12. No noticeable difference.
13. A slight increase in the price of these goods. 14. No.
15. It has neither retarded emigration nor encouraged Canadians who had left to return. 16. In this section there is an increased tendency to invest capital in farm property, caused by the cheapness of money and better crops. In some sections the contrary is the case. 17. Yes.
18. Reciprocity if possible, and if not then lower the duties on articles used by farmers.

JAMES LAIDLAW, M.P.P.,  
Guelph, Co. Wellington.

1. It can do no harm, as we grow more than we require for home consumption.
2. It has had no effect on the price of coarse grains that I am aware of. It has forced producers to feed their coarse grains, while they could more profitably have sold them and bought corn, had there been no duty on it.
3. It cannot possibly have raised the price, as they are higher in the States than here. 4. I cannot answer intelligently. 5. No. 6. Cannot say.
7. It would often pay to import corn. 8. No. 9. Yes. I do not think the present Tariff has improved our position to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. Little or none. 11. Cannot say.
12. The cost has increased; the quality, I should say, is as good.
13. Increased to the extent of the increase of the Tariff, or nearly so. 14. No.
15. No. 16. Not that I am aware of. No increase in value in my section.
17. Yes, there is an improvement amongst farmers this last year. Fair crops and good prices have had an effect.
18. Any legislation that will reduce the Tariff will make agriculture more profitable.

WM. NICOLL,  
Reeve, Morriston, Co. Wellington.

1. I do not think it would be in the interest of the Canadian agriculturalist to admit any American farm produce free of duty.
2. I believe it has increased the price of oats, rye, and pease; barley, it does not come so much in competition with, and therefore does not so much affect the price. No corn sown for profit in this section.
3. I have not given the subject sufficient consideration to answer intelligently.
4. It has created a better home market, less fluctuation in the trade, increased demand and higher prices.

5. In cattle I believe the duty has increased the price. I do not think the price of horses is affected, as the United States is our chief market.
6. The breeding of heavy draught horses I consider profitable at present prices, more so than other farm stock. Our principal market is the United States.
7. In ordinary years I believe the Canadian farmer can profitably raise all the grain he requires for feeding; exceptional years it may pay better to import corn.
8. I believe the present Tariff has a tendency to increase the price of such articles.
9. In my opinion reciprocal trade with the United States would be of much benefit to the Canadian farmer, and that we are in a better position now than before the present Tariff came into operation to obtain such.
10. I do not think the price of wool is much affected, as the greater part of the imported article does not come in competition with the class of wool grown here.
11. Neither flax, tobacco nor sugar beet are raised here for profit.
12. I believe that all kinds of farm implements are fully as cheap and the quality as good, if not better, than before the present Tariff, the increased competition in the trade regulating both price and quality.
14. From my personal knowledge I could not say that they are affected either way by the present Tariff.
14. I believe it has, by the duty imposed on foreign produce and the protection of our own market to that extent, the fostering of the industries of the country thereby creating a consuming population in manufacturing centres.
15. I believe it has. 16. It is my opinion that the tendency for investing in farm property has increased since 1878, and that farming lands have increased in value since that date. I attribute it to good crops, fairly remunerative prices, a good home market, and increasing confidence in the future prosperity of the country.
17. Yes; the general condition of the farmers and labouring classes is very much improved since that date. 18. I decline to answer that question.

MATTHEW SWEETNAM,

Reeve, Guelph, Co. Wellington.

1. Do not think so. 2. Cornmeal has been rather dear the past year, but not, I think, owing to the duty, so much as owing to the consumption in the shanties. Rye, barley, oats and peas not much used here.
3. Cannot say that flour has been any dearer on account of duty.
4. I think somewhat higher. 5. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the trade to answer satisfactorily.
6. This is a fishing locality and not a stock raising community.
7. I think it would be very expensive to import corn to fatten stock.
8. I think the market has improved.
9. Reciprocity might be beneficial, but doubtful. If it is a benefit to have it, I think we are in a better position now than at any time previous to negotiate.
10. Very little done in the wool trade. Tariff not affecting the small sales.
11. None grown in this locality. 12. So far as I can learn, they are not increased and the quality is good.
13. Do not think the price has been raised on account of the Tariff, of the articles named. 14. This is not a farming community.
15. Labour has been more plentiful, wages much better, and in this place no emigration. 16. From different accounts I think real estate is improving.
17. Most assuredly. 18. I leave this for wiser heads.

*General Remarks* :—The principal business carried on in this community is fishing. There are two or three lumbering establishments, and I think they have no reason to complain of the Tariff. The fishermen did better last season than for some years previous, receiving a good price for their fish, and provisions and salt were medium prices.

WILLIAM GUILD,  
Councillor, Head of Jeddore, Co. Halifax,

1. I believe it would not. 2. No answer. 3. Flour has ruled rather high for the past year, but I believe it has been owing to the short crop of wheat.
- 4 to 8. No answer.
9. I believe farmers in this Province would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, and I certainly believe we are in a better position to negotiate than we would be if we adopted the jag-handled Free Trade policy.
- 10 to 13. No answer. 14. I believe it has been so improved.
15. A good many of the young men are going to the States, but most of them could do just as well at home if they would work as they have to do there.
16. Not much tendency to invest in farm property here. There is too much good land in the North-West that is attracting the attention of persons wishing to invest.
17. The condition of these classes has greatly improved. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—Living as I am, on the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia, I am not in a position to answer many of the above questions. I am a firm believer in the principal of Protection, and although, from the nature of this part of the country, we are consumers rather than producers, lumbering and fishing being the chief branches of industry, I believe the policy of the Government is eminently calculated to further the interests of the Dominion as a whole.

ISAAC GAETZ,  
Musquodoboit Harbour, Co. Halifax.

1. No, decidedly not. Farmers need protection, as much as manufacturers.
2. No rye, corn, barley or pease grown here. Oats and buckwheat have ruled higher since the present Tariff came into operation. 3. Cannot say.
4. Hogs, and their products, have advanced in price within the last two years; cause—less American pork imported. 5. Horses are ruling higher in price than for many years. Many going to the United States.
6. With present prices it is profitable to breed horses, but not more so than other stock. The chief market is the United States.
7. No corn fed here for some time. Oats and buckwheat are universally fed, and can be grown profitably for fattening. Corn cannot be imported at present prices. 8. Not materially affected.
9. Decidedly the farmer would be benefited, as there is a steady demand for all we in New Brunswick have to spare in the way of farm produce. We are in a far better position to negotiate for Reciprocity now than before the present Tariff. 10. I cannot say; think there is no effect.
11. None that I am aware of. 12. Cost not increased, quality equally good. Mowing-machines, horse-rakes, reapers, ploughs, harrows, cultivators, drills, forks, hoes, rakes, &c.
13. Woollens and cottons are as reasonable in price as at any time within ten years. Cannot say in reference to hardware.
14. In some articles the market is improved. Notably in pork.
15. Undoubtedly more employment has been given under the present Tariff than before. Emigration has been more or less retarded by good wages and steady employment. This is now the rule, instead of the exception.
16. Cannot say there is an increased tendency to invest in farm property. Farms have slightly increased in value since 1878, owing to various causes, the beneficial effects of protection being one of the largest factors.
17. Yes, decidedly so, beyond the shadow of a doubt. Prosperity is manifest on every hand.
18. Can hardly say. Unrestricted liberty to import stock from United States would be advantageous to this section of the Dominion; as well as sufficient Government subsidy to establish an efficient steamer between St. John and ports in Great Britain.

J. E. FAIRWEATHER,  
Farmer, Hampton, Co. Kings.

1. Yes. The prices of farm produce in Canada are ruled by the markets of Great Britain and the United States. The admission of American farm produce free of duty, would increase and be a boon to the carrying trade of this country, enable our canals and railways to carry our produce at a cheaper rate and increase the shipping trade of our seaport cities, and in regard to Indian corn would be a great benefit to our farmers in feeding cattle for the markets of Great Britain.
2. It has no effect whatever upon the price of coarse grain except corn which cannot be profitably grown in Canada; with the exception of a few counties bordering on Lake Erie, our barley and rye is ruled by the price obtained for shipment to the United States; also peas, are largely exported there and also to Great Britain; and in regard to oats it has not raised the price to the Canadian farmer, in proof of which they are from 8 cents to 10 cents per bushel lower in the markets here than in the United States.
3. What may have been the effect upon the price of flour I scarcely know, I suppose the people of the Maritime Provinces will have to pay 50 cents per brl. more; but it has not been the means of giving the Canadian farmer a higher price for his wheat, but rather otherwise as we find that the American farmer gets a higher price for his wheat than the Canadian though the surplus of both countries is exported to the same market.
4. It may have increased the price of dried hams, &c., to the consumer; but the duty upon pork in barrel being the same as formerly, the increased duty on live hogs has had little or no effect in raising the price of pork to the Canadian farmer; as a proof take the price of hogs in the United States, also the price of good cattle here fit for export which is selling for 6 cents per lb. live weight equal to at least 9 cents dressed meat, a higher price than any farmer has got for his pork.
5. Not in the least, the price obtained by the Canadian farmer for his horses is ruled by the demand from the United States; very high prices have been paid this spring for horses both for the States and Manitoba, but the best horses have generally been sold to the Americans at very high figures.
6. Do not breed horses to any extent for sale, but the principal and best market for good horses is the United States, while a considerable number is sent to Manitoba.
7. Not in all cases. I have always found it profitable to grown barley for sale, and buy American corn, until the present duty on corn was imposed, and if the interests of nine-tenths of the Canadian farmers were consulted by the Dominion Government, they would at once repeal the duty.
8. No. Butter and eggs are also exported largely from this section, and as for vegetables and poultry I cannot see how the price can be improved as the demand cannot be increased from the fact that the population of the city of Guelph and the towns in this county is not increasing, but rather decreasing.
9. Yes to some extent, but as to being in a better position to negotiate a Treaty under the present Tariff, or when American produce was admitted free, it is very doubtful. The only difference to the Americans under the present Tariff, is that we take a little less of their corn, other coarse grain makes no difference to them, and as for their wheat a greater proportion of their surplus will be sent over their own railways and canals for export to Europe and less by the Canadian lines of railways and canals.
10. No effect whatever. The price of wool which is principally raised by the Canadian farmer is now lower than ever known before, namely, about 23 cents per lb., and a large amount of last year's wool in the hands of the buyers. How can it have any effect by putting a duty of 3 cents per lb. upon the wool which is largely exported and allowing the wool which we largely import come in duty free; it has always been a puzzle to me for what object this duty upon this class of wool was imposed. 11. Do not know; none cultivated.

12. As far as my experience goes I find very little or no difference, only many of our implements are now made of better material than formerly, and still very good.
13. Yes, to the extent of the increase of duty under the present Tariff.
14. No, the home market is entirely regulated by the price for which produce is sold for export either to Great Britain or the United States.
15. It may in some cases have done so. The cotton and woollen industrial classes may have increased but has not in the least retarded emigration to the United States, or encouraged Canadians to return to this country.
16. No. Farm property has rather decreased in value. Owing in a great measure to parties wishing to sell for the purpose of removing to Manitoba, North-West Territories, and to the United States.
17. Yes. Owing to good crops, and the high prices obtained for farm produce and fat cattle; owing to the deficiency of the harvests in Great Britain for the last two or three years, farm labourers are in good demand just now; owing to so many leaving for the Western Territory, but I pay no higher wages now than in previous years.
18. I do not see what legislation can do to make agriculture more desirable and profitable, except to legislate so that our agricultural produce can be carried at a cheaper rate to the sea-port. By taking off the duty on coal and reducing the duty on all raw material required in the construction and running of our lake-marine and railways, would to a certain extent enable the carrying trade to be carried on at a cheaper rate.

*General Remarks* :—I have no remarks to make except that this idea of giving the Canadian farmer a higher price for produce, by being protected by such a Tariff as now exists has proved to be only a delusion, which can be easily seen by any one comparing the markets of the United States with the Canadian. In fact the only things that can be raised in price is corn and hogs, but there has always been a duty on this last article, and the present Tariff has very little effect in raising its price.

WILLIAM WHITELAW,  
Farmer, Guelph, Co. Wellington.

1. It would to a great extent in this Province, because we have to import largely American wheat and corn.
2. Has not materially affected the price of oats, barley or pease; it has raised the price of corn and rye.
3. It has increased the price to the consumer.
4. It has increased the price very slightly.
5. No answer.
6. Moderately so. Favourably, United States.
7. Doubtful; not at present prices.
8. No.
9. Yes.
10. Prices are low here at present.
11. None grown in this county.
12. Increased. No. Mowing machines, forks, hoes, &c.
13. It has increased the price of cotton.
14. In my opinion it has not.
15. No.
16. No; decreased.
17. The labouring class get higher wages; the condition of the farmers has not improved.
18. A more economical administration of public affairs, and with the money thus saved assist in starting new manufactories, and making a market for the farmer at home. I would also give him the privilege, so far as is practicable, of trading advantageously with other countries, particularly the United States.

*General Remarks* :—It would require a statesman like Sir John or the Hon. Edward Blake to answer some of your questions.

WILLIAM McLEAN, J.P.,  
Nashwaak, Co. York, N.B.

1. A Revenue Tariff is all that ought to be allowed in any case, and that only on what may be considered "luxuries" as near as possible. Britain being the principal market for the surplus cereals and dairy produce both of Canada and the States, a duty on such cannot possibly benefit the farmer.

2. I received 73 cents in the Owen Sound market for my peas (60 lbs.) and whatever Indian corn could be laid down in Owen Sound for the same number of pounds would just be the advantage or disadvantage of a duty on corn. Oats are cheaper here than they generally are, owing to the large crop of 1881; our barley goes to the States for malting purposes, so that any duty imposed on American barley coming to Canada cannot benefit the farmer. Neither rye nor corn is grown here, at least not much of it.
3. My answer to question No. 1 will answer No. 3. The difference between fall and spring wheat in price is less than it used to be; I do not know the reason, I am told it is owing to the recent improvement in the milling department.
4. I do not know. 5. Our highest priced horses are sold to the States; in fact they are our principal buyers, therefore the duty imposed on Yankee horses coming here is of no use to us. I do not know about Manitoba and the North-West.
6. I find it more profitable to raise any other kind of stock than horses. The United States is our principal market for heavy horses.
7. It has been more profitable heretofore to import Indian corn, although we in this locality have done very little in importing. 8. Impossible.
9. Reciprocity certainly. The States will not be coerced into Reciprocity, and the extra prices the National Policy compels us to pay for all classes of manufactures will prove that we are paying too dear, even for Reciprocity. Should the Democrats have the good fortune of displacing the Republicans at the next elections, and the Reformers be successful in Canada, then we will get Reciprocity and not till then. 10. Ruinous. 11. I know nothing about these things.
12. What was the use of putting a duty on at all if the manufacturer was not to receive a higher price for his manufactures, more especially when the National Policy taxes the raw material. It is the height of imposition. Farm implements about last year's prices, which would easily stand 25 per cent. of a reduction for cash, and then the manufacturer would have plenty of profit.
13. All the manufactures mentioned in this question are higher under the National Policy than they would otherwise be under the Mackenzie or Reform Revenue Tariff. 14. Decidedly not. 15. Not in the slightest degree.
16. Farm lands decreased 25 or 30 per cent. at least, settlement of the North-West the cause. The increased indirect taxation caused by the National Policy might possibly have some effect in making people dissatisfied with their present position.
17. Yes; I think so, owing to good crops in Canada and bad crops in Britain and elsewhere. A great many of the labouring classes have gone to the North-West, those who remain must necessarily be improved in circumstances, so far as the National Policy will allow.
18. Repeat the National Policy; do away with the Senate. Reduce the number of members of Parliament. Do not profligate the people's money on favourite contractors. Make the Election Laws so strict that Government contractors, or any other person spending money in connection with elections shall be punished as a criminal. Give farms (wild) to actual settlers. Superannuation of Government officers is wrong, unless it be done under the same equitable principal of life insurance companies.

HUGH REID,

Master, Hawthorn Grange, Annan, Co. Grey.

- 
1. Not without Reciprocity. 2. It has increased the price of all grain specified.
  3. A steady home market not affected by American wheat.
  4. A steady home market not affected by importations from the United States.
  5. Yes. 6. Profitable to breed. Now principally Manitoba.
  7. He can raise all he requires. 8. Yes; very much.

9. Yes. In much better position now than without our present Tariff.
10. It will raise the price when we produce the kind manufactured here.
11. I am not aware of any. 12. Reapers, mowers and other implements are cheaper and superior in quality. 13. I do not think so.
14. Yes; by the increased manufacture causing more demand, and the Tariff keeping the market for the Canadian farmer. 25. Yes. Yes.
16. The free grant lands in the North-West are depreciating lands here to a small extent at present. 17. Yes; very much so. 18. No answer.

W. S. PETRIE,  
Miller, Holstein, Co. Grey.

1. Not at all, except we could have Free Trade both ways.
2. It would be better for us to have no duties on barley, as no barley comes from the other side here; but for other coarse grains, we are better under the present Tariff. 3. It has been to our profit.
4. It has also been to our profit to have the increased duties on these articles.
5. I know that prices have increased very much in the last three years.
6. We find it profitable to breed good horses, and find a strong market in both places.
7. I consider the Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the coarse grain he requires for feeding purposes. 8. They are.
9. That is a question in my mind. We are in a much better position than we were three years ago. 10. Not to our profit. 11. It is to our profit.
12. They have not increased, and the quality is as good if not better.
13. They have not increased. 14. Undoubtedly it has, to a fearful extent.
15. It positively has without a doubt.
16. There is an increased tendency; farm lands have increased very much in value under the present Tariff. Undoubtedly they are very much improved.
18. I do not know of any worth naming.

*General Remarks* :—I have seen several of my neighbours and have shown them this paper, and they are generally of the opinion in this section, that we are quite well enough under the present Tariff, and hope that the present Government may long reign and have the blessing of God on them.

HUGH BROWNLEE,  
Farmer, Kars, Co. Carleton.

1. Reciprocity better. Duty free would be better than the National Policy.
2. No improvement in prices. A great loss to the farmers in cheap feed for fattening purposes.
3. No advantage; prices regulated by Liverpool; it has been lower here than in Chicago.
4. Regulated by foreign demand. 5. Can't see any advantage gained by the duty. The Americans buy nine-tenths of the horses sold here.
6. Yes; suitable for the American market.
7. It pays better to sell our pease and buy American corn. 8. None.
9. I think he would. Just ask the Yankee. 10. It has depressed the price.
11. It has completely ruined tobacco.
12. Increased 25 per cent. on thrashing machines and reapers. 13. All increased.
14. Not a particle. 15. There has been a greater emigration than before.
16. Nothing like the demand there was before. 17. Not by the National Policy.
18. Equitable Tariff and just transportation rates.

*General Remarks* :—I have been away on an extensive tour in the Western States and have just returned and found these questions for my consideration. I had conversations with a good many farmers in the States of Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri,

Indiana and Illinois. The general opinion was that there would be a change in their Protective Tariff as they have to pay too dear for nearly all their farm and family supplies. I believe a Protective Tariff is a damage to any country that produces a surplus for exportation, as it causes greater expenses in living, as all family supplies are advanced in price according to the amount of Tariff levied.

L. VANCAMP,  
First Deputy, R. 2000, Bowmanville, Co. Durham.

1. It would not be to our interest, except we had Reciprocity.
2. Improved from 20 to 25 per cent., and rye 50 per cent.
3. These are improved 15 per cent. 4. These are fully 25 per cent. improved.
5. Greatly improved in value. 6. There is a better remuneration in selling horses to Manitoba, owing to the United States claim of 20 per cent.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise more than he can consume. 8. Decidedly;—fully 20 per cent.
9. Majority of Canadian farmers would wish for Reciprocity. I think we are in a better position at present than formerly. 10. I have noticed no change.
11. None of these raised in this locality, indeed very little in the County of Carleton.
12. Prices of all agricultural implements are less and improved in quality.
13. Hardware is less, also woollen fabrics.
14. It has considerably increased under the present Tariff.
15. Wages of both artizans and labourers are greatly improved. The present demand is good for both. Labourers, artizans, and a number of Canadians are returning home from the States.
16. Farm lands are improving in value, and interest is considerably less since 1878.
17. Decidedly. 18. I think the country is satisfied with the present legislation.

*General Remarks:*—This portion of the country is in great want of a branch railway from Ottawa to Arnprior. If the Government could induce the Syndicate, by bonus or otherwise, it would be a great boon to this part of the country.

Wm. BOUCHER,  
Yeoman, South March, Co. Carleton.

1. Certainly not. 2. It has raised the price of oats and pease. We do not grow rye or corn in this section.
3. We get a better price for wheat and flour since the duty has been imposed.
4. A great improvement in price since 1878; it does pay now to raise pork.
5. In this part of the country it did not pay to raise horses until the Manitoba market was opened for Canadians; now it pays. Other live stock has greatly improved in price.
6. It pays well to breed horses; we cannot compare with other parts of the country until we get better sires; other stock pays better at present. The United States takes our first class, and Manitoba all sorts.
7. Yes, and to spare. It would not. 8. The price is very much better these last two or three years, whatever is the cause.
9. There is no doubt he would. Well, now, what is the use of asking that question? Don't you know that we are, when we have got the bull by the horns!
10. I cannot say. 11. Cannot say. Do not cultivate either in this section.
12. The cost has decreased, and the quality is better. All the implements we use are cheaper now.
13. Woollens and cottons are no higher, and we get a better article. We do not pay so much for Manchester size as we used to pay, and there are no shoddy pedlars scouring the country now. 14. A decided improvement.

15. Labour of all sorts is scarce here at present, and will be this summer. I had a man working for his board during the winter of 1878-79.
16. A great many farms have changed hands in this neighbourhood lately.
17. I have a neighbour here, a brickmaker, and he has more bricks ordered for this summer than he has made these last four years, all for farm houses.
18. I am well satisfied. Go on as you are doing.

ANDREW McLEAN,  
Farmer, Cheviot, Co. Bruce.

1. It would be to the interest of farmers to admit all free; there is no produce except corn and pork, but what a foreign market rules; the price mostly in sympathy with the American markets.
2. As we have to take the market prices as our guide prior to the imposition of the present Tariff, it has had no beneficial effect on our coarse grains except Indian corn. Oats have ruled quite as high in the American market as with us. Rye is governed by foreign markets; as distillers would not consume all we raise, they are governed by outside prices and markets. Barley is our staple crop governed entirely by the American market as we could not consume one eighth of what we raise. Peas are also governed by outside markets as it does not pay to feed and make pork of them.
3. Wheat and flour are invariably governed by foreign markets, also, in sympathy with the American as the European markets.
4. It has increased the price no doubt to the amount of duties imposed, but they are not a staple article for farmers to raise, and consequently but little benefit to them but a tax on the consumer.
5. In consequence of transit being high to Manitoba, rather higher than the American duties, besides great risk, and the American our governing market, it has been no benefit, the Americans being our largest buyers and their markets our best markets for prices. Most of the horses taken from here to Manitoba were for settlers' own use.
6. It is profitable to raise a good class of horses. The American market is our best market as the demand is greater than in Manitoba.
7. It would pay better to import American corn for feeding, as we cannot raise any kind of coarse grains as profitable as corn for feeding purposes, less the duty which is a tax on the farmer who feeds it.
8. It has but little effect on vegetables, if any; but poultry, butter and eggs are ruled by foreign markets, mostly as to eggs and poultry, by the American market.
9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by Reciprocity as a whole; any Tariff we may impose on American produce could not hurt or affect their market as they are to a large extent our consumers; the Tariff could not have any effect to coerce or compel them to adopt Reciprocity; we think 4,000,000 can have but little influence to coerce 50,000,000 or thereabouts.
10. The Tariff does not help the price of wool as it is lower now than for some years and our growth has no protection 11. We raise no flax, tobacco nor sugar beet in this section of the country.
12. They have increased, especially reapers, mowers and ploughs. With all implements, especially whose raw material is taxed, the quality has improved as the country demands it.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware have increased in price in proportion to the Tariff imposed, especially on raw material in manufacturing; and consumers certainly pay all duties added to stock, or manufacturers must lose if not paid by consumer.
14. Do not think as a whole it has increased, as we have had no material increase in population. 15. Cannot see any benefit resulting from it. We have various industries such as existed prior to the imposition of the present Tariff, but no 20½

material advance in wages, not sufficient to prevent emigration to the United States; as under the present Tariff living is much higher consequently hundreds are leaving for Dakota and other parts of the Union, and but few returning to Canada.

16. No increased tendency to invest capital in farm property. It has decreased in value here but do not think the Tariff has anything to do with it, but principally owing to the monopoly and land speculation in the North-West Territory; the Tariff has certainly been no benefit.
17. Farmers' condition has improved much as well as the labouring classes, owing to a kind Providence sending us the early and late rain which gave us good crops and good prices, as a result of poor crops in Europe in general, consequently a large demand for our produce, and not the good effect of the National Policy.
18. Legislation that will allow or give the privilege of selling in the highest market and buying in the cheapest, taking advantage of times as they change and fluctuate, I believe would be to the interest of the agriculturalist in general and very many manufacturers.

G. B. SELLS,

Farmer, Co. Lennox.

1. Yes, because I grow wheat and barley and want cheap Western corn to feed.
2. It has not raised the price of oats, rye, barley or pease. It has raised the price of American corn to me about 11 cents per bushel.
3. I do not know anything about flour. American quotations in the "*Country Gentleman*," show that wheat has been a better price in Illinois and Ohio, than in Ontario the past season.
4. Live hogs were higher in Chicago all the past season than in Hamilton, by from half a cent to a cent a pound. I have not observed the prices of cured meats, as I only sell hogs dressed or alive as I find a purchaser.
5. No, the Americans still buy most of our good horses. Worn and blemished horses are chiefly bought here for Manitoba and the North-West.
6. In my judgment, cattle, sheep and hogs all pay better than horses, they can be got ready more quickly for market and can still be sold, though prices decline and the demand dull. I have chiefly sold my horses to Canadian buyers. Ontario takes as good horses as the Americans.
7. We have strong clay land here, and it pays us much better to buy corn at anything less than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound than to raise it. 8. No.
9. Yes, because we should get a better price for barley, horses, cattle, sheep and wool. No better position, as we sell the above to them, they do not sell those products in any quantity to us. We only take from them corn, timothy seed, tobacco, cotton and oranges.
10. It has been lower, right along, under the Tariff than I ever knew it before.
11. Don't know. 12. Prices are higher generally; harrows and ploughs are higher when made of iron. Reapers built as heavy as formerly, the agents ask about ten dollars more for them.
13. Grey cottons though quoted in the store same as before, are not so good, so my wife says. Duck, 8 ounces is 25 cents a yard, formerly only 22 cents; 10 ounces 30 cents, formerly it was only 25 cents. Nails are about half a cent a pound dearer and much poorer in quality. 14. No.
15. No, I do not know that it has, many have gone from here to the States.
16. No, there is a decline in the demand for farm property, but prices are still quoted about the same as 1878.
17. No, prices of wheat and barley were good last fall, but the wheat crop here was rather poor, so that there was not much more money moving.

18. Free Trade. That is what would suit the farmers, he wants to buy his goods and implements cheap, and have the world for his market. We want no legislation except to clear away the obstruction to his business, by destroying every statute that attempts to meddle with it.

WILLIAM PARKER,  
Farmer, Garnet, Co. Haldimand.

1. Yes, because the Tariff prevents small dealers from speculating or dealing in American farm produce, and therefore limits their operation to Canadians only and consequently they must have larger profits out of the former to make up for this limited trade.
2. Corn has been increased in price about 10 per cent. The price of pease is regulated by the demand abroad; the same is true of all grains of which we grow a surplus.
3. The farmer gets only the Liverpool price less freight and commission, the Tariff is no benefit as far as wheat is concerned.
4. The Tariff acts with hogs as it acts with all other articles of which our supply is deficient. If we have less it raises, if we have more than we require it does no good as we have to take what the foreigners offer.
5. We always had the home market; our good horses go to the United States and England, the scrubs to Manitoba and North-West.
6. It is now profitable to raise horses, but not more so than any other kind of stock. For our markets see above.
7. Yes. The profitableness of imported corn to fatten our stock, which depends upon the difference in price between what we grow and what we can buy corn for.
8. No, decidedly no; it is foolish to ask such a question, expecting it to be answered in the affirmative.
9. Yes, we are in no better position than formerly.
10. There is no Tariff on such wool as we grow in Canada.
11. I don't know.
12. The cost is not materially increased to the farmer. The manufacturers take the increase, to a considerable extent, out of his men. He uses machinery instead of manual labour.
13. I would answer this question by quoting the general rule of supply and demand. If our supply is deficient it raises the price, if not deficient it does no good, and prevents outside competition.
14. No; we always had it.
15. No; The Tariff has not. The number leaving here every day for the United States and Manitoba is very great.
16. No, to the former, and to the latter would say that the lands have decreased in value very much.
17. Yes, but the Tariff has not done it. You might as well ask if 1870 was better than it was six years before; this date may not be correct.
18. Free Trade as far as it is possible; restrict the trade of no person, and open outside market. No amount of duties can add access to the profits of any trade or calling where we have to find a foreign market for the surplus of our produce. We have a surplus of wheat, oats, rye, barley, horses, cattle, sheep, eggs, butter, cheese, peas and such like products, therefore the Tariff does not benefit, consequently justice demands that the former should not be taxed for the benefit of those whose goods the Tariff increases in price.

D. MCGREGOR, J. P.,  
Caledonia, Co. Haldimand.

1. Yes; in part, at least. Because the Eastern Provinces cannot grow enough corn and wheat for home consumption.
2. To make them dearer to the amount of the Tariff. Very little trade here in these except corn and oats.

3. More costly to the extent of the Tariff, as above. Flour only imported here. Each grade dearer as per Tariff per barrel, without regard to value. No fall wheat sown here. 4. Probably no marked effect, as they have usually wanted our surplus rather than for us to want theirs.
5. Do not know that they have. Our best beef market is in England. I am not acquainted with the effect in Manitoba and the North-West.
6. No; I think not—more especially when compared with other stock, which is more remunerative and readier in sale. In the United States rather than in Manitoba. 7. I think not. Yes; if free from duty.
8. No; I should say it is not, as they usually want our surplus of these articles and not we theirs. 9. Yes; can't see that we are in any better position further than the possibility of the Tariff making them desire it.
10. Do not know that it is affected very materially. The price here is about the same as it was six or seven years ago.
11. Not any that I am aware of, but would say, however, that if the Tariff on tobacco will have any effect toward stopping it from growing in Canada or any other country, keep it on.
12. Increased; quality not so good. We usually get better wood, steel and finish in implements from the States, baying tools more particular. Mowing machines, scythes, forks, &c.
13. Increased somewhat. I am not well enough acquainted with the hardware trade to answer correctly. Cottons more particularly I should think.
14. Yes; taken as a whole. I should say it has been increased at any rate. By the labourer having to pay more for his provisions, to the advantage of the few as manufacturers and to Western flour dealers.
15. Most certainly not. There are more young men leaving this county each year, and they go chiefly to the States.
16. Not here. Decreased. Because parties think they can live easier and make more money elsewhere.
17. I think it has. The principal reason being the marked improvement in the commerce of the world at large.
18. The partial repeal of the excessive Tariff on these articles that the farmer has to buy; the teaching of agriculture in our common schools, and the diffusion of instruction by agricultural literature for those now engaged in farming; the encouragement, by Government subsidy, to model and stock farms in such a way as to make the present excessive price of thoroughbred stock come within the purchasing power of the common farmer generally, and the carrying out of a project to keep up a line of steamers from some desirable point or points in Canada to the Old Country, in such a way that the freight shall not be burdensome.

G. M. PECK,

Master, Albert Sire Grange, Hopewell Hill, Co. Albert.

1. It would be in the interest of agriculturalists of this county and Province. Because a great many, even of agriculturalists, buy flour and use corn for feeding purposes. Cheap flour and cheap corn is actually in the interest of even the agriculturalists of Pictou.
2. The effect of the duty on corn has been to increase the cost of feed for cattle, and has in no measure affected the price of oats, which is controlled by prices in Prince Edward Island.
3. The effect has been to increase the cost to some extent to the producer. I cannot say exactly how much, as a large portion of our flour in this county is obtained from Ontario.
4. It has had no appreciable effect on the prices of live hogs. Ham and bacon are, and always have been, imported from Ontario.

5. Has not had the slightest effect. 6. I do not find it profitable to breed horses. Our sole market for horses is in this Province.
7. It would, in very many cases, pay better to import corn. 8. It is not.
9. He would be. We would be in quite as good a position to negotiate a Treaty under the old Tariff, and in the meantime we are subjected to a burdensome taxation.
10. No beneficial effect. Our wool is manufactured here and exported to Ontario and the United States. We import none. 11. No effect. 12. Undoubtedly the cost of farm implements is increased by the increased duties on iron, &c. 13. Every description of goods is necessarily increased to the extent of the increased duties.
14. It has not. 15. The population of this county is, at the present moment, moving *en masse* to the United States and the North-West.
16. Farm lands have not increased in value. 17. The general condition of the farmers and labourers is discouraging.
18. Tariff for Revenue and not for Protection.

JOHN ROSS,

Farmer, New Glasgow, Co. Pictou.

1. It would be detrimental to the interests of Canadian farmers to admit duty free anything that we can raise ourselves. 2. Oats, rye and pease are 30 per cent. higher in my locality than they were before the Tariff was imposed.
3. It has improved the price of wheat in some sections for home consumption.
4. The price of pork in our market has advanced fully 50 per cent.
5. We never import horses from the United States; our importations are from the Old Country, and then only for breeding purposes.
6. Average sized horses of any breed sell well now.
7. Canadian farmers can raise what coarse grain they require for feeding.
8. I cannot speak of the effect of the duty on the market for eggs, poultry and vegetables. 9. We might be benefited by a Reciprocal Trade.
10. Wool is advancing in price. 11. I have no knowledge of its effect upon tobacco, flax or sugar. 12. Farm implements are cheaper and better.
13. Hardware and woollens unchanged; cottons are a trifle higher.
14. The home market is greatly benefited.
15. It has increased the general prosperity by giving employment to every one.
16. Farm property is advancing in price. 17. Much improved.
18. Frame such laws as will keep the money lenders from imposing excessive rates of interest upon such farmers as are obliged to borrow.

THOS. HEENAN,

Farmer, Grafton, Co. Northumberland.

1. I think not. 2. Corn none grown, oats, rye, barley and peas remain about the same.
3. Has produced no visible changes. 4. They have increased in value.
5. They have. 6. To breed from good stock we find horse raising more profitable than other stock; principal market at home.
7. We prefer fattening our stock on the produce of our own farms. 8. It is.
9. I am not sure that the Canadian farmer would benefit by Reciprocity, but we are certainly in a better position to negotiate such than before.
10. Increased a little in value. 11. We don't grow either in this section.
12. We find mowing machines, horse rakes and hoes decreased under the present Tariff. 13. No visible change in those articles.

14. The home market for farm produce has increased by preventing Americans from Free Trade. 15. It has given diversity of employment and encouragement, but still our young folks incline to go to the States. 16. In our district there is not, as a number of our farmers wish to sell out and move to Manitoba. 17. It has. 18. I do not know of any to benefit agriculture.

DAVID DILLMAN,

Councillor, Meagher's Grant, Co. Halifax.

1. I think it would. Free Trade, and especially the repeal of the Corn Law, has made Britain prosperous, and is the only sound economic principle; and whatever benefits the masses will be to the interests of the Canadian farmer.
2. The effect upon American Indian corn has been to enhance its price, and has imposed a burden on this Province indeed grievous to be borne. Respecting oats and rye, I cannot say, as rye especially does not enter largely into consumption here.
3. The price of wheat and wheat flour has been increased to almost the amount of the duties imposed, and that increase has been paid into the pocket of the Canadian trader, and perhaps the farmer has received a part of these wages of iniquity.
4. I cannot say; we cannot afford such luxuries as these down in Shelburne County, but I dare say the price of these articles has been increased also.
5. No doubt both the market price and the home market also have been improved, but the first at the expense of the purchaser; and this advantage to the Canadian farmer is more than balanced by the disadvantage to the settler in these new countries struggling for bare existence.
6. These animals are not raised here for exportation, but if they were, the United States would be our natural market, as it is also in almost every other article produced in Nova Scotia.
7. The importation of American Indian corn is a necessity, as the Dominion does not grow enough for home consumption, and the Canadian farmers have not yet been able to raise enough of any other substitute, if indeed such an article exists. 8. Not in this country.
9. Yes, yes, yes. I do not think we are in so good a position now as then.
10. Wool in this county remains at the same price now as before.
11. I am not prepared to answer. 12. The cost of these articles has increased, and those coming from Canada—*i.e.*, Ontario—are inferior in build and in quality. Seythes, rakes, hoes, forks, ploughs, or any other article I ever saw made there.
13. Cottons, and hardware in common use amongst farmers and fishermen, are increased to the extent of at least 2 cents per yard. I cannot say of hardware to what extent, but know they are very much higher than formerly.
14. I believe it has. By compelling Canadians living in Nova Scotia to buy wheat, flour, corn and cornmeal, either raised or previously imported into Canada from the United States, from the Canadian dealer, which he would not do if these articles of necessity were free of duty.
15. The effect of the Tariff has been to discourage almost all kinds of industry in this county, to encourage emigration, and keep our young men away in the United States. They keep leaving in crowds, and soon, if this thing continues, the country will not be fit for a residence.
16. Real estate is at the lowest ebb here now, because no encouragement is offered for young men to live in the country, and no advantage is to be derived from working here.
17. The general condition of these classes is a great deal worse than previous to 1878.
18. 1st. A general retrenchment of the salaries in all the Departments of the Government of Canada, commencing with the Governor-General. 2nd. Legislation

that will make Canada a cheap country to live in. 3rd. Legislation that will increase and extend the commerce of the Dominion, and that will break down the Chinese wall raised up by the present National Policy. 4th. An imposition of Tariff duties upon the luxuries of life for the purpose of raising a revenue only. The staff of life, and raw material for manufacturing purposes, to be absolutely free.

*General Remarks*:—I have given these answers as I think, honestly and candidly, just as I think to be the truth, and not from any party or political prejudice. They may be wrong, but I believe the longer this policy is continued, the plainer will it appear that these answers are the only ones that can truthfully be given.

T. W. WATSON, J.P.,  
Barrington, Co. Shelburne.

1. It would not be to our interest.
2. It has not interfered as far as we can see.
3. It has no effect in regard to making these articles any more expensive.
4. None whatever.
5. We can notice no change.
6. We find it more profitable by 40 per cent. Our market is the United States and New Brunswick.
7. It would never pay to import Indian corn or meal to fatten our stock for market at any time.
8. Not any.
9. We would be benefited. We think we are in a better position with the present Tariff.
10. Not any.
11. Not any.
12. They are cheaper and much better.
13. We find these goods all cheaper.
14. We can notice no change.
15. It has given employment to thousands, and has retarded emigration to the United States, and encouraged our people back.
16. We notice no change for the worse.
17. It has improved very much since 1878.
18. We do not see that any legislation could make any change in it.

RICHARD COSTAIN,  
Postmaster, Miminegash, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

1. It would not be to the interest of Canada to admit farm produce free.
2. No effect only to raise oats for shipment, and they are mostly shipped to Europe.
3. The duty on flour has closed out the cheap American trash that used to flood our markets.
4. To give us a better demand and higher prices for pork.
5. Not increased much in this province.
6. It is profitable to breed good horses; our markets are the West Indies, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.
7. He can.
8. No.
9. Yes, we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty with the present Tariff now, and Reciprocity with the United States would greatly benefit this Province.
10. It has made a home market for it. Several cloth mills started since the new Tariff came into operation.
11. Do not cultivate either.
12. Not increased.
13. Prices not increased.
14. Not in this Province.
15. Not in this Province; large emigration to Dakota and North-West this year.
16. Not increased, owing to the large emigration to Dakota and North-West.
17. Not in this Province.
18. Reciprocity with the United States.

*General Remarks*:—We have to ship all our fish and potatoes to the United States, and believe that Free Trade would greatly benefit this Province.

HUGH CAMPBELL,  
Farmer, Rollo Bay, Cross Roads, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. Certainly not; because Indian corn can be produced more extensively and at less cost in the States than coarse grains can be here, which if admitted free would act injuriously to Canadian interests. This was fully demonstrated by the policy of the late Government.
2. Corn and rye are not grown in this section. The duty preserves a steady price for coarse grains. Before the Tariff, oats and corn filled the markets here before our farmers could thresh reducing price by amount of duty; each of these grains named maintains a uniform and higher price than before.
3. The duty tends to benefit the farmer. There is now a large market for wheat which did not exist before, as shown by the export returns, whilst a better price is obtainable.
4. Hogs can be produced more cheaply in the States. Free admission of pork must be prejudicial to our markets, this has been fully proved for many years past.
5. The Protective Policy holds good in this as in every other case. Our farmers have now control of the Manitoba and North-West markets, which they could not have if American animals were admitted free.
6. The breeding of horses has become profitable and compares favourably with other stock. Manitoba now affords the best market.
7. I am decidedly of opinion that all grain required for fattening stock can be raised in Canada, and that it would pay better than imported corn.
8. The effects of protecting these products are beneficial, for reasons given in the answers to other questions. Whatever protects against undue competition must benefit the Canadian farmer.
9. I see no reason for thinking so. The States are superior to us in population, wealth, agricultural and mechanical resources, which would render successful competition with them impossible; but we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty now than previously.
10. The effect may not probably be so marked as in the case of other products; but protection to wool must be an advantage to the farmer.
11. In this section none of these products are as yet cultivated.
12. The cost has not increased; home competition prevents this, and the machinery is fully as good, if not better, than heretofore.
13. These articles have not increased in price; they can be purchased as cheaply and of as good quality as before the present Tariff.
14. The replies to previous questions answer this. I repeat that our home market has been increased and improved, because so long as foreign produce was lowed to swamp us, we could have no home market worth the name.
15. Yes; it has given an enlarged employment in every line of business. It was the want of this which caused the emigration of our working people, but the North-West, not the States, is now the point of attraction.
16. Farm business having become more profitable, a greater encouragement for investment necessarily follows, which must cause a corresponding increase in the value of farm property.
17. Most certainly, there is abundant evidence of this on every side.
18. Some improvements might possibly be made, as doubtless they will; but certainly these would not be effected by a change of Government.

*General Remarks:*—The National Policy has caused such wide-spread prosperity as to meet the general approval of men of all shades of opinion, and in common with the majority I may express the hope that nothing will occur to interfere with its salutary working.

WILLIAM EDEN,  
Farmer, Arthur, Co. Wellington.

1. No, so far as this Province is concerned.
2. It gives us a better home market for oats.
3. None whatever.
4. None.
5. Not to this Province as the United States is our market.

6. Yes, favourably. The United States. 7. Yes, he can. It would not pay to import corn or any other feed.
8. Not any, as the principal market for vegetables and eggs is the United States.
9. Most undoubtedly, especially this Province. With the present Tariff we can much better negotiate a Treaty. 10. I cannot see that it is any advantage to us. 11. None cultivated in this Province for shipment.
12. The price and quality about the same. 13. They have somewhat increased by the Tariff, yet they are about as cheap as ever they were, owing to goods now being manufactured at less rates than when the duty was  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.
14. Not for this Province. 15. Not to this Province, but rather the reverse.
16. Not any. Cannot say that farm lands have increased in value since 1878.
17. There is perhaps some slight improvement.
18. One very great impetus to agriculture in this Province would be efficient steam communication all the year round with the rest of Canada, and another is our share of the Fishery Award, and legislation tending to give us this much desired right would do more for agriculture in this Province than either the present or former Tariff.

*General Remarks:*—We believe that for the Dominion as a whole the present Tariff is very suitable, but this Province from its isolation can never expect to reap much benefit from it, being purely agricultural, and as Canada never wants our produce, it is very desirable that Reciprocity in farm produce with the United States be brought about.

DUNCAN McDONALD,  
Merchant, Montague, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. It would not be in the interests of agriculturalists in Canada to admit any kind of American produce free of duty.
2. The imposition of a duty on coarse grains has not been felt here, oats being the only coarse grain grown here to any extent, the prices being governed by the state of the European market.
3. None whatever on flour, and, except a little for seed, there is never any wheat in the market here.
4. There has never been anything of the kind imported here. 5. Little or no home market here for any kind of live stock, and we are too far away from the Upper Provinces to feel the effect of prices.
6. Horses are the most profitable stock-raising here, and mostly sold for United States market.
7. For the purpose of fattening stock, American corn has never been imported here.
8. The production of these three articles has always been largely in excess of the demand for home consumption, consequently the present Tariff has not materially altered prices.
9. Farmers here would be greatly benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, especially in the market for potatoes, but the present Tariff or a more stringent one, appears to be the only means of obtaining such.
10. The Tariff in a direct way makes little or no difference in the price of wool here.
11. There are none of these three articles cultivated here at present.
12. The cost of farm implements of all kinds is much less, and they are of superior quality, under the present Tariff.
13. Woolens and cottons have not been much affected here in price or quality, but hardware is cheaper and better under the present Tariff.
14. There is no difference here in the home market by the operation of the Tariff.
15. The Tariff or anything else has never had any effect in retarding or encouraging emigration to the United States and back again from these parts.
16. There is an increasing tendency for the investment of capital in farm property under the present Tariff. Farm land has increased in value since 1878,

because we see our industries protected, fostered and encouraged, which will, no doubt, improve our home market for home produce, and hopes are strongly entertained of getting a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States by means of the present Tariff.

17. The general condition of everybody and everything is improved here since 1878, and it is still improving.
18. I would recommend a Government inspection of certain manufactories producing goods consumed by farmers, such as boots and shoes (where in some cases paper is used instead of leather), cottons, ready-made clothing of all kinds, &c., &c.

*General Remarks:*—As regards the Tariff, it is my opinion that the N.P. is only one step in the right direction, for whatsoever is produced or manufactured within the Empire, should (in the eye of common sense) be let in free, from any one part to the other; but on all foreign productions (excepting such as we have not, or in insufficient quantities to supply the demand) the duty ought to be almost, if not altogether, prohibitory. That, and that alone, carried to its widest extent, to ships, freights, lands, emigrants, &c., &c., is the only true National Policy.

JOHN LESLIE,

Farmer, Souris West, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. Not so long as the Americans tax the produce of Canada.
2. The duty has raised the price of oats, rye, corn, pease and lower grades of barley.
3. To cause a more urgent demand for each. 4. Increased value.
5. Improved prices on horses and live stock, but I do not know the cause.
6. The profits arising from breeding horses will compare favourably with that of other stock. Principal markets are the United States and Montreal.
7. The Canadian farmer can profitably raise all the grain required to fatten his stock. 8. No, from the fact that those articles are consumed at home.
9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty, which the present Tariff would much facilitate. 10. Not noticeable.
11. I am not engaged in raising any such produce. 12. The price and quality are both to the advantage of the farmer.
13. Woollens unchanged, cotton slightly increased; competition decreasing in the prices of hardware.
14. The home market has been most decidedly increased to the advantage of the farmer, in consequence of the beneficial action of the present Tariff.
15. Yes, it has given diversity of employment, and an increase of 20 per cent, in wages, and thereby retarded emigration, except to Manitoba.
16. It has increased the investment of capital by wealthy farmers, in purchasing the lands of those who are desirous of settling their families on independent homesteads, which they have found in the Prairie Province. 17. Decidedly so.
18. To cancel our Local Legislatures.

*General Remarks:*—We are of the firm opinion that the present Tariff has been a boon to, at least, this Province, in consequence of which, the farmers are most happy and prosperous, more so than at any time of their previous history.

GEORGE SMITH,

Reeve, Sandford, Co. Ontario.

1. It would be to the interest of agriculturalists in Canada to admit any or all kinds of American farm produce free of duty, because the Dominion must be thereby benefited, and whatever is in the interest of Canada, must, on the whole, benefit the Canadian farmer,

2. The effect of the imposition of a duty on American Indian corn has been to enhance the price of that article and to improve any intolerable burden, especially on the people of Nova Scotia.
3. The same answer as given to the last question only with much more emphasis.
4. It has been to increase their price. 5. No doubt their increased duties have improved the market price of horses and other live stock to the seller, as the expense of a tax and a burden upon the purchaser.
6. These animals are not raised here for exportation to either country.
7. The importation of American Indian corn is absolutely necessary here, for the Dominion does not produce enough for home consumption.
8. It is not improved here. 9. Yes. No. 10. No effect in this county at present.
11. I cannot answer. 12. The cost has increased and the quality not as good. Scythes, rakes, ploughs, forks; material not as good.
13. The price of cotton and hardware in common use amongst farmers is undoubtedly increased, cotton at least 2 cents per yard.
14. The home market has been increased, I will not say improved, but has proved a great burden upon the people of Nova Scotia.
15. It has not had this effect in Nova Scotia, but has stimulated emigration, and encouraged Canadians to remain away from this Province.
16. Real estate was never lower than at the present time, because all the young men are leaving the country to seek employment in the United States.
17. Their condition since that period has been rendered worse, chiefly on account of the National Policy.
18. (1.) Make Canada a cheap country to live in. (2.) Legislate so that Canadian commerce may be increased. (3.) Impose a Tariff on the luxuries of life for the purpose of raising a revenue only. (4.) Admit raw material free of duty for manufacturing purposes; and the staff of life should be absolutely free of all duties.

ALEXANDER WATSON,  
Farmer, Barrington, Co. Shelburne.

1. I think not, except when they would reciprocate with us.
2. I cannot say that it has any effect, for we never import these cereals here to my knowledge.
3. I do not think that it had the least effect on the price of flour, for flour never was so low here as immediately after the imposition of the duties.
4. I could not tell you. 5. I think it will do so now, for there are parties here contemplating taking some of our horses out to the Canadian North-West.
6. The principal sale of horses here is to supply a local demand, and a few of them are sent to the United States.
7. Certainly he can, for I believe it would not pay to import for that purpose, even if on the free list.
8. I do not think it has, because we export a considerable surplus of these articles.
9. He certainly would be greatly benefited by Reciprocity. That we are in a better position to negotiate a treaty with the present Tariff, admits of no doubt.
10. Wool appears to be a little higher and in more demand. 11. I cannot say.
12. The cost of farm implements has decreased, I would say 10 or 15 per cent., and better in quality. Mowers and reapers, ploughs and harrows, forks and spades, &c., &c.
13. I would be puzzled to name one article that has increased in price in consequence of the Tariff; on the other hand, every article we buy appears to be a falling off in price.
14. The price of our farm produce is fairly good, but cannot say the Tariff has much or anything to do with it.

15. It has to a small extent, and cannot be otherwise until we have a continuous communication with the railway system of the Dominion.
16. It is difficult to answer this, the great inducements offered by the Federal Government in free farms in the North-West, causing so many farms being put in the market just now, has a considerable effect on the value of farms.
17. Yes, certainly; business is more lively and more business doing. 18. I have no suggestion to make.

*General Remarks:*—I am convinced that the National Policy has done an immense good to the different industries of this Dominion, without pressing unduly on any particular class, and the increased number of factories has the effect of leveling down prices of manufactured goods.

CLEMENT McDONALD,  
Farmer, Clear Springs, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. By no means, under the present trade policy of the American Government.
2. I cannot say, as very little American Indian corn is used in this locality.
3. The price of wheat and flour this year is somewhat higher than usual owing to a partial failure of the wheat crop last year. I do not think the duty has anything to do with it.
4. I cannot say what the effect of the increase of duty on the above specified articles may have been, but the price of pork has risen 50 per cent. in the market these last two years. 5. I cannot say.
6. Some of our farmers go in for raising heavy horses for market; others prefer raising sheep and horned cattle. The horses command large prices in the United States and New Brunswick. Our beef goes to the English market, and our sheep to England and the States.
7. We do not want their cornmeal; it would be folly for the farmers of Prince Edward Island to go away up to the Western States and to fetch it here to feed stock. We have our oat crop, and our potato and turnip crop, we can compete with any part of the world.
8. The prices of these products have been raised since the passing of the Tariff.
9. Unquestionably the farmers of the Lower Provinces would be benefited by Reciprocity with the United States. We are in a better position now than before, for this very good reason, we can give as well as take.
10. The price of wool is better since the passing of the Tariff. 11. I do not know; we do not grow those things here. 12. I do not know; I do not think there is any increase.
13. I would just state here that a bushel of wheat, a bushel of oats, or a carcass of pork will buy more goods that are now used in a family than before the present Tariff.
14. I think so. New industries have started up in a great many places which employ a large number of men with families. These take a great deal of their provisions from the farmers who are near at hand and can supply them.
15. I think so, the bad times two or three years ago reduced many to almost beggary, and numbers went to the States and elsewhere, but since the revival of trade the emigration to the States has ceased.
16. The price of real estate has not raised in value since the return to prosperity, owing, I should say, principally to a great number of people from this locality removing to the North-West.
17. Yes, people are getting their debts paid, and the general gloom and mistrust of the past has given place to confidence and hope for the future.
18. The Legislature might do much in reducing the cost of farmers taking their produce to market, such as lowering the Railroad Tariff, and deepening our harbours.

*General Remarks:*—Do try and get our harbour deepened.

THOMAS MACNEILL,  
Farmer, Alberton, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

1. No, it would not. 2. It has given us the home market for our oats and barley; the only grains grown here for export.
3. The duty on wheat and flour has had a tendency to raise the price.
4. Increased the price. 5. Yes. 6. I do, heavy draught horses; but not more so than sheep. The principal market is the United States.
7. He can; it does not pay to import corn for feeding stock. 8. It is.
9. He would. I believe we are in a much better position now, than when produce was admitted free. 10. Wool is higher.
11. It induces the farmer to grow flax and tobacco. 12. Reapers, mowers, rakes, ploughs, seed-sowers, are cheaper, and the quality is just as good.
13. Just as cheap as before. 14. The Tariff has shut out produce from the United States, and we have the home market to ourselves. 15. It has.
16. Farming pays well at present, consequently farms have increased in value.
17. Yes, certainly improved since 1878. 18. Legislation is satisfactory to the general farmer.

*General Remarks:*—Farmers are fairly prosperous, and look forward with confidence to the future. Money never was more plentiful than now, nor was interest lower since we entered Confederation. Reciprocity with the United States is very desirable, if it can be obtained on equitable terms, not otherwise.

NELSON HOWATT,

Farmer, North St. Eleanors, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

1. No, we want no American produce here that I know of.
2. It has not affected us any. 3. The price of flour is not affected by the duty.
4. The prices are higher, as we now have good markets in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. 5. No visible difference here.
6. Yes, farmers who raise good horses find it as profitable as any other stock. United States.
7. Yes, we feed on oats, turnips and potatoes, our staple products. We never imported any American corn to any extent, it would not pay. 8. Not here.
9. Yes, for us. We would have a better market for our potatoes and other products. Yes, it is now more to the interest of the Americans to reciprocate with us. 10. It made no difference.
11. It affects us nothing, as we scarcely raise any of them.
12. It is increased. We still use the American implements, such as forks and rakes, and they are made of better material, especially the wood.
13. They are mostly all cheaper than they were.
14. It has. We have good markets still for our products, whilst some of them are improved by protection, as in the case of pork.
15. No, we have no manufactures here.
16. There is, although at present owing to the Prince Edward Island Bank failure and the Manitoba fever, it is not so great. Prices of farms are up since 1878. Farms make fair returns on money invested.
17. The condition of the farmers is much better; labourers are few. 18. No answer.

D. A. McLEOD,

Belfast, Co. Queen's, P.E.I.

1. It would not be the interest of agriculturalists to admit any farm produce free.
2. As we never imported any coarse grain, except a little corn, the duty has not affected us much.
3. We raise only spring wheat; the duty on flour has given us our own market; before we could not sell sometimes on account of flour coming in from Boston at a low freight as return cargoes.

4. So far as this Island is concerned, we export pork largely. I am not aware that we import any.
5. So far as the North-West is concerned, I have not the means of knowing; we never imported any stock from the States; we have exported largely there.
6. I do not consider it so profitable to breed horses as other stock; our principal market is the United States, we export largely there.
7. I consider it is more profitable to raise our own grain for feeding purposes than to import it. 8. I believe it has by increasing the home demand.
9. I have been of the opinion for some years, that a Reciprocity Treaty would be an injury, as it would encourage the growth of a large breadth of oats, and shipping in the raw state would deteriorate our soil, instead of feeding to stock, thereby returning to the soil what was taken from it.
10. I cannot say positively, I suppose the home manufacture will help it.
11. We cultivate no tobacco nor sugar beet, and very little flax.
12. We get all farm implements cheaper and better quality. Mowing machiues, rakes, harrows, seeders and smaller tools, there is no denying this.
13. All woollen and cotton goods are cheaper under the present Tariff, so far as I am aware. Notably tweeds, wineceys and worsteds.
14. The home market for all kinds of produce has been improved, first by the duty on flour; second by the encouragement of home manufacture, and the employment of more men at higher wages.
15. Very few manufactories on the Island. The Tariff has helped what we have.
16. The price of farming lands has risen in value since 1878, in consequence of better times. 17. In general it has, especially the labouring classes.
18. In my opinion no change is required.

*General Remarks:*—I am not in favour of a Reciprocity Treaty with the States, as I think Great Britain is our best market. We should feed more of our coarse grains to fattening stock, so as to make more manure, to keep up the fertility of our soil, instead of exporting them to the States, as we did under Reciprocity,

WILLIAM M. N. SIMPSON, J. P.,

Hamilton, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

1. No. 2. The effect is good if the farmers would give their attention to the production of coarse grain instead of so much wheat feed on the farm, their profits would be greater and their farms would improve in quality.
3. It has produced more local demand and the manufacturing of our surplus to a greater extent than usual before exporting.
4. The price is increased since the duty was imposed. These articles cannot be produced in Canada for the same cost as in the United States where corn is so cheaply produced. 5. Yes. 6. Yes, compare favourably. Divided.
7. He can. 8. Yes it is, and the more industries that open up in our country the more demand there will be for such articles.
9. We are better as at present until our manufactories are built up to compete in the markets of the world, and most assuredly we are in a better position to negotiate with our neighbours for anything than prior to the present Tariff.
10. A good effect by putting our own wool into home consumption.
11. None of these cultivated in this section. 12. The cost is decreased, and the quality much improved from competition. Nearly all.
13. Many decreased, none increased. 14. There is a good demand for all kinds of farm produce, and good prices. The Tariff must have something to do with it inasmuch as they work well together.
15. Most decidedly. 16. Good farming land holds its value well, but the tendency for investment at present is almost exclusively for lands in the North-West.

17. Yes, very much indeed. 18. Less machinery, we do not want so many Parliaments, nor so many County Councillors. "Rep. by Pop." has brought a sorrowful day for us in Canada.

J. R. STEPHENSON, Reeve, }  
 ANGUS EGO, Clerk, } Georgina, Co. York.

1. No. Simply because the American people would flood our markets with that which we want to supply ourselves, but if their duty on all was cancelled, then an equal basis would prevail, probably a little in our favour on grain.
2. Enabled us to consume our own production, and caused less fluctuations in markets.
3. As to this section of country little or no wheat is produced, over and above home consumption, and in prices for western flour there is no increase visible.
4. It has enabled our farmers to get better prices for hogs and prevented American pork flooding our markets.
5. Even with the increased duties, prices are well maintained and are higher.
6. Breeding horses is profitable, and the principal market is the United States.
7. He can, and can do so cheaper than to import corn. 8. No effect in this section except poultry.
9. He certainly would, and not to have a retaliatory Tariff would be disaster to Canadian farmers, so that the position is better now than when admitted free. 10. It has increased its value.
11. Don't grow to sell. Each farmer uses flax and tobacco for his own purpose.
12. There has been no increase and the quality of home production is fully maintained. 13. Not visible here.
14. It has. As we are on an equal basis with our neighbours, and we cannot be flooded, but consume our production, if no Tariff, where would the 50 to 75,000 bush. of oats now going from here to Manitoba go from. Answer: Chicago.
15. Yes. Most decidedly, labourers wages 50 per cent., and has retarded emigration to the States.
16. Most decidedly, farming land has increased 200 per cent., all sales are principally cash, for the reason capitalists are seeking investments.
17. Yes, decidedly. All get their cash and I say are fully 100 per cent. better.
18. None, so long as the present Protective Tariff exists.

THOS. McDONELL,  
 Agricultural Secretary, Williamstown, Co. Glengarry.

1. Corn should be admitted for feeding. It makes no difference to farmers whether other grains are admitted free or not.
2. To cramp the farmer in fattening stock for the English market by making corn dearer. It has not affected the price of other grains.
3. None. 4. None. 5. No, all horses raised here are sold in the States.
6. It is profitable to raise horses. The United States is our principal market.
7. We can't raise corn in this section profitably. American corn should be admitted.
8. No, towns all going back. 9. Yes. Can't say.
10. No effect on the quantity we sell. 11. Don't know.
12. They would be cheaper but for the Tariff. 13. Yes, my wife says she has to pay more for all of them. 14. No, but reduced by filling the towns.
15. No. More left for United States during last two years than ever before.
16. The value of farm lands has decreased in this place 25 per cent. within the last three or four years.
17. The general condition of farmers is better this last year owing to good crops.

18. Let the farmers buy where they can buy cheapest, and don't compel them to subscribe to enrich the manufacturers. You tax everything they have to buy, and can't give them any better price for what they have to sell. If you can't have Free Trade get as near it as you can.

WILLIAM YOUNG,

Farmer, Co. Huron.

1. It would favour farmers to get corn duty free, they could feed the corn to cattle and sell their pease both to America and Great Britain.
2. It has entirely stopped the importation of corn here; oats are about the same price; no rye and very little corn raised here; I think barley has been as high this year as ever it was, with the exception of one year; peas I think have been higher.
3. The effect has been to cheapen both flour and wheat; little spring wheat grown here now; fall wheat lower in comparison with western markets.
4. No answer. 5. Until last year horses were very cheap, this last winter they have been 50 per cent. higher than they have been since the county has been settled.
6. It is profitable to breed heavy horses now, they being most in demand; the raising of horses to a limited extent compares favourably with other stock and produce. The United States seems the destination of most of the horses bought here. Most of the settlers for Manitoba, however, that have horses, have been taking them with them this spring.
7. I believe it would pay well to import American corn to feed here, provided the duty was taken off it; it would be the cheapest way to get our manure pile enlarged. 8. I don't know.
9. Yes, it would come good I believe any time. 10. Long coarse wool raised here has been cheap and duller of sale. 11. None raised here.
12. The cost of implements is higher. Machinery for horse power is better made, lighter and higher in price.
13. Cottons are if anything higher, and coarse woollen goods are if anything higher.
14. I do not think it has, wheat has been lower in comparison with the United States markets; barley and peas have been as high as formerly.
15. There has been a great emigration from here, mostly to Dakota and some to Michigan; this spring a good many have gone to Manitoba; none returned.
16. About a fourth of the people here would sell out if they could; decreased about 20 per cent., and 30 per cent. on the poorer; lots discontented with their condition this year; labour about one-third higher.
17. With the well-doing it has, that is, those who own the land, tenants and labourers are no better off.
18. I fear very many, judging from the past career of the present Government. It would be little use offering any suggestions, as it seems they they have had the interests of the manufacturers in view more than the agricultural or labouring classes.

*General Remarks:*—There is a want here of men to work on the farm, ditching, fencing, &c., &c.; also of men with money to buy out those that are anxious to sell, as they are a great drag to the well-being of a settlement. The people here are preparing to go more into cattle and sheep feeding, a great drawback is the winter, the (two last) killing the clover, the best remedy for which would be tile draining, as most of the land of this county is what is called heavy. We would like to see the duty off coal—wood all gone here through bush fires.

DAVID HENDERSON,

Reeve, Kincardine, Co. Bruce.

1. We do not think we should admit any American produce against our own.
2. We consider the price of grains mentioned in this number a better price now, than they have been for a long time. The impetus given to the lumbermen under the National Policy has risen the price of oats especially.
3. Flour is now at a steady price, and farmers are sure of the price of their wheat which they were not before. It was up one day and down next according to American speculation. This applies to all wheat.
4. We have not had, at any time much experience in these articles, but we who have them to sell are satisfied with the price and labourers and consumers also. They say they are now able to buy on account of increased labour and wages. We do not wish to change the policy on these.
5. Since a home market was opened we notice a marked improvement in the price of horses and cattle. We want a strong active opposition to American speculators.
6. We find that raising horses compares favourably with other stock. We cannot say which is our principal market, but the home market has raised the price of horses considerably.
7. We can and always have raised profitably all our own grains especially since American corn has been stopped. We consider the importation of American corn would be detrimental to our oats and other grains.
8. We cannot say having no experience. Our section of the country is more adapted to grazing than to anything else especially for fattening purposes.
9. We consider a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would make Canada a granary for the United States. As to the latter we cannot say.
10. We have no experience. We sell our sheep alive. 11. We raise none.
12. Farm implements cost a trifle more but the increased quality more than compensates. Ploughs, harrows, thrashing machines, forks and scythes, spades and hoes in particular. 13. We cannot notice any difference.
14. Increased. We now sell to our own merchants at the same price for which we before had to buy from the American speculator.
15. We have a marked difference in employment since the operation of the Tariff. We do not see so many of our young men going to the United States, but see some coming home.
16. Ours is not an agricultural section of the country, so we cannot say.
17. Most decidedly. In what little farming we do we notice a marked improvement.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—Having laid the matter before the Council composed of "two Conservatives" and "three Reformers," the annexed is our report: We wish all speed to the National Policy and assure a stronger support than at the last election.

JAMES TAYLOR,

Farmer and Reeve, Kirkfield, Co. Victoria.

1. It would be to our interest to have it free, as the duty on all our supplies that we cannot produce is high; our millers get the wheat and oats about free under bond regulations; barley and pease are seldom brought here.
2. It has raised the price on pease and oats, but that would be more than made up in the privilege of having corn free for feeding; we are not benefited in barley as it does not come in here.
3. I will have to class wheat as one that has not been benefited by the National Policy, so that if any one is benefited it is the miller.
4. I do not see any effect, as the price is as high on the other side as it is here; we are all governed by the British market to a great extent.
5. The Americans do not send their horses here; we are selling them many of our best horses, and we lose the amount of duty they pay; they need more horses there than they can produce.

6. At present, the lower class of horses we send to Manitoba, but the best we send to the Americans. I think there is more profit in growing cattle at present to supply the foreign market; it would be better still if we could get the corn free. 7. It would pay better to import corn.
8. I think not; before the present duty was put on the Americans were in our markets buying all those named here.
9. I think we would be benefited by Reciprocity. I think if there is any difference we are in a better position now.
10. It has reduced our wool, I think. I never knew it so low as in the last two years.
11. There is not enough of either grown in this section for to form much of an idea; the tobacco is like corn, there is but a very small belt of our country where it will be profitable to grow it to any extent.
12. I think the price has increased somewhat, as they cost the manufacturer more than they did before the present duty was put on. I think they are making them lighter.
13. They have increased in price. When I am buying those articles that are named, if I say they are high, the merchant tells me every time that the duty is so high that he cannot sell as he could if the duty were off. I was buying a carpet a few days since, the merchant said that he paid 40 per cent duty on it, and I paid it. He said I could thank the National Policy for that 40 per cent.
14. I think it has; the cause is feeding cattle for the foreign markets.
15. As far as I know, the tide has increased; our population is still flowing to the United States, and very few are returning; the tide has turned to Manitoba, now the complaint is that their supplies are so high that they cannot live here as well as they can over there.
16. No, there appears to be a feeling to get rid of farms. I don't think they have increased in value, save the improvements. I think the reason is the farmer feels that he is not protected, while the manufacturer is highly protected to the farmer's prejudice.
17. If they are, it is by their industry, frugality and better crops. This is as true a statement as I can give under the circumstances; the question is asked in such a way that when I answer it does not give the information needed. We pay this heavy duty on every article we use, on all those that we cannot produce.
18. I think if there could be some legislation that would place the farmers of the country in a fair position with those monopolies; we think that almost whatever is done, is done with a single eye to the manufacturers' interest; at present farmers have to put up with it, and the Legislature says to bear our burden, no matter how heavy, we will build a manufacturers' monopoly. We are paying a heavy duty on all we buy and the protection does not reach us except in that way. They say that it will be better by-and-by. I have been trying to farm for forty-three years, I have removed the forest and brought it into cultivation, and now they say to me you must build up this country or the various monopolies. These good signs in the future are very much like the sick man and the doctor, when the doctor was saying to him "that his symptoms was all good," "Well" he replied, "it may be so, but I think they will kill me."

CHARLES HEDGERS,  
Reeve, Kanelagh, Co. Brant.

1. Only on the ground of reciprocal trade. 2. I cannot definitely say, but I am quite certain it has had the effect of increasing the prices of the coarse grains.
3. I think the Tariff has had very little effect on the prices of wheat or flour.
4. I think the duty has increased the price of hogs and their products generally.
5. I do not think the duties have had much effect on the price of horses. I believe there are more horses sold in our vicinity for the American market than for the North-West.

6. I believe the best breed of horses pays better than any other stock, but poor breeds not so well—more especially if not well fed and cared for.
7. If it would pay the Canadian farmer to import corn to fatten his stock, I think it would pay him better to remove to where corn can be had for half the price. I do not think there can be any profit in feeding American corn in this country at double price, and selling beef and pork at American prices as we do.
8. In my opinion decidedly so. I have seen the time when these articles would hardly pay for taking to market.
9. I believe we would be benefited by Reciprocity with the Americans, and believe we could make a better bargain with them now, than in years past.
10. I do not think the Tariff has increased the price of wool, nor will, until we manufacture more woollen goods. 11. I cannot say.
12. In some instances the cost may be increased a little, but on the whole I think the country is benefited thereby, and that the quality is as good. I cannot specify the articles.
13. I am not a good judge; but cannot think the Tariff has had any material effect on the prices of such goods.
14. Yes. By the greater home consumption of farm produce at home, and by the manufacturing classes.
15. I don't think the Tariff has had a great effect in changing emigration to the United States, but I think it has increased foreign emigration to this country, and increased the population, especially of the manufacturing classes.
16. On account of so many leaving this section for Manitoba, the North-West and United States. I don't think farm property has increased in value, but rather the reverse.
17. Yes; very materially; times are much better for the classes referred to. I do not think, however, that the change in times has been caused altogether by the increase of the Tariff.
18. Reciprocity if possible with the United States.

*General Remarks*:—I lived in the United States when a small boy, and have seen good wheat sold in the (then town) city of Auburn, N. Y. State, for 37 cents per bushel, when at the same time the cheapest English iron was \$5 per 100 lbs. Woollen goods and other imported articles in the same proportion. In five years after the high duty was levied by Americans, the same quality of iron could be bought for \$3.50 per 100 lbs. Woollen goods came down materially, although wool went up in price. I read Horace Greely's history of the effects of Tariffs, and satisfied myself that that country benefited largely by increasing the Tariff.

JOHN DOBBIN, J. P.,

Ex-Reeve, Garrafraxa, Co. Wellington.

1. No. 2. It has had the effect of stimulating the increased cultivation of corn, oats, rye, barley and pease, with a uniform increased average price.
3. It has enhanced the price of spring wheat, and thus increased its cultivation. It has given additional home market for both spring and fall wheat.
4. It has driven the American pork, to a large extent, from our markets, and increased the price of pork of the farmers, but has left an immense amount of money which has been paid to our farmers in the country.
5. Yes; horses and cattle were never so high before 1878, as at present.
6. It is profitable to breed horses of 1,400 pounds weight, but not as profitable as cattle, which will produce quicker returns to the farmer. Both, but more particularly in Manitoba. 7. He can raise all he wants by judicious management, and thus prevent the drain of money out of the country.
8. Yes. 9. Yes; we occupy now a favourable position to negotiate a Treaty. It was very disastrous to our farmers and manufacturers during the Hon. Mr.

- Mackenzie's administration, which allowed the Canadians to become serfs of the United States, and contribute largely to pay their war debt.
10. It has not affected the price to any extent. 11. To stimulate their cultivation and price, there should not be any restriction on the cultivation of tobacco, as Canada should be able to raise her own flax, tobacco and sugar-beet.
  12. The farm implements are greatly reduced in price and the quality greatly increased, with desirable improvements, such as reapers, mowers, thrashing machines, ploughs, &c., &c., since 1878.
  13. They are greatly reduced. 14. Yes; by the exclusion of American produce.
  15. Yes. Yes. 16. Yes; farms have slightly increased, but were it not for the reaction of the North-West Territory, the increase would be far greater, because people will not buy land when they can get it in Manitoba for almost nothing.
  17. Yes; they have been able to pay their mortgages and thus reduce the rate by less demand for money.
  18. To continue the National Policy, which will foster our native industries and thus increase the demand for labour and give an increased local market to all farm products.

*General Remarks* :—Since 1878, the Milton grain and feed stores and grist mills are supplied wholly by Canadian grain instead of American, with the exception of a few car loads of corn. I have had a direct interest in farming since 1860, and have purchased coarse grains largely for my farm, and I know that the prices have been increased and more uniform since 1878, and now there is not any American grain in Milton, which was formerly supplied by American corn and oats.

CLARKSON FREEMAN,

Physician and Surgeon, Milton, Co. Halton.

1. It would, as we import no grain unless for the consumption of farmers themselves. 2. None. Oats, rye, corn, barley and pease are as low or lower now than they were in 1878.
3. To raise the price of flour by almost the amount of duty. In regard to wheat the American market has been higher than the Canadian market since 1878.
4. The effect of the increased duties on hogs has not been to raise the price. The effect on hams, bacon and lard has been to raise the price to consumers.
5. No certainly not, as all our best horses go to the American market, and they pay the best prices. 6. Yes, we can get \$200 for a four year old horse and our principal market is the United States.
7. It will pay better to import corn if you live near the railroad. 8. No.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would benefit Canadian farmers. As our taxes hurt ourselves and not the Americans, it is plain that the National Policy has not put us in a more favourable position for negotiating a Treaty.
10. Nothing at all. 11. To raise the price in every instance.
12. The price of farm implements has increased. Mowers, reapers and seed drills.
13. They are. Tweeds are taxed 50 per cent., and the imported tweeds sell along side the home made, showing plainly that the tax operates in all cases alike. Hardware has increased in price.
14. No. It has driven more people out than it has brought in. 15. No; emigration to Dakota never was so large as in 1880 and 1881. 16. No. Farm lands have decreased since 1878 by 20 per cent. 17. Yes, thanks, to two good harvests and good crops. 18. A return to a Revenue Tariff.

CHARLES GIRVIN, SEN.,

Reeve, West Wawanosh, Co. Huron.

1 to 18. No answers.

*General Remarks*:—Dalton being annexed to Carden for municipal purposes we can only give the same answers as are given for Carden. One of the Council is from Dalton and he endorses the same. For answers consult Carden, and you will get them.

JAMES TAYLOR,

Reeve, Carden and Dalton, Co. Victoria.

1. No. 2. To raise the price of oats, barley and pease. We grow no corn or rye in our section, so the duty does not affect the price of corn or rye.
3. It does not affect the price of wheat, as we do not import any, but it gives us a better quality of flour, as flour of an inferior quality used to be shipped from Chicago to Owen Sound.
4. It has raised the price of green pork to the farmer, and as we cure our own bacon it does not affect us in that line. 5. It has.
6. In our section it pays better to raise cattle than horses. The States has been the principal market for horses this winter. 7 and 8. Yes.
9. He would. We are now in a better position to negotiate a Treaty than before, from the fact that before the present Tariff Americans had nearly all they would get under a Treaty. Now they have to pay for the privilege of selling in our markets, which is right. 10. No answer.
11. It don't affect us directly, but by forming those industries it will give us a better home market. 12. Decreased; quality as good; all implements, but especially ploughs, reaping and mowing machines. 13. Not increased.
14. It has, by encouraging new industries, thereby giving more employment, and consequently increasing the population. 15. Decidedly it has.
16. In our section farm property has decreased owing to people going to the North-West. 17. Yes. 18. By trying to effect a Treaty with the United States, so that we can have free markets with both countries.

*General Remarks*:—People are well satisfied with the present Tariff, except a few extreme Grits. A great many Reformers will vote National Policy next election.

JAMES ALLAN,

Councillor, Varney, Co. Grey.

1. I do not think it would make much difference whether Canada admitted American farm produce free or not (corn excepted.) We produce more of nearly all kinds of farms produce than we require for home consumption, and so long as we do so, it is evident we cannot be benefited by a Protective Tariff.
2. A loss and inconvenience to farmers. If farmers could import corn cheaply, they could fatten their own stock at a profit instead of shipping their cattle in poor condition to be fattened by the Americans, and also sell their oats and barley at a profit. Rye and corn not much grown here.
3. Have not noticed much difference. When the price of all kinds of wheat is high in the States and Great Britain, it is high here as formerly.
4. Same as No. 3. 5. They have not, we have always had the home market; but now, as before 1878, our best market is the Eastern States. A few inferior animals go to Manitoba, chiefly with settlers.
6. It pays well to breed heavy draught horses. The profits compare favourably with those from raising other kinds of stock, especially if first-class animals are raised. Principal market in the United States.
7. All except corn, which is not a sure crop here. It would certainly pay better, or it would not be imported and used.

8. Not improved so far as I know. Eggs and butter are largely exported to the United States from this locality, and the price could not be affected by a Protective Tariff of 1,000 per cent.
9. He would, as it would increase the price of nearly all kinds of farm produce by the amount of the American duty on the article. I cannot give the opinion of the authorities at Washington on this subject. Perhaps it would be advisable for the Government to test the point by opening negotiations with the Americans. 10. I have noticed nothing of importance, but that the wool market has fallen very much since 1878.
11. I have noticed no effect on flax. The price is low in the United States at present, and correspondingly low here. No flax will be grown in this township the coming season, and the two flax mills will be idle for the want of a market and paying prices for flax. No tobacco and sugar-beet grown.
12. Have not noticed much difference. 13. Not much difference on cottons and woollens. Some articles of hardware have increased by amount of duty on the article. 14. It has not.
15. It has not, except perhaps in some of the large cities, while the villages and towns have suffered a loss both in population and business activity.
16. No. Farm property has fallen in value about 15 per cent. since 1878, on account of the exodus to Dakota, Michigan and Manitoba, making the number of farms in the market greater than the demand, and farming being more profitable in the United States. 17. It is when the crops are good.
18. I do not know if legislation can do much for the farmers, unless the Government can afford to take the duty off all the articles he has to buy for the use of his family and farm, and at the same time can induce the Americans to take the duty off all the different articles of produce he has to sell. Then with good crops, farming would become a most desirable and profitable occupation.

GEO. BUCHANAN,

Reeve, Hay, Zurich, Co. Huron.

1. No. 2. It helps to raise those grains here. 3. It raises wheat here of all kinds just the duty imposed. 4. It raised this article about 3 cents per lb.
5. About 20 per cent of a raise on horses. 6. Very profitable, more so than any other stock. Mostly Manitoba.
7. He can raise enough with profit. 8. I cannot say. 9. No. 10. I cannot say.
11. It encouraged it. 12. They are decreased and the quality as good.
13. There is not much change. 14. Yes, it has increased.
15. Far better employment now. 16. There is an increase. 17. Yes.
18. Encourage industrial establishments, also money to carry them on.

*General Remarks*:—We want industries of some kind, nothing but agriculture alone here.

THOMAS ROCHE,

Clerk, Brudenell, Co. Renfrew.

1. In my opinion it would not. 2. I don't know that it has made any material difference in the price of these grains during the time of the N.P., except corn, which I think has somewhat advanced in price; the other grains are higher this year, but I think it is owing to the scarcity. 3. As for wheat and flour it has been beneficial, or, in other words, they are higher in price. 4. Most decidedly beneficial.
5. I cannot say as to this. 6. It is. The market in this section is the United States. 7. This section is more a dairy section, very few cattle fattened.
8. The market for these articles is fluctuating, but upon the whole I think the market has been better.

9. I think we are in a better position for Reciprocity now than we were before the present Tariff. 10. I cannot answer this. 11. I don't know.  
 12. I don't think the prices have increased, and I think mowers, ploughs, harrows, and farm implements are equally as good.  
 13. Cottons have, I think, increased; woollen goods have not. 14. Yes, I think it has. 15. I am not prepared to answer this question.  
 16. Yes. Yes, increasing. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—I have consulted some of the farmers in this section and they agree with my answers.

A. D. MEIGS,

Mayor, Stanbridge, Co. Missisquoi.

1. Decidedly not. 2. It has increased the price of oats, rye, corn, barley and pease.  
 3. It has increased the price of spring wheat very much, it has also raised the price of fall wheat. 4. Thirty per cent. better prices. 5. Yes.  
 6. We find it profitable to breed horses. Principal market Western States.  
 7. We can raise all the coarse grain we want, it pays as well as wheat. 8. I think so.  
 9. Would like Reciprocity. Think we are independent of the United States, and in a better position to negotiate. 10. But slight, none manufactured at home.  
 11. But little sown here. 12. We think that the quality is better, prices no higher.  
 13. No increase in price; woollens and cottons are better. 14. Yes. 15. Very much. 16. Yes. 17. Fifty per cent. improved. 18. Stick to the National Policy.

JAMES EDGE,

Treasurer, Edge Hill, Co. Grey.

1. It would not. Corn can be grown profitably in western Canada, also oats.  
 2. It has raised their value. Rye is exported to Europe and not affected; oats are raised usually, but not the peas. Barley is only brought in to mix?  
 3. In this section flour is not imported only spring wheat, and that would be reduced by importations. 4. It has raised them all in value.  
 5. It has improved the market especially in light horses.  
 6. Breeding horses is now as profitable or more than any other stock. The United States for heavy horses and Manitoba for ordinary.  
 7. He can grow enough without importation. 8. It is considerably.  
 9. It would. We are in a better position to negotiate with a Tariff.  
 10. Nothing on long wool; lower than ever. 11. None cultivated here.  
 12. Reapers, mowers, ploughs and thrashing machines, about same price and quality.  
 13. Woollens lower; cottons and hardware a shade higher. 14. It has improved by the duty, and by the increased consumption. 15. It has given diversity of employment, and the consequence must be to encourage a return.  
 16. There is. Lands have increased in value. The revenue is increased by population and employment. 17. It is considerably improved.  
 18. Reciprocity is desirable, also the encouragement of a better grade of immigrants and farm labourers.

*General Remarks*:—The Tariff should tend to a discriminating Tariff in favour of Great Britain. Freight is a great burden to the farmers, and the difference between through and local freight per mile very unjust.

E. S. MARTIN,

President, County Agricultural Society, Cayuga, Co. Haldimand.

1. No. 2. We think the price of our coarse grains better. We raise no cotton.
3. We export no flour or wheat, but import flour from the Upper Provinces.
4. We had pork \$7 per cwt.. 5. We have no sales in Manitoba and the North-West.
6. I cannot say whether it is more profitable to raise horses or other stock. Our market is the home or the United States.
7. We can raise all the grain we need. 8. I think so. 9. I could not say.
10. Good. 11. I do not cultivate either. 12. As cheaply as before.
13. I think cost increased on every article. 14. Yes; for every article raised has a ready market.
15. It has neither retarded or increased emigration to the United States.
16. Yes; farm lands always increase in value when there is a demand for farm produce. 17. Yes. 18. I cannot suggest any.

D. MACLEOD,  
County Councillor, Westville, Co. Pictou.

1. No. 2. No effect. 3. Not felt. 4. Not noticeable.
5. No horses raised in this section for exportation to speak of.
6. Beef cattle pay best. 7. Yes, cheaper than American. 8. Most assuredly.
9. I do not think so. Our position is better now. 10. None. 11. Encouraging.
12. Better article for less money. 13. Cheap English woollens may be a little dearer.
14. The coal duty has increased the out-put, and hence the home market is better.
15. Yes. 16. Markets are much better. 17. Without doubt. Yes.
18. Any encouragement given to home manufacture would be beneficial.

PATRICK NEVILLE,  
Bridgeport, Co. Cape Breton.

1. In Cape Breton it would, as flour and cornmeal would be cheaper to the extent of the duty. 2. Cornmeal is dearer by 50 cents. 3 to 7. No answer. 8. No
- 9 to 11. No answer. 12. Decreased, but the quality is not near so good. Axes, scythes, rakes, &c.
13. Cottons increased in price about 2 cents per yard. 14. If anything decreased, more especially in beef and butter.
15. There never has been a larger emigration to the United States than this year from Cape Breton. 16. None whatever. 17. No. 18. No answer.

JOHN MUNRO,  
Farmer, Boulardarie, Co. Victoria.

1. No, indeed. 2. The price of corn, oats, barley and rye has increased; no pease; not enough duty on corn.
3. Better price for fall wheat; no spring wheat. 4. Higher price for pork, and better encouragement for farmers to raise more.
5. Greatly raised the price. 6. Yes; the profits are about the same. Manitoba.
7. Farmers can raise with good profit all coarse grains for fattening purposes, and a great deal more. No American corn wanted.
8. Very little change. 9. A reciprocity Treaty would surely benefit the farmers. Our chances are better under the National Policy. 10. Good enough.
11. More tobacco raised; no flax and no sugar beet.
12. All farming implements are better and cheaper under the present Tariff.
13. No difference. 14. Yes, greatly improved through the National Policy.
15. Yes, and very nearly stopped emigration to the United States.

16. A great one. Farm lands largely increased in value; higher prices being obtained for farm produce through the National Policy.  
 17. Immensely improved. 18. Trust the present Government.

JOHN B. CADA,

Deputy Reeve, Pike Creek, Co. Essex.

1. It would not be in the interest of the Canadian farmer to admit American farm produce free, with possibly the exception of corn, which can be fed profitably to stock, when pease and barley are high, as is the case at present.
2. The duty has raised the price of corn and possibly oats; rye is not grown here to any extent; the Tariff has had no effect on the price of barley, as the American market rules that; pease have been advanced in price.
3. I can't see that the Tariff has had any effect on the price of wheat, as the miller will not give any more than the shipper of wheat in bulk to the British markets; can't say as to flour.
4. Can't positively state, but I think advantageous. 5. Yes.
6. I think Ontario well adapted for raising a superior class of horses, and they should be raised with profit. The United States is the best market for the most expensive class of horses.
7. In a county like Wellington where feeding is largely practised, and in years like the present when barley and pease are high, and no corn can be grown here, I think corn under certain restrictions should be admitted free.
8. The Tariff has not been long enough in existence to have had any very material effect upon this class of farm produce.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would be highly beneficial. The Tariff gives us a decided advantage to negotiating a new Treaty.
10. It has had no effect whatever on the price of wool. 11. A beneficial effect on flax; no sugar beet or tobacco grown here. 12. I think farm implements of all kinds are cheaper now than a few years ago, and are also of superior quality.
13. No material increase of price in any of these articles.
14. I think the home market has been improved by the Tariff, the bulk of the supplies for Manitoba and the North-West has now to be purchased in Ontario.
15. Yes. 16. The exodus to Manitoba has had a bad effect on our real estate, and although improved farm property sells more readily, no material rise in price has taken place.
17. Most undoubtedly improved. 18. Such legislation as would place the farmer in the same position as the manufacturer, that is, if he is feeding cattle for the British market, a rebate equivalent to the duty upon any raw material imported by him, such as corn, oil cake, &c.

*General Remarks*:—Under our system of Government we have far too many governing bodies, and too many paid officials in proportion to the population.

JOHN MCGOWAN,

Farmer, Alma, Co. Wellington.

- 1 and 2. But a small quantity of corn is grown in this Province, and is used largely for feeding purposes; the duty is an injury. Price of oats and other coarse grains are ruled by the quantity exported and the demand for lumbering purposes; the duty is no benefit.
3. It has increased the price of flour in New Brunswick without any corresponding benefit. 4. The extra duty on dried hams, bacon and lard is offset by the duty on corn and meal.

5. No. Horses are largely exported to the United States. 6. The principal market is the United States. 7. It would pay to import Indian corn if it were not for the duty.
8. No, as these articles are chiefly exported not imported we receive no benefit; ruled by supply and demand. 9. Yes. Cannot say as to position.
10. No effect, ruled by foreign markets. 11. Cannot say. 12. Increased as a whole.
13. All these are increased by the present Tariff. 14. No.
15. No. Although wages have increased, caused by more extensive lumber operations, a larger number of labouring men are leaving the country thereby making a scarcity in the labour market.
16. No, a decrease. The people are leaving the country. 17. Not by the Tariff.
18. A Revenue Tariff and Reciprocity with the United States.
- General Remarks*:—Farmers in this Province derive no benefit from the increased Tariff.

JOHN DUNN,

Musquash, Co. St. John.

1. None. Because they tax our produce. 2. The duty on American corn has stimulated our farmers to raise more grain such as oats, rye, corn, barley, peas, &c.
3. It is to the interest of our farmers to pay more attention to the raising of wheat. The imposition of a duty has not enhanced the value of flour.
4. The duties on live hogs and on all cured pork has stimulated our farmers, and made it better for them than under the old Tariff.
5. I am not in a position to give an opinion, having no trade here.
6. There is not sufficient trade in horses to justify my giving an opinion.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all grain with the exception of American corn profitably. To the latter I should say it was questionable. 8. Very much so.
9. We are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty than with the present Tariff than when American produce was admitted free.
10. It has increased the value of wool, consequently made it better for our farmers keeping sheep, owing to our local wool factories.
11. None raised in this section of the country. 12. Agricultural implements are no dearer than under Mackenzie's Government; some, for instance, mowing machines, are much lower, and as our manufactories increase will be still lower.
13. No increase in price to consumers of any of the articles by the Tariff. I should say that woollen goods are decidedly cheaper and cotton goods a shade higher, owing to the advance in the price of the raw material.
14. The home market for farm produce has both increased and improved by the operation of the Tariff by keeping the Americans out of our market.
15. Has given decided encouragement to the various industrious classes and checked emigration to the United States, thereby encouraging Canadians to our increasing mills and factories.
16. To the first there is a very increased tendency for the investment of capital in farm property under the present Tariff, and farm lands have very much increased in value since 1878. 17. Very much so.
18. I would not recommend any change in the legislation at present, as it would not have the tendency to make agriculture either more desirable or profitable.

*General Remarks*:—I have framed my replies to the foregoing questions after having carefully consulted the principal farmers and leading men of this vicinity. My own private opinion is much in favour of the present Tariff, and would meet the Americans on their own ground.

ALFRED VIDETE,

President, Agricultural Society and Councillor,

Bridgetown, Co. Annapolis.

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—The list of questions by the Parliamentary Committee as to the effect of the National Policy on the farmers in New Brunswick, has been mislaid, and notwithstanding a diligent search has been made, it has not turned up. But having some knowledge of the general questions of free imports from the United States, I say most decidedly it is not to our advantage to admit American produce free. The duty on cornmeal is a benefit to our farmers inasmuch as more coarse grains are grown in New Brunswick since the National Policy than before; it has also had the effect of keeping Ontario oats out of our market, they being worth more at home from the duty on meal. The price of wheat and flour is not enhanced one red by the duty. It has encouraged the raising of pork and increased the price. In respect to the importation of corn and meal to fatten stock, we can raise all we need for that purpose and a surplus. I have always been in favour of Reciprocal Free Trade with the United States, but not otherwise, and glory in the National Policy, believing its ultimate attainment will be an equitable trade. In respect to the increased duty on our wearables, our clothing is as cheap now as ever it was when trade was brisk and money easy. The price of wool has raised on account of the Tariff on cotton. We have no need of farm implements from abroad, as we can manufacture them in the Dominion as good and very much cheaper than we can import them if the duty was taken off. Home markets for all kinds of farm products are greatly improved by the operations of the Tariff, and farmers are more prosperous and well able to pay the advance on farm labour. The raising of horses for the United States market has always been considered profitable, notwithstanding the Tariff we are met with. We have not sent any to Manitoba as yet. On the whole we are perfectly satisfied with the National Policy.

W. FOWLER,

Hammond Vale, Co. King's, N.B.

1. I should say most certainly not.
2. There has been a better demand and a better price for oats in the Dominion as regards corn, pease, rye and barley, little is grown and none imported.
3. Wheat, to my knowledge, has never been imported from the United States. Whatever flour is imported comes from the Dominion. The price there governs the price here.
4. This question I cannot answer with any certainty. Probably it would.
5. Pork the last season has been a better price, but why, I cannot tell.
6. Horses have increased in value; so have sheep. I suppose a better price and demand throughout the Dominion.
7. We never think of importing grain to feed stock.
8. Last season potatoes and turnips brought high prices, owing, I imagine, to there being a poor crop in other places—not to the Tariff. Eggs bring a higher price, and I believe all go to Boston.
9. No doubt this Island would be wonderfully benefited by Reciprocity with the United States. I would suppose the Americans with the present Tariff would more willingly reciprocate than formerly.
10. Wool has brought a better price; why, I cannot tell.
11. No effect, as we grow none. 12. Generally, I think they cost less. Quality, I think, no different. 13. I cannot say that they have.
14. No perceptible difference, excepting oats and potatoes, which bring a better price in New Brunswick.
15. Formerly young people went to the States. Now, however, I think more go to the Dominion than to the States.

16. I think the Tariff has no effect on the labouring class, as I may say there are no manufacturers here. 17. No difference to my knowledge.  
 18. None that I know of, unless the Legislature could warrant good crops and good prices.

GEORGE COMPTON,  
 Farmer, St. Eleanors, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

1. No, not while a duty is imposed by the United States Government on produce shipped from Canada. 2. It has increased the sale and consequently the price of our own oats and barley.  
 3. I do not think it has made the least difference in price.  
 4. It has had the effect of enhancing value by giving us our own market to sell in.  
 5. I do not see any difference. 6. Horned cattle pay better than horses; the best market for the latter is in the Maritime Provinces.  
 7. We grow all we want and don't want to import any from the United States.  
 8. Can't see any difference. 9. Reciprocity with the United States would be a benefit. I think we are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty by having the present Tariff.  
 10. The Tariff has had the effect of making a home market for all our wool.  
 11. None grown here. 12. There has been no advance in the price of agricultural implements. Under the Tariff they are all made in Canada and are equally as good. 13. I do not know of any increase in any of the articles named; on the contrary a great many of these articles are much lower than formerly.  
 14. No perceptible change. 15. Cannot give a satisfactory answer as we are not a manufacturing community. 16. No change to note.  
 17. Yes, the country is more prosperous now than in any time of its history.  
 18. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

HENRY DAWSON,  
 Farmer, Tryon, Co. Prince, P. E. I.

1. It would not because Indian corn can be produced cheaper in the Western States than pease and other coarse grains can in Canada, and would therefore if allowed in free of duty compete to our disadvantage with Canadian coarse grains.  
 2. Previous to 1878 the highest price for pease in our markets was 50 cents, but we realize from 73 to 75 cents now, hence the imposing of a duty on corn gave us the difference in said figures.  
 3. From the late returns we find that in 1877 we consumed in Canada 5,210,890 more bushels of United States wheat than we did in 1881, shewing that in 1881 we had a home market for 7,302,000 bushels more of home grown wheat than the average for the years 1877-1878; besides we find that during some portions of the present year flour was higher in Toronto than in Chicago, this could not have been the case if wheat was allowed to come in free of duty.  
 4. In the importation of this class of produce the result has been similar to that on corn.  
 5. There has been a lively and increased demand for a class of horses for Manitoba, which heretofore could scarcely find a buyer; this I presume could not occur if American dealers were allowed to flood Manitoba with similar animals free of duty.  
 6. Of late years the breeding of horses has been much more profitable than it was previously chiefly from an increased demand for second and third class animals. Our best horses still go to American markets.

7. I think an ordinary farmer can grow profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock; in addition to this many of them have a surplus of coarse grain after supplying their own demands.
8. I cannot say. 9. I am favourable to Reciprocity, although in my opinion it is very difficult to obtain; and in my opinion can only be obtained, if at all, by the imposition of a heavy Tariff.
10. Cannot say that the price of wool has been affected injuriously or otherwise by the Tariff. 11. Cannot say, as there is very little flax and no tobacco or sugar beet raised in this section.
12. My experience has been that a superior articles, such as reapers, mowers, and ploughs can now be purchased for less money than previous to the imposition of the duty on all agricultural implements.
13. Cannot see any change. 14. Our home market has certainly been improved in so far as it is less a slaughter ground for American surplus produce and manufacturers, and is now as near as can be a market for Canadians.
15. There is certainly more employment and better wages for the various industrial classes; the wages of farm hands has increased at least \$5 per month, and those who are leaving the country are chiefly going to Manitoba.
16. Cannot say there is an increased tendency to invest, owing to the great facilities and inducements in Manitoba. The chief part of idle capital is going in that direction.
17. Most certainly, as the price of produce and wages is higher. 18. Elect fewer lawyers and doctors.

THOMAS McMANUS,  
Farmer, Parker, Co. Wellington

1. No, it would not. 2. The imposition of a duty on American coarse grains has no effect here.
3. The duties imposed on these articles only affected the price of flour.
4. It had no effect here. 5. Yes; I think the increased duty has a good effect.
6. We don't breed many horses here for exportation. The buyers are from the United States and New Brunswick.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain required for fattening his stock.
8. The markets for eggs and butter are improved. 9. Yes, the Canadian farmer would be greatly benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.
10. Price advanced. 11. None. 12. Mowing and reaping machines have decreased, but the quality of all agricultural implements is as good.
13. No increase. 14. The home market for farm produce has been increased, owing to the number of lobster factories.
15. The present Tariff has not done much towards giving employment here.
16. The price of land has increased, because we have no absentee proprietors, and every man can become a freeholder. 17. Yes, they are. 18. Cannot say.

*General Remarks* :—Although a supporter of the Government, I am not pleased with the Government for retaining their political opponents in office against the wishes of their supporters, especially those officials who took an active part in politics as the Preventive Officer for the district of Murray Harbour North had done. This official canvassed against the two Liberal-Conservative candidates and did his best to defeat them.

JOHN JAMIESON,  
Farmer, Sturgeon, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. It would be in the interest of the farmer here to have Free Trade with the United States on the produce of the land. We could interchange our commodities; what comes here does not hurt us.

2. The present Tariff is very much against us here, it has advanced the price of corn, cornmeal and other grains that we import for general use. The Tariff on these is heavily felt in this place.
3. The duties imposed on wheat and flour coming from the United States is very much against us here, because it prevents us from buying in the cheapest market and gives a monopoly to the miller, and it is no benefit to the poor farmer whatever.
4. The duties put on live hogs, pork, or cured and fresh meats is of no benefit to us here, for the simple reason, that we find a good market in the United States for different kinds of fresh meat every year; it is our best market.
5. The duty imposed on live stock coming from the United States is against us here as we could import improved breeds a good deal cheaper than we could get them from the Old Countries, so that the National Policy is against us farmers very much in this.
6. I find that it is profitable to breed a good stock of horses here, because we can find a good market in the United States, and that is the only place that we can find a good market for our horses.
7. It would be cheaper for us to import corn than to produce it ourselves, but the high Tariff imposed by the National Policy is very much against us in fattening our stock; we have to kill our stock before they are half fit for the market and then get a poor price.
8. The price for these things is not improved here by the National Policy; if it were not for the demand in the United States market for our poultry, eggs and butter, that we export largely each year, we would not be able to get along at all.
9. I think that Reciprocity with the United States would be a great benefit to us farmers here. We would be glad to have Free Trade with the United States. I do not think, nor do I believe, that the United States Government can be driven into such a Treaty with Canada by the imposition of the National Policy. But we are the sufferers, not the Americans as many gentlemen imagine.
10. The Tariff on wool is of no benefit to us here whatever; we have got better prices for our wool years before the National Policy was ever heard of than we do now.
11. The duties on these are of no benefit to us whatever, we are not engaged in this enterprise or industry.
12. The cost of farm implements has increased much here on account of the high duties and by the working of the National Policy. Hay forks, rakes and other implements we find better when made in the United States than those we get from the Upper Provinces.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are not as cheap as they were before the National Policy. Shirting that cost 25 cents per yard in 1878 has cost 34 cents per yard in 1882; the duties on all kinds of clothing is from 30 to 60 per cent.
14. The home market for our produce, as a rule, has not increased one cent except potatoes, but no thanks to the National Policy for that. It is the demand in the United States that helps us in this Province and not the National Policy.
15. The high Tariff has done nothing towards improving or relieving the sufferings of the working people in this place. There has been many of our young men and women who left here and went to the United States and will never come back. They began to go in 1880 and 1881.
16. There has been a great decline in the property of the farmer here under the operation of the National Policy of the present Government. There are many of our farmers who would sell out if they could, but they can't. There are a few who sold their farms and went to the United States; there are others who left their farms unsold and went away this spring.
17. They have not improved any by the high Tariff. The National Policy has increased the cost of living and no advance in the wages of the labouring classes of our farmers, and that is one of the reasons that so many are going to the States every year by the effect of the National Policy.

18. The changes that the farmer requires and all others as well in Canada, is in reality an honest Government and a wise legislation, with Free Trade or a light Revenue Tariff. By adopting these principles the public will have nothing to fear.

*General Remarks:*—Now gentlemen, I do not think that protection is a wise legislation for our Government to pursue in a young country like Canada. It will not induce or attract immigrants to come from other countries to settle in our wild lands, and that should be the main object of our Government, to settle our wild lands in all parts of Canada, and to have the hidden resources of the whole country developed. This would be a wise policy in my estimation. And the proper way to do this is by reducing the burdens that bear so heavily upon all classes of the labouring people in this country. When immigrants, that come here from the Old Country, begin to find that the Government has placed such heavy taxes on them, by the operation of the National Policy, will be likely to go to the United States, and that will help to enrich that country to our loss.

DENNIS CONNOLLY,

Farmer and Lumberman, Golden Grove, Simonds, Co. St. John, N.B.

1. Admit none free. 2. It has made sale for our oats and barley.
3. I do not think it has made much difference. 4. It has left us our own market.
5. I see no difference here, but believe in keeping the duty on.
6. Other stock pays better here. New Brunswick. 7. We grow all we want here.
8. The effect is very small, it leaves us our own market.
9. We think we would be benefited. We are in a better position than a one-sided Tariff. 10. It leaves us our own market.
11. We grow none here to export. 12. Not much difference.
13. I think not increased any here. 14. Yes, by shutting out foreign competition.
15. It must have given employment. 16. I do not think the Tariff has any effect.
17. Go to your Savings banks for answer.
18. No change wanted, but make no bad contracts.

JOSIAH HOWATT,

Farmer, Cape Traverse, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

1. I think the admission of American corn free of duty would be advantageous to the Canadian farmer generally, for feeding purposes; with regard to other grains no injury would arise from such admission.
2. The imposition of such duty may have slightly raised the prices of corn and pease, but there is little of the former grown for sale here, and the proportion of the latter grown has been much reduced of late years on account of the ravage of the pea bug. There is little rye grown, and the effect upon oats and barley is imperceptible.
3. Some millers say that the duty gave them the command of the Lower Province markets, but as a farmer I can see no improvement and comparison with our neighbours across the lines, would indicate that a change has taken place to our disadvantage, whatever may be the cause of it.
4. I find on looking over my books to 1865, that the averages price obtained for pork previous to the year 1879 was at least equal to that received at this time.
5. I think not, the Americans being large importers of horses; against a heavy Tariff of their own. I do not see that they could be very formidable rivals in the markets of the west.
6. I have not had much experience in breeding horses, but many in this locality look upon the profits derived therefrom as very satisfactory, while others

prefer to raise other kinds of stock, this depending very much upon the situation and taste of the parties. The principal market for good horses is the United States, while most of the inferior ones go to Manitoba.

7. I think as a general thing it would pay the Canadian farmer better to import American corn than to depend upon grain raised by himself which usually he can dispose of to advantage.
8. Have had a good market for these things for many years; do not think the Tariff has effected them in the least.
9. I think a fair Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would benefit the Canadian farmer, though probably not so much now as it would have done at one time. My opinion is that the imposition of the present Tariff has not improved our position for the negotiation of such a Treaty.
10. I think it is simply impossible that any such regulation could have any beneficial effect. 11. Could not say, have had no experience.
12. Prices of implements do not seem to have varied much here since the imposition of the present Tariff. For the last ten years or so there has been a good deal of competition amongst manufacturers in this locality, though some, such as reapers and mowers are made much lighter than formerly, and may really cost less to the manufacturer, though the material used is no doubt advanced in prices by the duty.
13. I think there can be no doubt that all these things consumed by the farmer upon which a duty is levied are increased in price to him to the extent of the duty or nearly so. To compare prices at present with those of 1878 and say that they have gone up or down as the case may be, might be very misleading, and could prove nothing satisfactory, as that variation or even a greater may have taken place in the country where purchased. 14. I think not as a general thing.
15. It should have this effect, but with regard to emigration to the States many have left this locality for that country since it came in force, and in fact are still leaving, but few return who once settle there.
16. Not that I have observed. The value of farms may be slightly increased since 1878, but are not equal to what they were previous to the times of depression.
17. The good crops obtained by the farmers for the last two years have done much to relieve them from difficulties which they experienced previously, and no doubt the others have benefited as well.
18. I really could not say, unless it is to relieve them from burthens that may have been imposed upon them for the benefit of others who are just as well able to bear them.

WM. TURNBULL,

Farmer, Brantford, Co. Brant.

1. It would. We import no farm produce except flour; New Brunswick paid \$65,000 duty on that article last year. This ought to be a sufficient answer.
2. It has raised the price, as we do not grow enough for our own consumption of any of the cereals named.
3. On wheat flour we are forced to pay the Canadian miller about 47 cents on every barrel of flour we consume, above its market value.
4. No answer. 5. No, we never export horses to Manitoba or the North-West, as it would cost more than the animal is worth in freight charges.
6. Yes, we can raise horses as profitably as any other stock. The United States is our only market, not Manitoba or the North-West.
7. It would not pay to import American corn for fattening stock under the high Tariff. 8. No, it is improved by the scarcity in the American market; the rise in prices is in no way attributable to the National Policy.
9. Yes; we want Free Trade with the United States. I do not think we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty now, as the Government have in-

- creased the debt of the Dominion to such an extent within the last four years, they will be obliged to keep up a high Tariff to meet their extravagant expenditure. 10. The price of wool has not increased since 1878.
11. We raise none of those plants. 12. The price has increased in consequence of the duty on the raw material. On every article the farmer uses.
  13. Yes. Before the Tilly Tariff came into operation, we could buy all wool goods at 55 cents per yard, for which we are now obliged to pay 75 cents—although we get no more for our wool. I have paid as high as 101 per cent. Tariff on bolts manufactured by Levi H. Young.
  14. In no way has it been increased by the Tariff. We had the National Policy in full blast in 1880, and yet were obliged to sell good potatoes for 60 cents per barrel, on account of the American crop being good.
  15. No, the Tariff has driven and is still driving thousands of our population out of the country to seek employment in the United States.
  16. The price of farms has decreased more than 100 per cent. I do not believe there will be any capital invested in farm property, so long as the present extravagant Government are in power; people want more encouragement than a high Tariff represents before they invest capital where its value can so easily be seen. 17. No, the farmer is worse, much worse; the labourer, so far as wages are concerned, is better, there is less competition, a great number of this class have left the country; but the purchasing power of his wages is reduced by the operation of the Tariff.
  18. Induce immigration by making this a cheap country to live in, let the Government show by their acts that they intend in the future to govern wisely and well, and to discontinue the system of throwing away millions of the people's money to their favourites, as they did to the Syndicate and Onderdonk & Co., and to cease robbing the whole Dominion for the benefit of a few monopolists. This may stop the efflux to the United States, and perhaps induce immigration.

*General Remarks*.—I have answered the Doctor's questions, will he be kind enough to answer mine. How is it that the Finance Minister has asked \$28,000,000 for the Civil Service of the Government, when he said in the Rink, in St. John, in my hearing, that \$22,500,000 was more than sufficient for all purposes?

JAMES H. BOWES,  
Farmer, Golden Grove Woollen Mills, Co. St. John, N.B.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculturalists of Canada to admit American farm produce free of duty, which is generally of an inferior quality, and consequently lowers the price of the superior article.
2. By the free admission of American corn the price of our coarse grains would be lowered, which is quite a damage to our agriculturalists.
3. The effect has been to increase spring wheat in price from 10 to 15 cents per bushel, and a better home market and a superior article in flour, which we had not before the Tariff was put on, as our market was generally glutted part of the year with damaged spring wheat from the United States.
4. I think the price of live hogs has about doubled the last two years, which is quite an advantage to the farmers, and consequently to all classes of the community.
5. Prices on live stock have improved. Manitoba will be our best market for live stock, if the duty is kept on stock coming from the United States.
6. It is becoming very profitable to breed horses, and Manitoba will be our best market.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock; the importation of American corn into Canada would have a tendency to lower the price of our coarse grains, and to cause the growing of more wheat than the farms will bear, which is not right.

8. We have a better home market for these articles than formerly.
  9. If we wanted Reciprocity certainly we are in a better position to get it than before the present Tariff; but I think we are better as we are now, as we then would allow the American people to have more of the carrying trade, and we would have more adulterated goods in our market.
  10. The effect of the Tariff on the price of wool I think is not much. 11. The effect of the Tariff on flax, tobacco and sugar beet, I think is of no consequence.
  12. Under the present Tariff the cost of our farm implements is about from 20 to 30 per cent. less in price, and the quality of our reapers and mowers, seed drills, horse rakes, ploughs, harrows, hay and manure forks, is much better since, our own manufacturers have more confidence in their business, and are not afraid to invest largely and turn out goods by the hundred instead of by the dozen as formerly.
  13. Woollens, cottons and hardware are not increased in price by the Tariff, but quality is much better, not near so much shoddy goods in the market.
  14. The home market for farm produce has increased and improved by the operation of the Tariff. The reason, I think, is on account of such an immense increase in the manufacturing trade, consequently plenty of work for all hands, no such thing as the thousands of idle men in every city as formerly, there is a stir all round.
  16. I think farm property at cash rates is better than formerly, and would be much better still was it not for such a move to the North-West.
  17. The general condition of the farmers and all classes of the community, except the bailiffs, is much better than before 1878.
  18. I think the Parliament should do something to give the agriculturalists of Ontario more farm labourers, I do not know of anything more wanted just now.
- General Remarks:—*I think the present Government is doing well, it would be a sad mistake to have any change.

FRANCIS CASSIDY, J. P.,

Fergus, Co. Wellington.

1. Yes, it is profitable to sell oats and barley, and buy American corn for feeding purposes, the duty tells against the farmer in this matter.
2. It has raised the price of American corn, but has not made the price of our coarse grains any better. 3. As compared with American and European prices the Canadian farmer has suffered.
4. I do not know that it has had any effect at all. I have got higher prices for pork before the National Policy than I did since it came into force.
5. No, the United States is our best market for the better class of horses. When the Americans are buying so many horses in Ontario, it is not likely they would export to Manitoba.
6. I have not bred extensively. The United States is the best market for good horses; Manitoba goes in for a cheaper class.
7. It has paid me to use American corn, and if it does not pay farmers they will not buy it. 8. No, how could it be.
9. It would be better. Our position is not any better.
10. Never saw wool so cheap. I do not know if the National Policy is the cause; but while the wool has gone down clothes are dearer.
11. Don't know anything about it. 12. I can't say, have not had to buy any.
13. Yes, almost everything. Cotton and woollen goods are all dearer, also general hardware. 14. No, there is no improvement.
15. Emigration through the National Policy was never so great, a large number of farmers and others have sold out and gone to the other side. The Syndicate

bargain and the Government land regulations no doubt had something to do in shaping their destiny. 16. No.

17. No; the peoples' condition does not improve by being compelled to pay high duties. 18. Take off the duties.

ROBT. MURDOCH,

Reeve, West Luther, Gordonville, Co. Wellington.

1. No; because it would lower Canadian products in the market of Canada.  
 2. It has the effect of raising the price of all our coarse grains correspondingly to the Tariff imposed, and encourages the farmers to go more extensively into the raising of the same.  
 3. It has had the effect of creating a better home market for all our wheat.  
 4. It has made the raising of hogs a paying industry to the farmer, for we get 2 cents per pound more for them.  
 5. Yes. 6. We find it profitable to raise horses, since there is such a good demand for them in Manitoba, and I think they pay better than other stock.  
 7. We can raise all the grain to fatten our stock at 20 per cent. cheaper than import from the United States.  
 8. It has very much improved. 9. The Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, and we are in a much better position to negotiate a Treaty now than before the present Tariff was imposed.  
 10. Good. 11. It has a good effect. 12. The cost of all farm implements has decreased under the present Tariff, and the quality is fully better. Reapers, mowers, sulky-rakes, ploughs and iron harrows.  
 13. Our woollens and cottons are much superior, as they are almost all of Canadian manufacture, and a great deal cheaper considering the quality.  
 14. The home market has been very much increased under the present Tariff, by encouraging manufactories, consequently populating the towns and cities, and creating a home market for the farmer.  
 15. The present Tariff has given diversity of employment to all classes, and thereby retarded emigration to the United States, and encouraged a number of Canadians to return to Canada.  
 16. There is an increased tendency to invest capital, and farm lands have increased in value since 1878, I should say 25 per cent.  
 17. Very much, indeed. 18. None.

*General Remarks* :—Keep the Tariff as it is until you get Reciprocity.

THOMAS SMITHSON,

President County Agricultural Society,

Deputy Reeve, Fenelon, Co. Victoria.

1. No. 2. Oats, peas and rye increased in price, barley not affected; we do not raise any corn. 3. The price of wheat is generally higher, especially spring wheat. 4. Increased by the amount of Tariff. 5. Most decidedly.  
 6. Yes. Not so profitable as breeding cattle and sheep—Manitoba.  
 7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. In a better position now.  
 10. The price of coarse wool is better. 11. None grown here.  
 12. Decreased in cost; quality improved. 13. No. 14. Yes. By keeping out foreign produce. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Not much change, but indications of increase. 17. Yes. 18. Abolishment of market-fees.

*General Remarks* :—I think it would be better for the agriculturalists of the Dominion if they sent more farmers and less lawyers to Parliament.

THOS. L. DAVIES,

Postmaster, Bellevue, Co. Victoria.

1. No. 2. It has increased the price of oats and corn, they being the kind of coarse grain principally used here.
3. Price of both kinds is higher since the duty was imposed ; I think the increased duty is to a great extent the cause.
4. Prices are much higher than before, owing to the increased home demand caused by the duty. 5. Yes.
6. At the present price there is no stock ; pays better than to breed horses. Manitoba is our principal market. 7. Yes. 8. Yes.
9. Yes. We are in a much better position to negotiate with the Americans than before the increased duties. 10. None.
11. None produced in this section of the country.
12. Generally decreased from 10 per cent to 15 per cent, and quality is better.
13. Woollens are much cheaper. No change in cottons. Hardware not much change in price, but quality of Canadian manufacture much improved.
14. Yes, by retaining the home market for our own producers. 15. It has.
16. Owing to the excitement about Manitoba in this section there is no increased tendency to invest in farm property, but lands are held and bring a higher price when sales are made. 17. Yes, very much.
18. I think the farmers are generally satisfied with the present Tariff.

HIRAM WILSON,

Reeve, Dawn, Florence, Co. Lambton.

1. Not by any means, unless they allow us the same privilege. 2. Oats higher, corn higher, pease higher.
3. The price is more steady, which gives us our home market.
4. Hogs higher. Hams, bacon and lard a better quality, as we cure our own pork, and can sell all at home.
5. Yes. 6. More profitable than formerly. Our market is Manitoba.
7. It pays much better to raise all coarse grain. 8. They are higher than formerly.
9. Would be benefited by Reciprocity ; we are in a much better position to negotiate a Treaty with the present Tariff, as we have now something to offer. 10. Wool is cheaper.
11. It has greatly increased the cultivation and production, and kept a large amount of money at home. 12. I consider them lower in price and more substantial, and better adapted to our wants.
13. Woollens and cottons much lower, and of a superior quality. Hardware cheaper, and since the Tariff our home manufacturers have greatly improved the articles now made here, than when formerly imported.
14. Yes ; as we can now depend upon our home market.
15. All classes of workmen are fully employed. No United States currency. Many are coming back. Emigration from here confined solely to Manitoba.
16. The increased tendency for investment in farm property, and would be much higher where it not for the North-West.
17. Yes, and the country generally improved, and its people contented and happy.
18. Keep Canada for the Canadians.

*General Remarks* :—All intelligent people are well pleased with the workings of the Tariff. Dissatisfaction only with a few whose political training would not allow them to read any other than the *Globe*, and *London Advertiser*. May the National Policy continue and prosper.

THOMAS DILLON,

Reeve, Bothwell, Co. Kent.

1. We never required any except corn, and we at first felt the loss of it, but we have got quite over that, and are now making much more profit out of feeding our own chopped oats and pease than we ever realized out of corn feeding. Wheat was of course imported, but that did not effect us much here, except that it filled up a space that we could ourselves have filled at a more profitable price.
2. We grow neither corn nor rye here. The prices of oats, barley and pease are all considerably enhanced. I am near the outskirts of an extensive stall-feeding district, and I can confidently say that except in one direction, there could not be gathered within 20 miles of me 100 bushels of these grains for sale in a week's tramp. But the indirect advantages are only now beginning to be felt through the rest, the land has decreased through not being wheated one-half so extensively as in former years.
3. It would be useless to differentiate between classes as there is very little latitude on that point here, but the prices of both wheat and flour have ranged higher during the last three years than during the Free Trade periods.
4. There have not for many years been any hogs raised here about, except for local consumption, which means that we eat them ourselves, except the few that we sell to the villagers, and then we get a high price especially for ham which at the present time in our local stores is 14 cents per pound.
5. Very much, and besides that, it has done for us what the United States war of secession did, it has pretty well cleared our country of "scrubs," which were fast accumulating upon us on account of the penny wise and pound foolish policy of our farmers letting go their good brood mares at an apparently high though ruinously low price. At the present time no one would have the cheek to offer less than \$200 for a good brood mare.
6. The horse is now the most profitable kind of stock. The Americans not being able to touch the top of the market have to a great extent retired from the field. We look to Manitoba as our horse market, and we are getting higher prices than ever before. Formerly, breeding except for your own use was not only unprofitable but an actual loss.
7. On our own coarse grain we can very profitably feed and fatten our stock. The uncertainty of the corn crop is frequently a serious drawback to feeding, by catching the feeder short of supplies, and also unable to buy from his neighbour who had previously received such meagre encouragement to raise coarse grains, that he had only enough for himself and then we have these grains to depend on instead of one. Besides the effects of rotation of crops, instead of constant wheating, is already beginning to be observed by the most casual observer.
8. All these articles have through the present Tariff increased in price, not, however, from the exclusion of the foreign article, but by the increased number of consumers and the improved relation of labour to capital which is a direct result of the N.P.
9. He would not till the National Policy had set all our young industries so firm on their feet that the older and stronger ones of the United States could not shove them to the wall as they unquestionably would do if they could, and leave our whole population at the plough's tail. If it were thought desirable, now would unquestionably be the time to strike for it, but if the present policy is pursued, we will in due course be in possession of every advantage Reciprocity could give us. You may think this answer overcomprehensive because it touches on the trades, but I believe that Reciprocity with the United States, in the present semi-developed condition of our hitherto orphan industries, would disastrously reduce the population and that would be a very serious injury to farmers.
10. I have in one instance seen it lower during the National Policy's reign than it was a few years before the beginning of that epoch, but on the average we sell better than we did under the Free Trade regime.

11. Tobacco is not grown here, and sugar beet only for feeding, consequently there is no market for either. Flax has increased in price, but the average has not increased but rather the reverse, because we are nearly all feeders and require the ground for roots, which though nearly as severe on the soil as flax, return something to it which the flax does not.
12. There is not an iota of difference either in the price or quality of agricultural implements since the inauguration of the N.P., except in one solitary instance and that would require a decimal of the third place to express it. That solitary instance is in the case of seeders, on which there is not quite as much time given. I may say that I bought a seeder from an agent a few weeks ago, terms C.O.D., and to be delivered in two weeks. Before that time the agent having consulted his principals, received instructions to stop selling and to cancel all orders taken after a certain date, or else, get the parties to agree to a deference of delivery till fall, as there were already far more orders in for the coming seeding season, than the whole of the Canadian manufactures could supply for a month. Accordingly I have to wait.
13. Woollens and cottons unchanged, hardware especially, nails slightly increased.
14. Home market both increased and improved, because the population of our towns and villages under Protection has increased and are also better paid for their labour.
15. We are here in the midst of Germans, the great bulk of whom are thrifty men and good citizens, but there is a considerable balance of them of the shiftless kind who see in republicanism something more attractive than in monarchy, especially if they have succeeded in getting well into debt. In the emigration from here into the United States there are four defaulters to one level-headed, thrifty farmer. The English speaking portion of our population do not emigrate to the United States, unless for the purpose of evading payments of their debts, and therefore it is quite evident that we have very few returning Canadians. I think I could count on my fingers all the Canadian emigrants from here to the United States who would run the risk of coming back.
16. There would be, were it not for the *furor* about the North-West Territories. Till this set in, land was increasing uniformly in value. But the land market is not so very dead after all, for there were sold in this vicinity, within two weeks, two farms which three years ago were offered at \$4,500 each, and not taken, and which have now brought \$7,000 and \$7,500 respectively.
17. Most decidedly. We have to pay higher wages, but we are more than proportionately repaid by the enhanced price of our produce.
18. I cannot suggest any change that would be equitable and just to all other interests, except it be the passing of Doctor Orton's Bill *re* mortgage and interest—and that, too, with a retroactive power, where the contract is so evidently iniquitous. There are hundreds hereabout who are paying from 12 to 15 per cent., and who entered into the contract in the belief that they were paying 5 or 6 per cent. These men are already utterly ruined, unless either the Commons or the Legislature brings the relief in the shape of a bill like Orton's—the more like it the better. I can name to you ten young married men whose blood was sucked by the vampires, and who were, before they began dealing with the loan companies, fairly "fixed," who are now reduced to the position of hired men. And the list will be largely augmented this summer, unless legislation interferes.

*General Remarks*.:—I would further suggest that greater inducements to farmers' sons to acquire a good agricultural education would go far to making farming both a more desirable and more profitable occupation. I suppose, however, this is *utra vires* so far as the Commons is concerned. Before closing, allow me to make one more remark about the Dr. Orton bill, namely, that Provincial autonomy notwithstanding, the Dominion Government could greatly strengthen its position here by removing the unconstitutional points in the bill, but still retain the powers it was evidently intended to have. Although I am not a sufferer myself, I know so many that have

been so shamefully swindled by legally authorized "Building Societies," or "Canada Permanent Loan and Saving Societies," or this or that concern with a benevolent sounding name, that I cannot refrain from speaking very openly on this point. You may consider this rather protracted, but it does not contain a quarter of what I would like to say if I had more space.

JOHN TRUSSLER,  
Farmer, Wellesley, Co. Waterloo.

1. No, it would not.
2. They have been advancing and will pay at present prices.
3. I think we get a better grade of flour at higher rates; cannot specify the effect on the different classes.
- 4 and 5. No answer.
6. It pays well to breed horses; the profits compare favourably with other stock.
7. We can get a much larger yield of coarse grain, and I don't think it pays to buy grain when the farms will grow it.
8. No answer.
9. Not yet for some years.
- 10 and 11. No answer.
12. They are not increased in price in this part of the Province, and we get a better article.
13. None.
14. Yes.
15. Yes.
16. I think land investment a sure and safe one at present.
17. Yes.
18. Two Protectionists for one Free Trader in the House.

*General Remarks* :—I think on the whole that Protection is what we want for some years yet.

THOS. MAGWOOD,  
Councillor, Poole, Co. Perth.

1. No.
2. It raises the price of corn.
3. Flour commanding a higher price in the United States is not imported here.
4. To raises the price.
5. Not in this locality.
6. Breeding good horses pays well and will compare favourably with the profits upon other stock.
7. All the grain and roots necessary to fatten cattle can be raised by our farmers.
8. Not in this locality.
9. Yes; we are in a better position than before.
10. No effect.
11. Very little effect, if any.
12. Cost decreased; quality much improved.
13. Hardware no higher; woollens no higher, and many lower. Business under this heading very flourishing.
14. Increased by shutting out Indian corn.
15. Yes, it is a blessing to the country.
16. Decreased since the opening up of the North-West.
17. Yes; undoubtedly improved.
18. By furnishing farmers with choice cereals for seed at cost price; also male animals to improve the stock, which may be done through the County Agricultural Societies.

ISAAC SIMPSON,  
Private Banker, Kingston, Co. Frontenac.

1. I think not.
2. It has increased the price by amount of duty, and given a ready sale for all grown.
3. All wheat is bought here in proportion to price of flour; therefore it has increased by amount of duty.
4. To increase them by the amount of duty.
5. Yes.
6. Yes, favourably. Manitoba.
7. Yes. I think not.
8. I think not. Most of the poultry purchased here is sent to the United States.
9. I think we should be in a better position.
- 10 and 11. No answer.
12. I do not think the Tariff has affected them any.
13. I think not.

14. It has increased the price at least by amount of duty, and given ready sale for all produced. 15. I think it has; there is employment and higher wages for all. 16. Increased; ready sale for all offered. 17. Yes, greatly. 18. No answer.
- General Remarks* :—The Circular being sent to the clerk who was away from home, I did not receive it till lately.

WILLIAM T. FIELD,  
Reeve, Chalk River, Co. Renfrew.

1. Certainly not. 2. No answer.  
3. The price has not been increased, the competition amongst our own millers being sufficient to keep the price down, or in other words to prevent a monopoly. 4. To slightly benefit the Canadian farmer. 5. No answer.  
6. Good horses are profitable stock. The best horses go to the United States as yet. 7. Taking Canada as a whole, he can. 8. Yes.  
9. Yes, in my opinion, much better position under the present Tariff, as the Americans must have learnt we can live without them.  
10 and 11. No answer. 12. The cost has not increased, and the quality has not deteriorated. The "Toronto Mower" is the best machine I ever had; used three others. 13. They never were cheaper.  
14. Slightly, as we have had our own market to a great extent heretofore.  
15. Emigration has not appeared to have decreased from our Province.  
16. Investment in farm land has not increased in general. The lands in the North-West having been opened up for settlers, I think, is the cause to a large extent. 17. Yes.

18. Reciprocity with the United States; if that can't be obtained by a Reciprocity Tariff.
- General Remarks* :—Questions 2, 5, 10 and 11 refer more particularly to farms in the Upper Provinces. The present Tariff is working satisfactorily, generally speaking, and the longer it is in operation the greater will be the benefits to the farmers, as the tendency is to increase our manufactories, and give us more demand for our produce.

E. TUPPER, Jun.,  
Warden, Upper Stewiacke, Co. Colchester.

1. Wheat and corn yes, as we do not grow any quantity for home consumption.  
2. It has increased the price, corn is much scarcer and hard to be got.  
3. It has increased the price more than the duties, especially on wheat.  
4. Hogs that sold for 7 cents per pound, now sell for 10 cents.  
5. No, our horses all go to the United States. 6. Not with the present Tariff. United States. 7. Yes, to import American corn. 8. Eggs, butter, poultry and vegetables are the same.  
9. I think he would. I see no better time. 10. No answer. 11. None, I think.  
12. Cost increased, not as good, such as axes, scythes, saws, forks and several other articles. 13. Cottons and hardware, yes. 14. Increased, yes.  
15. No, our young men have all, or nearly so, gone to the United States.  
16. See answer to question 15. 17. No. 18. Free Trade.

*General Remarks* :—At present our young men have all gone to the United States to seek employment and try to better their circumstances.

ALEX. M. KITTRICK,  
Farmer, Marbleton, Co. Wolfe.

1. Yes. An interchange of farm products, particularly in those sections near the boundary line, would be beneficial to the farmer and would not materially affect prices, as in most cases they are regulated by the Liverpool markets.

2. I do not think it has had any effect, except in the case of corn. The price of imported corn (there being very little raised in Canada) has been increased to the consumer by the amount of the duty collected. As farmers use large quantities of corn for feeding purposes, they are to some extent injured by the Tariff, so far as it affects corn.
3. There has been no perceptible effect, for the reason stated in the answer to No. 1.
4. It has had no appreciable effect. 5. I do not think the duty has affected the price materially. The Americans are still our best customers for horses.
6. Horses are perhaps scarcely as profitable as other stock, but some of our people make it pay. See answer to question 5.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise plenty of oats and pease but not corn, except in a very restricted portion of this Province. I believe in many cases it pays best to import American corn.
8. I do not believe that the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter has been affected by the Tariff. The Canadian farmer practically controlled this home market previous to the change in duties.
9. The Canadian farmer would certainly be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I cannot see in what way the present Tariff improves our chances of the renewal of such a Treaty.
10. The effect has been slight, if any, because the duty is placed on the variety of wool that we would not import in any case. The price of wool is lower than it has been for years. 11. It has had no effect in this part of the Province.
12. The price has been considerably increased; the quality is about the same.
13. Yes, cottons, woollens and some kinds of hardware have been largely increased by the Tariff, particularly the two former. 14. Not in this section at least.
15. No, there never was such a large emigration from this part of the Province to the United States and Manitoba in its whole history.
16. I do not think there has been any increase in value of farm lands, but the reverse; on account of such a large exodus from the country.
17. The general condition of farmers has been improved during the past year, owing to better crops than what we have had for many years, together with the partial failure of the crops in Europe, thereby increasing the price and consequently improving the condition of the agricultural classes. The large emigration is also likely to raise the wages of the labouring classes during the coming summer, by creating a scarcity of hands.
18. Any change in the Tariff that would lighten the burden of taxation now borne by the farmers would be desirable. I would like to see the duty on woollens, (particularly the coarse varieties) cottons, refined sugar, hardware, stoves, furniture, agricultural implements and many other articles materially lowered.

ISAAC MARRETT,

Reeve, N. Gwillimbury, Keswick, Co. York.

1. No. 2. I think it has raised the price of oats, rye and corn, but has had no effect on barley or pease. 3. I think it has slightly improved our own.
4. They have increased the prices to some extent.
5. I think it has improved the demand and price of horses. For the last year the greater part of our horses have gone to Manitoba. 6. Yes, favourably. Manitoba for the past year; previously our principal market was the United States.
7. Yes, and does not require to import American corn. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. 10. Yes.
11. None of these articles grown here. 12. Cost decreased and the quality improved.
13. Not much change. 14. The demand has increased and improved. 15. Yes.
16. The value of farm land has not increased on account of the large emigration to Manitoba. 17. Yes. 18. Only such changes as the circumstances of the country may indicate from year to year.

WALTER RIDDELL,

Reeve, Hamilton, Co. Northumberland.

1. It would not. Oats that sold in 1878 for 30 to 34 cents per bushel, now sell at 40 to 45 cents. Rye is about 15 cents per bushel higher; pease from 15 to 20 cents higher; corn is 20 cents higher.
3. Flour about same price; it rises and falls 20 to 25 cents per lbs. according to crop.
4. Hams, bacon and lard are from 2 to 3 cents per pound higher than in 1878.
5. Horses and cows are about 25 per cent higher than in 1878. 6. No answer.
7. He can raise all he wants of grain, cheaper than he can buy it. 8. Yes.
9. No. Times generally better since the Treaty was closed. Yes; we have now something to offer if we want to. 10. No answer. 11. No answer.
12. Cost decreased. I am selling cultivators and iron harrows for two dollars less than they were sold for three years ago; quality equally as good; all kinds of agricultural implements better and cheaper.
13. No. Equally as good and as cheap as before the Tariff, and I think somewhat cheaper. 14. Yes, there has been a better demand for home consumption; prices have generally raised.
15. There has been a greater demand for working people here lately, than has been the case for many years before. 16. Yes. Increased; farm produce selling for better prices. 17. Yes.
18. Make a law reducing the charges of lawyers and doctors, and keep the Grits out of office.

*General Remarks:*—The times have greatly improved since 1878. Providence seems to be on the side of Sir John A. Macdonald and the National Policy.

JOHN SKELLY,

Farmer, Melrose, Co. Hastings.

1. Most decidedly not. It would be unjust. Meet the Americans on all kinds of farm produce with equal Tariff. 2. It has raised the price of coarse grain to the amount of 10 cents per bushel, [and gives us an advantage of rotation of crops.
3. It has no effect on the winter season when wheat is going to Liverpool, as Liverpool is our chief market. Sometimes in summer we get 10 cents per bushel more for home consumption. 4. It has benefited the farmers. Pork has been at a good price. It has also encouraged pork raising.
5. Yes; it has. Our chief market has been Manitoba since the duty was put on, therefore shutting the Yankees out. 6. Yes; in Manitoba.
7. It is the more profitable to raise your own coarse grain for feeding purposes, on the farm. 8. Yes; very much improved.
9. Yes; very much so, and it strengthens our position to get Reciprocity, which would be a great benefit to the farmers of this country.
10. The Tariff on cotton raises the prices of wool.
11. Tobacco crop and sugar beet, are improved through the National Policy.
12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper and better.
13. Woollens unchanged; hardware unchanged; cotton goods about the same.
14. Very much so. By keeping out the Americans from glutting our markets with their produce, and by giving farmers home consumption.
15. The National Policy encourages emigrants to Canada.
16. A very great deal on account of cheap money through the National Policy.
17. Very materially so. 18. Meet the Americans with an equal Tariff on all farm produce, in hopes it may bring them to Reciprocity.

*General Remarks:*—I hope to see a change in the school laws, as they are radically wrong at present; so much so, that we cannot send our children out of one section into another without having to pay 50 cents for a pupil permit, no matter how much taxes you pay in the section you live in. I, with many others have suffered from this system of school law for many years.

PATRICK MURTAUGH,

Farmer, Cashtown, Co. Simcoe.

1. It would be in the interest of farmers to admit American corn free, for the reason that pease are a failure here on account of the bug, farmers here have gone largely in to raising cattle for cheese and beef for the English market, and corn was the cheapest feed but the National Policy has killed it.
2. The effect of the duty on corn has not raised the price of oats; barley is ruled by the American market. In 1878 we bought corn for 47 cents, sold barley at 80 cents; there is no rye grown in this part; barley is grown very largely here, on account of the failure of the spring wheat.
3. The price of wheat has averaged less this winter than in Chicago. Spring, Scotch and Red fall the same; white and other kinds of spring the same. I cannot tell about flour, but the mills around here are not doing much, two mills got burnt and the others are not buying wheat. There is no bran to be got here.
4. The duty on pork does not affect us much, we don't raise many pigs here. I think the duty has raised the price of pork, the raising of pigs was never a paying business here.
5. Our market for live stock is the American and English, we used to send large numbers of steers to the United States, since the English market has opened, they are fed for shipping to the old country. Manitoba has raised the price of a certain class of cattle and horses, the English market has raised the price of beef more than anything else.
6. I have found it more profitable to raise cattle than horses, they are not so liable to accident or disease, heavy horses sells best in the United States. There is a good demand for farm horses in Manitoba.
7. There is no other grain except pease and corn that is good for fattening cattle, this section is very good for pease, but the bug has these few years back destroyed them. I have the Canadian corn, but this section of the country is not suitable for it. I think it would benefit farmers to get American corn free.
8. I do not think there is much difference, there is less butter made on account of the cheap factories, as a rule the price of the English markets rule the price here, potatoes are not much grown here on account of the bug, all the other root crops are consumed on the farm.
9. Canadian farmers would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I cannot say whether the present Tariff will help Reciprocity or not.
10. The effect of the Tariff on wool is bad, it has lowered the price of wool 5 cents a pound, as the most part of the wool comes in free, it is the interest of the factories to keep the price of wool low.
11. There is no tobacco grown here, there is not much flax grown now here. I do not think the Tariff has any effect on flax. There is no sugar beet grown except for feeding cattle.
12. The cost in some cases has increased, in others not, but the material they are composed of is light. There are a good many Americans coming into this part, the casting is better than home-made and American cross-cut saws, there is a complaint that home-made are not so good in quality.
13. I cannot tell much about cottons, grain bags are not as good in quality and are smaller than before, woollen goods are higher.
14. I cannot say that the home market for farm produce has been increased by the Tariff, if there is a failure of one crop the Tariff will encourage the price of it, but if not, the price on the foreign market will.
15. The opening up of Manitoba has increased the demand for certain classes of waggons and sleighs. There are no ploughs going from here to Manitoba, they are not suitable for the country. There never was such emigration as is going on the two last years to Manitoba and the United States, if this continues much longer, this country will be a wilderness, there will be no one to work the farms.
16. There is every opportunity to become farmers almost every one is willing to sell, there has been more farms sold here the last two years than 20 years before, farms have decreased in value, too many sellers and no buyers.

- 
17. The general condition of the farmers is no worse, there were good crops and good prices. As for the labouring classes they leave the country.
  18. The best thing for Parliament is to let farmers alone, give them leave to buy were they like, and sell what they want.

*General Remarks* : —I think it is not fair for the farmers to be paying duty on dairy salt, while the fisherman gets his in free. If the Government would allow a drawback on the amount of cheese that is exported, it would be an advantage.

PETER STEWART,  
Councillor, Shakespeare, Co. Perth.

---

1. Admit none free. We can raise our own. 2. About 15 per cent. on grains in favour of the Dominion. 3. No answer. 4. Those articles are one-third dearer now than before the duty was increased.
5. It has improved the price greatly. 6. I find it profitable to raise horses and other stock. Our market is at home.
7. They can raise their grain cheaper than buy it. 8. It has improved.
9. You are in a better position now. 10. It has lowered the price of wool.
11. None in this locality. 12. They have increased in price; the articles are better.
13. They have decreased in price. 14. It has increased and improved by the Tariff.
15. It has benefited the labouring class of this section. 16. Increased.
17. They have improved. 18. No answer.

WILLIAM MILLER,  
Deputy Reeve, Omeme, Co. Victoria.

---

1. It would be in their interest, because they can buy corn cheaper for feed.
2. It has not increased our prices, our oats are generally lower than in Chicago. It has increased the price of feeding stock, barley is fully as good, pease are rather lower. 3. Prices are governed by England.
4. The price of pork being fixed by England, it does not do us any harm, but the duty on salt does. 5. No.
6. The principal market for horses and our best colts is the United States.
7. It would pay better to import corn. 8. No. 9. Yes.
10. It puts money in the manufacturers' pockets. 11. No.
12. Not much change. Lighter implements. 13. Yes.
14. No increase on farm produce, but there is on expenses in raising it. 15. No; stops it, if anything. 16. No; farms are cheaper and cost of labour increased.
17. Good crops last year have increased farmers' condition, scarcity of labourers by removal has increased wages, costs of living also increased.
18. Give the farmer his necessaries free of duty; diminish tax on sugar, coal, woollens and other necessaries of life.

DAVID PIPE,  
Councillor, Enfield, Co. Durham.

---

1. It would, because our prices are fixed by European prices, and corn would come in free for feeding. 2. It has not increased our prices. Oats are cheaper here than in Chicago. 3. It has depressed our prices.
4. European prices fix our prices, and duty of no use. 5. No.
6. Yes, it is very profitable to breed good horses; not much difference in the profit of the two. United States.
7. No, it would pay better to import American corn. 8. No.
9. Yes. No better position. 10. Slaughtered it. 11. None here.

12. Not much change. 13. Yes; increased, all.  
 14. Population diminished, and therefore home market not improved. 15. No.  
 16. No; land has decreased because of a diminution of population and more expensive living. 17. Farmers' condition improved by good crops. Labourers not improved, as expenses of living are increased.  
 18. Any change that will admit manures free of duty and relieve tax on implements and necessaries of life.

THOMAS H. HANCOCK,  
 Councillor and President of the Agricultural Society,  
 Tyrone, Co. Durham.

1. It would not. 2. It has increased the price of all. 3. It has had a tendency to increase the price of wheat. 4. It has increased the price of all. 5. Yes.  
 6. Yes; profits are about equal, In both. 7. Yes. It would not. 8. It is.  
 9. He would. Yes. 10. We cannot say that it has any effect in this section.  
 11. None of these are grown in this township.  
 12. Farming implements in general, have decreased in price; the quality is equally as good. 13. They have all decreased in price.  
 14. It has, by giving the farmers the home market. 15. It has.  
 16. There is. Farm lands have increased in value on account of the increased value of farm produce. 17. It is materially improved.  
 18. Encouraging the immigration of farm labourers and servant girls, would have a good effect.

JOS. H. MARSHALL, Warden and Reeve,	} London, Co. Middlesex.
THOS. W. SANGFORD, Deputy Reeve,	
R. W. JACKSON, Deputy Reeve,	
ED. ROBINSON, Deputy Reeve,	
PETER ELSON, Deputy Reeve,	

1 to 18. No answer.

*Remarks:*—Our business—agricultural implements—never was injured to any extent by American competition, and we now have the duties on iron and coal to contend against. Prices of implements have not advanced, but are continually improving in quality. For the last two years more money has been in circulation and farmers have bought more freely than before, but competition has kept down prices and is likely to do so.

The cause of improvement in business is largely owing to confidence inspired by the action of Government in the reorganization of the Tariff, inducing the investment of capital, combined with the good crops and better prices with which we have been favoured of late years. The market for the farmer has much improved, especially in the neighbourhood of manufacturing centres, but is correspondingly unimproved for mechanics who have to purchase. The increase of wages would not compensate for advance in prices, except met by steady employment, this the mechanic now has. No sooner, however, does the ordinary mechanic get 10 per cent. advance, than he, like Oliver Twist, (not Oliver Mowat more twisting) wants more, and goes on wanting more until business is totally demoralized—See Toronto and other cities to-day—and the history of the past repeating itself.

Before reorganization of Tariff we bought largely from the States and got from them some of our very best goods; now these goods are either made in Canada or imported from England. This has not resulted in any improvement in quality, but in some cases the reverse.

Large quantities of manufactured goods made in Canada now find a market in our North-West Territory. Whether it will pay or not will be a question of the future.

The expense attending such business is enormous, and as a long credit business in our line is being done, then much will depend on a continuance of good crops and good prices.

The change in Tariff has no doubt assisted the fruit-grower, a leading industry in this section, at the expense of a large proportion of this country, not producers.

Prices of cattle and horses have advanced rapidly lately, principally caused by the demand—speculative—to a great extent from the North-West.

Large quantities of capital from this section, are being taken west and invested in paper cities or Syndicate lands for speculative purposes; this must eventually make the money market more stringent here.

On the whole the country is in a much better position financially since the introduction of the N.P. It has given capitalists confidence in the ability of the country to look after its own interests, and it only rests with the country now to see that it is continued to ensure for the future of Canada a high state of prosperity.

Some changes can no doubt be advantageously made; among others we cannot but feel (in spite of the elaborate arguments of Messrs. Tilley, Plumb, *et al.*) that we pay the duty on coal, and we would like it taken off.

JOHN H. GROUT,  
Reeve, Grimsby, and Ex-Warden, Co. Lincoln.

1. I think farmers in this Province would be very much benefited by the admission of American farm produce, free of all duty.
2. Indian corn we cannot grow, therefore we cannot have Indian meal. Wheat is not a sure crop, very often rust and weevil destroy it; without wheat we can have no flour, and all the above should be free.
3. The duties imposed on these two articles, such as wheat and flour, bear pretty hard on the industrial classes; cheap bread is what we all want.
4. Not being versed in this department I cannot form a correct opinion.
5. Good work horses ten years ago brought \$200, within the last six years the same class still average \$120 and \$130; our surplus mostly goes to the Boston market.
6. It is considered here profitable to raise horses; a stylish saddle or carriage horse is generally in demand. Boston takes all we have to spare.
7. This question is answered in No. 2.—The Indian corn crop is grown very little in this Province, only in small patches, as it is considered hazardous.
8. The present Tariff has in my opinion made no visible change in the prices here of vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter; we find a ready and profitable market for all our surplus in that line, in Boston.
9. Reciprocity with the United States would be of vast importance to us farmers in these Provinces, as our market would be unbounded.
10. This not being much of a sheep or wool growing section, I do not feel competent to satisfactorily answer this question.
11. I may state there is very little flax, tobacco or sugar beet grown in this quarter.
12. The present Tariff has increased the cost of farming implements considerable.
13. Not being in a position in any way to answer this question, I cannot form a correct opinion.
14. There is an improvement in the prices of farm produce in this quarter for a number of years back, up to the present. Any surplus we may have to part with, finds its way to Boston.
15. I am truly sorry to say the present Tariff has become anything but popular, quite the reverse, oppression and taxation seem to be the watch word, talk and comment of mostly every household, the effect is, that the bone and sinew of our country is in a great measure leaving, I am sorry to say, to fill up the Western States.
16. Good farms can be bought to-day for a very much smaller figure than they could 15 years past, and those of us that are endeavouring to hold on, can scarcely

find men to help us with our daily labour; labouring men have caught the Western fever.

17. Farmers as a class have very much improved, their position in becoming better in every respect, where intelligence, perseverance and economy have prevailed, that class have become comfortable; the present Tariff has made it up hill work, what we want is Free Trade.
18. By liberal appropriations to Agricultural societies, by grants to Exhibitions, would tend in a measure to make agriculture desirable as well as profitable.

THOMAS DAVIDSON,

Farmer, Gervan Bank; St. John, N.B.

1. Yes; as the demand in Europe would prevent damaging competition here, and allow us cheap cereals for fattening purposes, and enable us to meet American dealers on the English market.
2. It has had the effect of raising the price of those cereals, consequently enhancing the price of their product in cattle, and thereby diminishing the profit of the cattle dealers in the English market; oats have not changed prices, rye is cheaper. Corn is not, nor will it be grown in the country in sufficient quantities for fattening purposes; barley is cheaper than it has been for the last fifteen years, pease about the same price.
3. Cheap flour is what is generally required, come from where it may, it does not materially affect Spring or fall wheat.
4. Those articles have been augmented in prices at the expense of the consumer.
5. The price of horses is graded by the American market, so that the farmer who sells a horse in Montreal must lose 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on the sale to recoup the buyer to allow him to pay the duty. Reciprocity is more in the interest of farmers.
6. More profitable, if the sales were made to Manitobians, as there is no duty.
7. He cannot raise all the grains required, and to enable him to compete, he should have a free market.
8. No substantial improvement, as the consumer pays the increase in price.
9. The Tariff does not change the state of things, except in so far as it shows us to be unfriendly and unwilling to deal with them, except on our own conditions.
10. No effect, as the quantity and quality of wool grown in Canada does not affect the market.
11. Enhancing the value to the consumer, who is generally unable even to bear a slight burden, whilst it gives the producer a profit which does not legitimately belong to him.
12. The cost is increased, and the quality is deteriorated by the want of competition promoted by legally providing the profits for the manufacturer. All agricultural implements manufactured in the Dominion.
13. Hardware, cottons and woollens are increased in price. Hardware increased particularly. 14. The home market for farm produce has not increased directly, as we sell principally to Americans for the American market.
15. The Tariff has given more employment to the few labourers and artisans, which the Tariff has not forced to leave the country to better their condition. It did not prevent emigration to the United States, nor did it encourage intelligent Canadians to return.
16. The emigration from the older Provinces to the North-West is the cause of the increased value of land property, by the sale of improved property at high figures to invest in land in its unimproved state.
17. Yes, but the better condition has been caused by favourable seasons and good crops, and more because of the quantity than the price.
18. Protect the farmer by giving him an open market.

*General Remarks:*—The first thing required is protection for the farmer in every sense of the word, by giving him an open market for his produce, and the advantage of buying in the cheapest market, and allow the merchant and manufacturer to rise or fall by his ability to properly prosecute his business by his talents and industry, there does not appear any resemblance between the farmer and the manufacturer, as the manufacturer under protection has a guarantee of his profits. When he makes a spade, it is a spade, whereas the farmer sows a bushel of wheat, and may not reap a bushel, his profits are not controlled by any favour within the influence of the interested. As time and tide wait for no man, and there appears no good reason why the bread of the manufacturer should be buttered by legislation, and the farmer eat his dry crust, and further pays for the manufacturer's butter.

JOHN McCABE,  
Mayor, St. Redempteur, Co. Vaudreuil.

1. Yes. Corn for breeding purposes. Rye, pease and barley as they do not compete with us. 2. I cannot see any difference in the price of grain mentioned, except corn, which is higher; small quantities raised; can raise coarse grain cheaper.
3. I do not see any difference in the price of wheat and flour.
4. The effect has been good for the farmer. 5. No.
6. No. More profit on cows and sheep. The United States.
7. No. To import American corn. 8. No. 9. Yes, when admitted free.
10. Bad. 11. I don't know. 12. Cost increased, quality the same.
13. Yes. Too numerous to mention. 14 and 15. No. 16. No. About the same value. 17. Yes. Big crops and good prices. 18. Lower the Tariff.

*General Remarks:*—I have sold my rye and pease and bought corn for feed, and saved 25 cents per bushel. I cannot do it now, the farmer wants Free Trade as far as possible, for the land must pay all.

DANIEL VANDERWATER,  
Farmer, Foxboro, Co. Hastings.

1. I think it would not. 2. Indian corn is not imported into this part of the country.
3. I do not know. 4. I think not much effect. 5. I think so. 6. Yes. Manitoba.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise what he needs for fattening purposes.
8. I don't know. 9. I think not. He would be in a better position with the present Tariff than without it. 10. I don't know.
11. None of these crops raised in this part of the country.
12. The price has not increased. Reapers, mowers and horse rakes are as good.
13. Not much, if any, increase in price. 14. The home market has been increased and improved, by the excellence of the produce of the various grain crops.
15. I fear not much. 16. No. Farm lands have decreased in value. The great rush to Manitoba. 17. Yes. 18. That is for wiser heads to say.

*General Remarks:*—I have given the above answers according to the best of my judgment.

THOMAS ELLIOTT,  
Farmer, Arnprior, Co. Renfrew.

1. For those who grow grain to sell, no; for those who grow grain to feed, yes.
2. Nil, not sufficient grown. 3. Flour is dearer. 4. The price is higher.
5. This spring prices have ruled higher; I presume in consequence of the duties.
6. Very few horses raised in this township.
7. Yes, he can in this township, because so few are fattened.
8. The market is purely local, very little affected by the Tariff. 9. I cannot say.
10. To make it higher. 11. None raised here.

12. Both increased. Thrashing machines. 13. Increased. Cottons and woollens.  
 14. Yes, to a small extent. 15. No difference here.  
 16. No. Value increased on account of emigration to Manitoba.  
 17. Condition same as before. 18. No answer.

R. E. SUTTABY,  
 Farmer and Township Clerk, Muskoka, Co. Simcoe.

1. If any corn, because it is used for stock feeding in Western Ontario.  
 2. It has a tendency to improve the price of coarse grains in our section of the country. 3. The price of wheat and flour has increased  
 4. Not prepared to answer; very few live hogs sold here, and as for hams, bacon and lard none sold from here. 5. The market price has been better of late and more demand for horses and cows.  
 6. It would pay to breed horses according to present prices. About equal profits, Principally American buyers.  
 7. As far as we are concerned we can raise the grain cheaper than importing it.  
 8. Yes. 9. Yes. We are in a better position now. 10. No improvement.  
 11. Not prepared to answer. 12. No increase. The class of reapers, harrows, ploughs, and horse rakes are equally as good.  
 13. Hardware and cottons about the same, as far as we have any dealings. A decided increase in woollen clothing. 14. To the best of our opinion we would say it has been and is, and there is a better demand for stock roots, butter and eggs. 15. Employment has increased. 16. Not here. Decreased, so many leaving for the North-West.  
 17. The general condition of the farmer has improved through obtaining better prices. The labour bill is higher. 18. Not prepared with an answer.

*General Remarks*:—We have answered these questions as far as our section is concerned, but cannot say how they would affect other sections of the country, being isolated here, hence not the same chance as those on the mainland to see and consult a wider sphere.

ROBERT FILSON,  
 Reeve, Amherst Island, Co. Lennox.

1. No. 2. A ready home market for oats, pease, rye, &c., with increased prices.  
 3. It has had the effect of keeping out a quantity of inferior spring wheat which the Americans used to flood this country with; hence the increased price of our spring wheat. 4. Increase in the price. 5. Most decidedly. The country is flooded with buyers, who are willing to pay good prices, and keeps the Manitoba market to ourselves.  
 6. Yes; Manitoba. 7. He can. We want no American corn; we can profitably raise our own coarse grains for feeding purposes.  
 8. Yes. 9. Reciprocity might be acceptable to some, but we are satisfied with the N.P., and are undoubtedly in a better position to obtain it, if thought advisable.  
 10. It has increased the price slightly. 11. Not cultivated in this county.  
 12. Quality better and prices lower on farming implements, of which we have ocular demonstration every day. 13. There is no increase in any of these articles, and we can produce much cheaper now.  
 14. It has decidedly; by increased prices. 15. Yes; no man that wants to work need be one hour idle. Not a tramp to be seen, and wages are high, but one can cheerfully pay them. Many Canadians who left here for the United States are returning and going to Manitoba.  
 16. Yes; farm property is again on the rise. 17. Yes; very much. Farmers and laborers both well satisfied and happy under the National Policy.

18. Keep Sir John in power, which we have no doubt the people will do.

*General Remarks*:—The people in this almost exclusively farming county, are decidedly in favor of the National Policy.

R. J. BANTING,  
Co. Clerk, Co. Simcoe; Secretary South Simcoe and  
Essex Branch Electoral District Agricultural Society.

CHRISTOPHER COOKE, J.P.,  
Ex-Warden, Co. Simcoe, and Treasurer of above Society,  
Cookstown, Tecumseh, Co. Simcoe.

1. It would not. 2. It has caused a steadier and better demand for oats, rye, corn and barley. 3. It has caused better prices for both classes of wheat, owing to the increased wants of millers. 4. Their tendency is to keep up prices.
5. Yes; the duty has caused an unprecedented demand for the North-West.
6. It is more profitable than breeding any other class of stock, and the principal demand in this section has been from Manitoba.
7. We can raise all the grain required cheaper than we can buy is from Americans.
8. Certainly, owing to the improved circumstances of the working classes in villages and towns. 9. Although in a better position to secure Reciprocity, I do not think we could gain by a change from the present Tariff.
10. Wool is not raised to any extent in this section. 11. I cannot say; not cultivated in this section. 12. The cost of reapers, drills, ploughs and harrows has decreased, and the quality is as good, if not superior.
13. The only increase has been in hardware, but caused by the increased cost of the iron used, and the increase even then, is not as high as in the United States during the same period. 14. It has, on account of the increased ability of the manufacturing classes to purchase.
15. It has. 16. There is a growing tendency to invest in farm property, and farms have increased in value 25 per cent. since 1878, on account of the improved markets for produce. 17. It has. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—Committee:—Antoine Thibert, Amedée Quenneville, Moses Sancier, John E. Braun.

ISRAEL DESJARDINS,  
Deputy Reeve, Tilbury West, Co. Essex.

1. No. 2. The effect on oats and corn was that owing to the scarcity they sell at a good price this year. 3. No answer. 4. It has made hogs and lard dearer.
5. Yes. 6. Our principal market is the United States.
7. I think the farmer can raise profitably all the grain he requires. 8. Yes. 9. No. 10 and 11. No answer. 12. Mowing machines are cheaper and better in quality.
13. No. 14. Yes. 15. Yes. 16. Increased. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

JAMES H. MOSHER,  
Mayor, West Farnham, Co. Missisquoi.

1. No. 2. In raising the price of oats 30 per cent.; pease the same. Barley depends on the American market. Very little rye or corn raised here.
3. In keeping the home market for the farmer, and in supplying a better article of flour to the consumer, and a better price to the farmer; flour is as dear here now as it is in Liverpool.
4. In giving a better price for pork, thereby making it more profitable to raise coarse grain for feeding purposes, thereby giving a better rotation of crops to

- the land. 5. Yes. 6. Yes, very much so; all kinds of stock are profitable here. Both in the United States and Manitoba. 7. Yes; no. 8. Yes.
9. I believe yes. We are now in a far better position than before the National Policy, as now we have something to give for what we get.
10. Can't say. 11. None of any consequence raised here, can't tell the effect.
12. Have decreased, the quality as good. Reapers, seed drills and waggons.
13. I can not see that the prices have increased any; I buy these articles as cheap, if not cheaper than formerly, and the quality fully as good.
14. Yes, greatly so, by having the market to ourselves and the shutting out of American competition. 15. In both cases.
16. Yes. Yes, as the farmers have now money to pay the mortgages on their lands and investing their surplus in procuring more lands, they find it now a good investment. 17. Greatly so, wages for the labouring classes have greatly increased. 18. Stick to the National Policy and preserve us the home market.

*General Remarks:*—I believe that the National Policy has been the salvation of the country, and the present Conservative Government should be supported and kept in power till the new order of things are firmly established, thereby giving more confidence to capitalists and others to invest their money in a rising and prosperous country, which I fear they would not do, if the other party were in power, as in such a case there is no guarantee that the present prosperous order of things would be maintained by them.

PETER CHRISTIE,

Reeve, Reach, Co. Ontario.

1. For this Province, I think it would be to the advantage of our farmers to admit American farm produce, free.
2. We would be better to have Indian corn and meal free, also flour, wheat in this section is not much raised at a profit to the grower. 3. This is answered by the preceding. 4. I could not give you any reliable statement. 5. I do not think it has in this part of the Dominion.
6. It is considered here profitable to raise horses and especially in Prince Edward Island, large numbers are shipped to the States at good prices.
7. The farmer can import Indian corn cheaper than he can raise it here.
8. I do not think it has improved our market, in fact we ship largely to the States of eggs, butter and vegetables. 9. We should be immensely benefited by Reciprocity.
10. I could not give you any reliable information. 11. Same answer as No. 10.
12. The cost of farm implements in this section is higher than before the Tariff.
13. Woollens, cottons and hardware here advanced by the Tariff, especially the cheaper description. 14. It has not, it may be to Ontario a benefit, but not here. 15. I am sorry to say not any benefit, immense numbers of our people are leaving, especially mechanics.
16. Not any, just the reverse. Land very much decreased in value.
17. I think the general class of farmers have improved their condition, but not, I think, on account of the Tariff. 18. No answer.

RICHARD THOMPSON,

Merchant, St. John, N.B.

1. It would not. 2. I would say it has a tendency to make corn dearer, I am not prepared to specify as to the other grains. 3. I am not prepared to answer this question. 4. Beneficial. 5. Upper Province farmer can answer this question.
6. Other stock is more profitable than horses. Our principal market is local.
7. We cannot in our section, and it would to use American corn. 8. I believe so.

9. Yes. And we are in a better position than if American produce was admitted free. 10. Helps the price. 11. Not prepared to answer this question. 12. I am not prepared to answer. 13. Slightly. 14. I think it has. 15. Yes, I believe it has, but our people go to Manitoba.
16. Not in our district, and it has diminished, in value on account of the inducements in the New Country. 17. Yes. 18. I am not prepared to suggest.
- General Remarks* :—Some questions asked are more practical to Upper Province farmers than to us down here, I have tried to answer them honestly as I thought.

GEORGE McLEOD,  
Farmer, Middle Musquodoboit, Co. Halifax.

1. I believe it would not be in the interest of the farmer to admit American produce free, unless we had Reciprocity, because we could not get as high a price for our produce.
2. It has raised the price of corn and caused more to be planted. The other grains are similarly affected, but I think not so much.
3. In this section of country we do not raise enough wheat for home consumption but I think it has been a benefit to those who have a surplus for sale, and also to the miller.
4. It has been a benefit to farmers, as we get more for our pork on account of the increased duties. 5. I think it has. 6. It is profitable to breed good stock and our principal market is the United States.
7. I believe we can raise the grain required; and I believe the Americans can or do raise it cheaper than we can.
8. I am not sure if it is improved much. 9. I believe a Tariff would be beneficial. I believe a Treaty would be easier got now, than when their produce was admitted free. 10. I cannot say.
11. I have not studied this question. 12. I think that implements are as cheap now, as formerly, and some cheaper. Say mowers, ploughs, rakes and thrashing machines. 13. I cannot say.
14. It has increased, because the Americans used formerly to undersell us.
14. I am sure it has, as all kinds of labour have increased.
16. There is no trouble in selling farms since the price of farm produce has gone up; and if it were not for land being so plentiful in Manitoba and the North-west Territories we could get larger prices. In 1878 times were very dull.
17. Yes, greatly improved. 18. Reciprocity with the United States.

A. McCONNELL,  
J. P., Cushing, Co. Argenteuil.

1. I do not think it would be the interest of agriculturalists to admit all kinds free.
2. As oats and barley are the principal products of this section of the country, it would lower the prices, which would be against our interest.
3. It has raised the prices of both wheat and flour, which is to our disadvantage here, not being able to raise enough for our own use.
4. It has given us a better market and better prices for our produce in that line.
5. It has. 6. I think that horned cattle pay better. Our principal market for horses is the United States. 7. I do not think it would pay to import American corn as it would lessen the value of our own. 8. It has.
9. That is a question I cannot answer, not thoroughly understanding it.
10. I cannot say. 11. As to sugar beet, there is none raised here, flax and tobacco are only raised for domestic use, and therefore do not affect us here.
12. I think the quality is fully as good, and I find them cheaper; ploughs, for example are 20 per cent. cheaper than they were. 13. I do not think they have.

- 
14. It certainly has very much improved by the operation of the Tariff, by our markets not being glutted with American produce. 15. It certainly has.
  16. I find an increased tendency in that direction, and therefore farm lands have increased in value.
  17. I think it has, as there are better prices for our products, and also the establishment of manufactories has given more circulation of money.
  18. Any change that will encourage manufacture will add to the benefit of the agriculturalists, as it will give a better market and more circulation of money.

**THOMAS FITZGERALD,**  
Farmer, Frampton West, Co. Dorchester.

---

1. It would certainly not be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit any kind of American farm produce free.
2. It increased the price of corn to the extent of the duty, and as other coarse grains supply the place of American corn, it has a tendency to increase price.
3. The duty on wheat and flour has no effect upon the price of either in my opinion.
4. I think it affects their price to the extent of the duty.
5. As no live stock has been exported from here to Manitoba, these duties have had no effect as yet here. 6. It is profitable to breed horses here, but horned cattle pay better. The principal market for horses is in the United States.
7. He can. It would not pay to buy American corn for such a purpose.
8. It is; particularly vegetables. 9. He would. We certainly are in a better position. 10. No effect. 11. No effect in this locality.
12. Farm implements cost about the same as they did previous to the present Tariff.
13. Woollens and cottons are not affected. Hardware may be a shade dearer.
14. It has, chiefly through the increased population, caused by the protection it gives to manufacturers, 15. It has.
16. There is. Farm lands have increased in value 50 per cent. since 1878.
18. I can suggest no change in the Tariff that would have a beneficial effect.

**WILLIAM J. McPHAIL,**  
Reeve, St. Andrews, Co. Stormont.

---

1. Admit corn and cornmeal free, as we cannot grow it here. 2. To raise the price. We can raise oats. Don't want rye. Can raise barley enough, but not corn.
3. I think not much on price. Not very much brought in. I do not think it interferes with either spring or fall.
4. To increase the price of pork. 5. Do not deal much in horses.
6. Not a horse raising section. 7. Not here. Yes; corn, bran and pollard here.
8. Yes. 9. Yes. Decidedly under the present Tariff.
- 10 and 11. No answer. 12. I cannot see much difference.
13. I see not much difference. 14. I think it has, by protective duties.
15. Not to the extent we would wish. 16. I think so. Rather increased, owing to more certain sales at paying prices. 17. I think so. 18. No answer.

**A. J. NEWCOMB,**  
South East Passage, Co. Halifax.

---

1. It would not. 2. The result has been better prices for corn, oats and peas. I don't think it has had any effect on barley. I cannot say anything about rye except that which I hear, and that is, that the price has been better this last year than for some time back.
3. On the whole the effect has been that prices are better.

4. A greater demand and better prices for Canadian pork.
5. I don't think it has affected the prices paid for live stock to any great extent.
6. No. The United States. 7. He can. I think not. 8. I cannot say, that it is.
9. Yes; in this vicinity, because our main crop is barley on which there is a heavy duty, and the Americans are our buyers. Most certainly we are.
10. I do not think the Tariff has affected it much. 11. None raised here.
12. Farm implements can be bought cheaper now, than at any time back for 10 years. They are more serviceable and the quality is better. Reapers, mowers, hay rakes, ploughs, harrows, corn huskers, fanning mills and other articles.
13. I can't see that the Tariff has made any difference on those goods.
14. Yes; for instance, Indian corn is one of the most profitable crops we raise, but the markets were glutted with American corn, which we had to compete with in our home markets, without being permitted to compete with American farmers in their markets. 15. Yes.
16. Yes they have increased in value. I would not presume to say why.
17. The labouring classes get better wages now than over I recollect before, and the farmers find their business more profitable than in 1878.
18. If any change is made, put a heavier duty on American produce coming to Canada, and keep down railway monopolies.

*General Remarks* :—It has been rumored that the duty was to be removed from corn and other coarse grain from the United States, at the instance of a few breeders and distillers. I feel sure that this would be unjust to Canadian farmers in general, unless we can have a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

CHARLES ANDERSON,  
Secretary Township Agricultural Society, Melrose, Co. Hastings

1. Decidedly not. 2. Better prices for all kinds of coarse grain.
3. To get a fair price for home grown; we don't raise spring wheat.
4. Higher prices for all descriptions of pork and lard. 5. The horse market is good, especially for Manitoba, other stock much better. 6. Horses are the most profitable. In Manitoba.
7. He can raise all he needs cheaper than he can import American. 8. Yes.
9. I don't think so, but we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. No wool grown here. 11. Good for tobacco, I know nothing of the other two.
12. Has increased, and better articles; all kinds of farming implements.
13. Not increased except cottons, which is caused by the raw cottons raising in price, woollens and hardware are cheaper.
14. It has, because the market is good for all produce at home. 15. It has.
16. There is, because we have better prices for produce, farms have increased in value considerable since 1878. 17. Most decidedly.
18. Get rid of half the lawyers and put in more practical men.

WM. McCORMICK,  
Reeve, Pelee, Co. Essex.

1. I would admit no kind free of duty, because it would reduce our own prices.
2. All sorts of coarse grain have risen in price since the duty on American Indian corn. 3. Better prices. 4. Much better price for all these articles.
5. Yes. 6. Yes, very profitable, equal with other stock. Principally Manitoba.
7. Yes. No. 8. Greatly improved. 9. We are in a better position to negotiate a Treaty with the United States with the present Tariff. 10. Good. 11. No answer.
12. Ploughs and reapers cheaper, quality much better.
13. Woollens and hardware cheaper. 14. Greatly increased. 15. Yes, both.
16. Yes, increased. 17. Yes. 18. Keep out the Grits.

JOHN ROBERTS,  
Farmer, Lindsay, Co. Victoria.

1. Yes, it would be in the interest of this part of Canada to have some at least come in free. We have to buy. 2. The effect on coarse grains is against us.
3. We have to eat more poor bread. Also discouraging and hurtful to the coasting trade. 4. I do not know. 5. If I was in Manitoba I would want to buy horses cheap. 6. The United States is our market for horses. 7. We want corn.
8. No. We send Jonathan eggs and butter sometimes. Our people have gone to the United States.
9. I would like to have a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I never stopped a boy from throwing stones at me by throwing same at him.
10. Prices are lower than in former years. 11. No answer.
12. Increased, and what we import, just as good as before the National Policy. Thrashing machines, &c. 13. Increased; clothing, hardware, &c.
14. Our market naturally should be St. John, but so many of the people have gone to the United States of late that it has greatly decreased, except for that improved, especially on such produce as can be profitably shipped to the States.
15. No, our people have gone and are going to the United States.
16. No. Decreased; taxes too heavy, there seems to be no confidence and people will not invest money here. 17. Wages are better than last year. 18. Free Trade.

*General Remarks:*—The questions refer largely to the Canadian farmer, but we are chiefly mechanics and do not like to pay a heavy duty on the corn and meal that our cow and pig eat, also on our clothes, so we go to the United States. We want our people back home for various reasons, but if they come, we must give them work, and this we cannot do without a trade from and to the United States.

ALEX. G. HOWARD,

Fairfield, Co. St. John, N.B.

1. Corn should be admitted free as we cannot raise it here. We would not object to American competition against such farm produce as we can grow to advantage. 3. Corn is higher, the other grains are not perceptibly effected.
3. We do not import any wheat in Northumberland. Flour from the United States is 50 cents per barrel higher. 4. We do not place anything in this line on the Canadian market.
5. Horses and other stock are lower in price at present than for several years.
6. Profits on horses, compared with other stock, are not good. We sell to the United States in part, but not at all to Manitoba.
7. Cannot raise the grain; must import American corn. 8. No.
9. Canadian farmers would be benefited by Reciprocity. We were in a better position to negotiate when American produce was coming in free.
10. We do not import wool into, or export it from, this country in a raw state.
11. We have not any experience in those articles for market purposes.
12. Cost is increased, and American implements, which are generally of a better class than Canadians, are almost shut out by the Tariff. This applies to nearly every implement required for agricultural purposes.
13. They are, in nearly all articles manufactured from cotton and wool or mixtures. Increase is from 5 to 30 per cent. In hardware the cost is greater than before the Tariff of 1878, while the quality is inferior in very many articles.
14. It has not. 15. It has not; on the contrary, more people have left this country since the change in the Tariff than, in any previous corresponding period, and they are still leaving very fast.
16. Farmers, especially the smaller ones, have sold or abandoned their farms in many cases. Those selling generally doing so at a sacrifice to enable them to go away, principally to the United States, because they have to pay higher prices for what they must buy and can get no better prices than formerly for what they have to sell.

17. It is not, notwithstanding a slight improvement in the lumber export business to the United Kingdom. 18. As far as possible to a Revenue Tariff or Free Trade.

BATHOLEMEW STAPLEDEN, J. P.,  
President Northumberland Agricultural Society,  
Chatham, Co. Northumberland.

1. We consider it would be in the interest of the Canadian agriculturalist to admit flour, cornmeal, apples and kerosene oil, because we could get them cheaper.
  2. The effect of the imposition of duty on corn is, that people cannot afford to feed their stock with it, and use barley in lieu thereof.
  3. We consider the price of flour higher than it otherwise would be if no duty were imposed on American flour.
  4. It has not materially altered the value, but it is supposed that the price to the producer would have been lower were it not for this duty.
  5. The duties imposed have not increased the price of horses. The home market is not so good as the United States. 6. The profits compare favourably with that on other stocks. United States. 7. He can raise all that is necessary.
  8. The market has not improved for those articles through the present Tariff.
  9. Yes; very much. We are in a better position, having some concession to offer in exchange for the same concession on their part.
  10. Prices have been lower the last few years from some cause. 11. No answer.
  12. The cost is increased—quality not so good. Such as rakes, forks, edge tools, &c.
  12. We pay higher for cotton warp, but do not perceive that there is much difference in other goods. 14. It has not. The United States our market for produce.
  15. More have had employment, but at very low wages. It has not encouraged Canadians to return to this country.
  16. The value of land here has decreased, owing to numbers moving to the North-West and to the depression caused by the failure of a bank.
  17. The general condition of the farmer has improved. There is not any improvement in that of the labouring classes.
  18. The great want is a larger market for potatoes, which Reciprocity would give.
- General Remarks* :—The condition and profits of farmers would be good, if we had a class of capitalists to engage in such manufactures as would afford employment to the labourers, and also by the establishment of factories for the manufacture of cheese and butter.

JOHN MILLS,  
Bay Fortune, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. On the whole it would not. In some sections and in some seasons it might benefit the stock raised to admit Indian corn.
2. From the duty and perhaps other causes, pease, barley and oats have commanded higher prices in our section, pease, 5 cents to 10 cents; barley, 20 cents to 25 cents, and oats, 5 cents to 10 cents.
3. Wheat has fetched higher prices, particularly spring wheat, which formerly was 5 cents to 10 cents less than fall wheat now fetches 5 cents more.
4. I cannot say, only I do know that dressed hogs, bacon and lard have fetched better prices. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. Both places in this section.
7. Yes. Some seasons it has paid to import corn. 8. I do not know.
9. Yes. Yes, in a better position with the present or some Tariff.
10. In this section it does not appear to have improved the price of wool.
11. I do not know, very little grown here. 12. They are about the same, some less if anything, particularly reapers, mowers, agricultural implements, &c.
13. As far as my experience goes they are not increased in price.

14. Yes, it has enabled millers to manufacture at a profit. 15. Yes, to a limited extent in our county, but it is an agricultural county principally.  
 16. No, farm property has decreased since 1878, caused by the extraordinary emigration to the North-West. 17. Yes. 18. Reciprocity with the United States.

JOHN TOLTON,  
 Township Reeve, Walkerton, Co. Bruce.

1. It would not. 2. A protective Tariff encourages the raising of Indian corn and other coarse grain in this part of the country.  
 3. The effect is not perceptible here. It encourages the sowing of spring wheat here.  
 4. The effect not perceptible, the decreased duty for the better. 5. It has not made much change, American buyers do continue to come to our market.  
 6. The profit in raising horses compares favourably with other stock, when sold at four or five years old. Chief market is the United States.  
 7. The farmer can raise grain profitably to feed his stock, and it would pay better than import Indian corn and gives a profit in many ways. 8. By this Tariff the farmer is encouraged to raise vegetables, poultry, eggs, butter, &c.  
 9. Reciprocity with the United States would benefit the farmer, and we are in a better position to negotiate with the present Tariff than when produce was admitted free. 10. I cannot say. 11. A good effect.  
 12. Not much difference; quality as good. 13. I see no difference. 14. It has.  
 15. It has, in every case, so much is it increased that labour is becoming scarce and dear, and it has almost put a stop to emigration to the United States, some have lately returned to this part.  
 16. There is an increased tendency for the investment of capital; farms have increased in value 25 per cent. since 1878, owing to increased prosperity in the country. 17. The general condition of the farmer and labourer is much improved. 18. Increasing emigration.

*General Remarks*:—A good homestead law; encourage education and lower the Tariff of doctors and lawyers.

ALEXANDER DALY, J.P.,  
 Rawdon, Co. Montcalm.

1. In my opinion it would not. 2. It has improved the price of all coarse grains.  
 3. It has improved the price and caused a steadier market for all kinds of wheat and flour. 4. An improvement that has been decided and steady since the present Tariff came into force. 5. I think they have. 6. No answer. 7. Yes. It would be no improvement to import corn. 8. It has never been better for the last thirty years.  
 9. I would prefer the present arrangement. 10. It is a better price. 11. No answer.  
 12. About the same; the articles as a general thing better. Reapers and mowers cheaper. 13. About the same. Woollen and cotton articles better in quality.  
 14. Most certainly. 15. That is one of its most pleasing features.  
 16. Yes, farming lands have increased in value. 17. Very greatly improved.  
 18. I should say, let well enough alone. Farmers would favour an increase in duty on corn.

*General Remarks*:—I think it must be evident, to every unbiassed mind, that the last three or four years have been the most prosperous in the history of the Dominion, which, I believe, is owing largely to the beneficial effects of the so-called National Policy.

R. GORDON,  
 Warden, Tweed, Co. Hastings.

1. No. Detrimental to our interests. 2. National Policy beneficial; corn especially.
3. Beneficial. 4. Our Canadian farmers receive higher prices for hog produce.
5. Yes. 6. Yes. Manitoba. 7. Yes. No. 8. Certainly, yes. 9. Not posted.
10. Good. 11. Flax and tobacco good, and beets. 12. Cost decreased; all kinds of farming implements better. 13. No. 14. Yes. 15. Yes, yes. 16. Yes. Yes.
17. Yes. More farmers.

*General Remarks* :—For our interest, support our present Government.

R. B. GOODFELLOW,  
Reeve, South Elmsley, Smith's Falls, Co. Leeds.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit American farm produce free of duty. 2. Has had no effect on the price of oats and barley. Rye, corn and pease not grown here to any extent.
3. Flour imported from the United States is higher by the amount of the duty, but the quantity is not large, most of the flour used being imported from Ontario. The duty on cornmeal is a heavy tax on the poor farmer.
4. I have no knowledge of the effect. 5. Our local market has not been affected by the duty. 6. Farmers find it profitable to raise horses for the local markets; such as coal mines, railways, &c. 7. It would not pay our farmers to import corn to fatten stock in this section. 8. It has no effect on this market.
9. Reciprocity would benefit our Lower Provinces more than any other Legislative Act. Our Province was never more prosperous than when Reciprocity with the United States was in existence. We are in a much better position to negotiate such a Treaty with a Protective Tariff, than we were when American produce was admitted free. 10. No difference in this section.
14. Flax, tobacco and sugar beet not cultivated to any extent in this section.
12. Farming implements are sold at about the same rate as formerly. There is an improvement in the style and make of ploughs, mowing machines and other agricultural implements. 13. Woollens, coltons and hardware have not increased in price. 14. I am not in a position to know.
15. The present Tariff has not as yet proved beneficial to the farmers and the industrial classes; and emigration to the United States and Canada has increased.
16. There is no increase in the investment of capital in farm property, and farm lands have not increased in value.
17. No visible change in the condition of the farmer. There is an increased demand for labour at the collieries, owing to large contracts taken by the owners.
18. A reduction in the Tariff on all articles used largely by farmers, would be a benefit.

JOHN LORWAY,  
Port Warden, Sydney, Cape Breton.

1. No. 2. No perceptible effect in this section.
3. The only effect produced is larger importation of flour from Ontario. Price not perceptibly affected. 4. A greater amount produced at home than formerly.
- 5 and 6. No trade in this section of the country with either the United States or Manitoba in horses or live stock, &c.
7. He can raise all that is required without importing. 8. Decidedly so.
9. Yes. Now in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty. 10. No effect here.
11. Same as above (10.) 12. Farm implements made in the Dominion under the present Tariff can be procured at lower prices and of as good a quality as those imported under the old. Articles such as forks, rakes, ploughs, mowing machines, &c., &c. 13. No perceptible increase.

14. Yes. In this Province by the prosperity of our coal mines. Materially assisted by the duty on coal. 15 and 16. No answer. 17. Decidedly improved.  
18. Additional protection to our coal industries.

RODK. McLENNAN, J. P.,  
President Agricultural Society, Sydney, Co. Cape Breton.

1. It would not be to our interest to admit any kind of American products free, unless to make a fair exchange. The Americans to throw their market open for our potatoes and we to do the same with their Indian corn.
2. We consider it a benefit to us to have all coarse grains shut out of our market, with the exception of Indian corn. 3. Not any.
4. We can command a better price since the increased duties on hogs, ham and bacon. We are also of opinion that an increased duty would be still a greater benefit. 5. It has.
6. We find it more profitable to raise other kinds of stock than horses. The United States has been our principal market for horses. 7. We can raise profitably all the grain for our stock, with the exception of what is mentioned lastly in question No. 1. 8. We want all those articles excluded from our market.
9. Yes, a Reciprocity Treaty would be a great benefit; and I consider we are in a better position now to negotiate such a Treaty, providing it can be got on a fair basis. 10. It has a tendency for our benefit. 11. Not any. 12. The price has decreased and the quality improved.
13. We find all cottons slightly advanced in price, but woollen goods cheaper and of a better quality. Hardware rates about the same as before.
14. It has not affected us any; with the exception of pork, we command a better price. 15. It has, and retarded emigration to the United States. 16. The Tariff has not affected the value of land here. 17. We cannot see much improvement.
18. We want a change in legislation to carry out the terms of Confederation by granting us constant communication the year round with our sister Provinces, and the only sure way and means is a tunnel across the Straits. Secondly, the extreme high rates on our surface and serpentine railway is a great drawback to the people of this Island, and we are sure it would be a great boon to the Dominion Government financially to have a large reduction made in the fares of our road. Thirdly, To open up a new market for us by giving a grant to a line of steamers to carry our produce to the West Indies, and we further hope and trust that you will use your best endeavours to have the duty (which is now 15 cents per bushel for potatoes entering the American market) removed as quickly as possible, as that commodity is what the farmers of this country largely depend on.

A. GILL,  
Farmer, Little York, Co. Queen's, P.E.I.

1. I think not, unless in importation of seed. 2. The effect has been to raise the price of oats and barley. Rye and corn, we do not raise extensively.
3. Our flour has been cheaper since the National Policy.
4. The price of pork and hams has increased, and the farmer can sell to better advantage. Pork 10 cents to 11 cents, hams 11 cents to 14 cents.
5. No answer. 6. We find it profitable to breed horses, as we get good prices from buyers from the United States. Americans being the principal buyers.
7. I think the Canadian farmer can raise sufficient to fatten his own stock, it is so in these Provinces. 8. Yes. 9. I think if we got the 15 cents duty off the potatoes we would be all right. Of course you are in a better position.
10. It has increased in price under the National Policy. 11. I cannot say.

12. About the same price. Mowing machines, &c. 13. About the same.  
 14. It has rather increased, although the principal buyers are from the United States.  
 15. It has given some employment, but there is still a considerable emigration to the United States and the West.  
 16. I think there is, and farm lands have increased in value.  
 17. I think they are on the whole better. 18. Get the duty as much as possible off things in general use, such as sugar, molasses, hardware, mowing machines, sewing machines, &c.

*General Remarks* :—I have endeavoured to answer these questions as well as I know, of course, taking my standpoint from the Lower Provinces.

ARCHIBALD SHAW,  
 Farmer, New Perth, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. Yes; to admit wheat, flour, corn and corn-meal. Because we import half of our flour, and nearly all of our corn and meal.  
 2. Increasing the price, as we cannot raise corn to advantage. Barley, rye and pease not much grown or used; buckwheat is our staple coarse grain here.  
 3. Increased; not much fall wheat sown here, nearly all spring.  
 4. Increased the price of barrelled pork; other kinds do not reach this market.  
 5. None sold here for the West or North-West. 6. Yes. Favourably. United States. 7. No. Yes, especially a year like last year, when the turnips and buckwheat crops were failures.  
 8. No. 9. Yes. I do not think we are in any worse position. 10. We have always sold to United States buyers. 11. We do not attempt to raise much of the two first named, and very little of the latter.  
 12. We think they are slightly increased, and not as good. Mowers, reapers, ploughs, horse-rakes, hand-forks, hand-hoes, and monkey-wrenches.  
 13. Woollens are not, but cottons and hardware are increased; all woollen goods, door-locks, hinges, &c., nearly or quite to extent of duty.  
 14. No. 15. I think not here, although it may have done so in towns and cities.  
 16. No; value about the same. 17. Yes. 18. Wheat flour, corn and cornmeal admitted free.

*General Remarks* :—I have answered your questions from a local point of view, and have taken my own locality as a standpoint. I do not object to duties on all kinds of manufactured goods. My reasons for objecting to duties on wheat and corn are, that we cannot raise as much as we would like to use, especially corn. If it were imported (duty free), and when cheap, we would feed more to our stock, and, as a consequence, would export more fat beef.

In time the farmers may raise enough wheat for their own consumption. Since 1878, farmers have prospered, which we attribute to the prosperity in the lumber trade and in the neighbouring Republic. The lumberman and United States buyers have taken our surplus horses, for which they paid good prices. Our sheep and lambs are eagerly sought after by United States drovers. Prices remunerative.

J. H. MURCH,  
 County Councillor, Bear Island, Co. York.

1. It would not be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit any coarse grains free of duty in Canada.  
 2. It has established a general use and demand for oats with all lumbering firms which formerly used principally American corn for horse feed.  
 3. The Canadian farmer receives more for his fall and spring wheat since the National Policy was established.

4. The farmer receives more for his hogs and all kinds of pork. Of course the lumbermen have to pay the difference, as they are the principal consumers in this part of the Province.
5. We think the duties do not affect live stock, particularly horses, as we generally export. The Manitoba demand for live stock may, and likely will, make some difference in the market.
6. We find it profitable to breed horses. Manitoba now; formerly the United States.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise his own feed cheaper than purchasing American corn, with the exception of those on the frontier where there is a very short distance to haul corn. 8. We think it is, as these articles are now taken from the back townships to the front.
9. We prefer the present Tariff, but certainly consider ourselves in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty than when American produce was admitted free. 10. I cannot state. 11. Such articles are not cultivated in this locality.
12. We do not see any particular difference in cost, but we consider the quality better. 13. We do not notice any difference, only that we find the means to purchase much easier than before.
14. It most decidedly has in our locality, by shutting out American corn and giving a demand and remunerative prices for oats.
15. We believe it has given employment to many of the different hands employed by the industrial institutions, who would have had to go elsewhere, and caused many to return home who had to leave during Free Trade.
16. We think they are decreased now by the Manitoba fever. 17. Times are much better now. 18. No answer.

P. J. GREEN, Municipal Clerk, }  
 CHAS. McDAVITT, Reeve, } McClure, Co. Hastings.

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks*.—I am in favour of the present Tariff.

ROBERT O. INNES,  
 Farmer, Porter's Lake, Co. Halifax.

1. Corn. 2. It has increased the price of American corn, and not increased the price of our coarse grains. 3. Tariff an injury. 4. No answer.
5. Certainly not. 6. United States for all valuable horses.
7. Pass an Act to keep the bugs off our pease, or otherwise take the duty off corn.
8. No. 9. Would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty. In a worse position.
10. No effect. 11. No answer. 12. Is increased. 13. Increased.
14. Not one cent. 15. None whatever. 16. Decreased \$10 per acre, owing to the opening up of the North-West. 17. Not by the Tariff. 18. Give us all the Free Trade possible.

*General Remarks*.—The National Policy is a perfect humbug.

JOHN H. SYLVESTER,  
 Councillor, Ratho, Co. Oxford.

1. It would be in the interest of agriculturalists to admit free every kind of American farm produce used in whole or in part for feeding stock.
2. It has not affected the price of oats. We do not raise rye. We do not raise corn but to a very limited extent. But as a corn consuming section the duty on American corn has lessened the profit on stock raising and dairy farming. The price of barley is not affected, nor the price of pease, except in the slightest degree.

3. As we are exporters of wheat and flour the duties imposed cannot increase the price. The price of these articles have been lower since the imposition of a duty, compared with the price of the same articles in the principal grain markets in the United States. 4. I cannot say.
5. No. 6. I have not bred horses for some time past.
7. In many cases it pays much better to buy American corn, but the present duty on which is a considerable drawback in the fattening of stock. Farmers who formerly clubbed and bought in the American markets through the trouble of dealing with the Custom House, buy from second hand, of course pay more. 8. No.
9. Yes. By waging a Tariff war we are irritating a nation ten times our number, and possessed of every variety of soil and climate by which they can raise every variety of product, from the semi-tropical to the temperate zone productions. 10. It has none, the wool generally imported not being subject to duty.
11. None. But the price of sugar has been increased as compared with other markets. 12. The cost is increased; the quality is as good.
13. Yes. Mostly all, and to nearly the amount of the additional duty imposed by the present Tariff, that is, quality considered.
14. No. 15. No. But the good crops of the past two seasons and the better prices for grain, especially wheat and barley, owing to the partial failure of the crops in Europe, has stimulated trade of all kinds to a certain extent.
16. No. But from the causes noted in last answer, farm lands did somewhat increase in value till last autumn, since the tendency has been downward.
17. Owing to the causes noted under answer to No. 15, it has improved to a certain extent. But it would have improved more if it were not for the inequalities of the Tariff imposing burdens for the benefit of a few rich monopolists.
18. The admission of agricultural implements duty free, and also the raw material which is used by manufacturers of said implements. Also a return to a revenue Tariff upon sugar and the articles enumerated in No. 13. And the prevention of the gigantic railway companies getting possession of competing lines, built in part by public funds, to secure reasonable freight rates.

JAMES YOOL,

Farmer, Brooksdale, Co. Oxford.

1. Only on Free Trade; some products not affected by the Tariff. Wheat, barley, pease, &c.
2. The duty on corn raised price to extent of duty, but last year it has had no effect corn being higher on the other side the line than here.
3. The effect has been very slight indeed, as both American and Canadian surplus wheat must find a market abroad. 4. I could not speak definitely.
5. Our best horses must find a market in the United States, the poorer are being shipped to Manitoba. 6. By breeding good animals either fancy or heavy draught, the profits compare favourably with the other stock.
7. In the corn belt of Ontario it might, but as a whole it cannot be done.
8. I think not. 9. Most undoubtedly he would. As the best time to obtain it, I cannot speak so definitely. 10. Wool not affected by it. 11. No answer.
12. Increased. Reapers, mowers and engines for thrashing, with other implements for farm use, are dearer, manufacturers must be the losers as iron and coal are affected by the Tariff. 13. Increased. 14. Not to any extent. 15. It has not.
16. There is no increased tendency to invest in farm property.
17. Of the former there is an improvement owing to a succession of good crops and a general renewal of trade, but the latter is not improved.
18. Legislation having in view a liberal Reciprocity Treaty is desirable.

L. COLEMAN,

Bloomsburg, Co. Norfolk.

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—I am in favour of maintaining the present Tariff as most conducive to the interests of the farmers, and do not desire to see any modification of it.

HARMAN HOSTETIR,  
Farmer, Virgil, Co. Lincoln.

1. No.
2. It has improved the market for corn, oats and barley.
3. It has raised the price of fall and spring wheat by giving the farmer his own market.
4. It has made the raising of hogs more profitable as well as all products from them.
5. It has encouraged the farmer to enter more highly into stock raising.
6. We do, and find horses more profitable than any other stock and for which we have a home market.
7. Yes, and it will be to his interest to do so.
8. Yes, as the town increases in commercial activity through manufacturing industries they consume more agricultural produce.
9. I do not think the farmer would be benefited by a Treaty, but I would consider that the country would be in a better position to negotiate for one if required.
10. Cannot say that at present it has had any effect.
11. Our farmers have not as yet cultivated those articles.
12. The price is lower and of better quality.
13. No change in price.
14. It has, by the increased number of people engaged in manufacturing, and thereby increasing the number of consumers.
15. The exodus to the United States has been checked by more work being provided for our people at home, and many that had emigrated have returned.
16. Land has increased in value and finds a ready sale at increased rates, owing to the improved prices of produce and the lower rates of interest on capital.
17. Very much so, and the encouragement gives to agriculture by the Tariff is the main cause.
18. The maintenance of the present will suffice to give a stimulus to improvement in farming, and making it a more profitable and attractive occupation than heretofore.

*General Remarks* :—The Tariff has benefited the farmer greatly in this section by giving him a market for his fruit and preventing the Americans from glutting the market, to keep the price up in their own country, which had the effect of preventing the Canadian farmer from cultivating extensively especially fruit.

HENRY PAFFARD,  
President Electoral Division Agricultural Society,  
Niagara, Co. Lincoln.

1. No, protection stimulates the growth of cereals that would not be grown could the American production come in free.
2. *Corn*—The effect of duty on corn has been to cause many times, perhaps ten times, as great an area to be planted. If the land is properly prepared very large crops can be grown, forty to sixty bushels of shelled corn to the acre. I have grown sixty bushels to the acre in Oxford county. I cannot see that the price is affected as corn is higher in Chicago than in Canada now, although the Western States can grow it cheaper than we can, as their land is light and easily worked, their seasons longer and the climate dryer, which are great advantages in the production of corn, and amounts to more in their favor than the Protection we have. *Oats*—I cannot say that their price is affected; our oats are much better than the American, and with good culture yield from fifty to eight bushels to the acre. *Rye*, none grown. *Barley*—It has had no effect on barley. American barley and ours are very different articles, ours runs from forty-eight to fifty-two pounds to the bushel and theirs as a rule is light. *Pease*—Pease have not been grown with us of late years owing to a bug infecting them but are very prolific. Do not think Protection affects them either way.

3. I cannot see that the price of wheat is affected as it is higher in Chicago than here ; I know that Protection has caused a greater area of fall wheat to be sown, and the farmers take more pains every year in preparing their lands for it, learning by experience what is required to produce it successfully, spring wheat has not been grown with us for a few years as a blight attacks it.
4. Live hogs—I think this stands as before Protection was put on. Live hogs cannot be brought in here and made into pork successfully as it is too far from where they are raised. It has been tried years back in Hamilton, but the establishment was closed which looks as though it did not pay. Dried hams, bacon and lard—Protection has helped this industry wonderfully, but there is not yet sufficient duty to preclude the Americans. Hogs are raised largely at our cheese factories. Factory hogs make the best of bacon. More Protection would bring about greater competition at home and tend to reduce price.
5. Duties on horses and other live stock.—Protection has helped the growth of the above. Without it we could not have sent horses to Manitoba at all, as the distance and freight is in favour of the Americans.
6. Profits on horse breeding.—Since opening up the North-West, the price of horses has advanced much, and at this moment are more profitable than cattle, there being so many bought for the North-West. American buyers have for the past year been extensive purchasers at good prices. For superior horses we have the English market.
7. There are seasons when it would pay the farmer who is feeding largely for export, to bring in American corn free of duty. I have experienced this myself, although I would not recommend it without a Revenue Officer were in charge of the establishment where such corn was fed. It would be for only a few months in the winter, and could be successfully done.
8. Eggs, &c., &c.—Yes, creating much labour, and causing an increased demand for these articles. 9. Reciprocity.—This requires much consideration. At present consider we are better off without it. 10. It has had no effect whatever.
11. Flax. There is a large area grown in our section. The Tariff will tend to increase its growth. Tobacco and sugar beet are not grown here, but Protection tends to develop all industries and has caused sugar beet growth in some parts of the country.
12. Cost of farm implements. Not increased under the Tariff. All classes of implements made in Canada are better, and more substantially made than those coming from the United States. The Americans make some labour-saving machines, which are now coming into use here and the North-West, such as self-binders. Their facilities and market is so much larger than ours, that the Protection is insufficient, particularly on ploughs. In some establishments in the United States they make, perhaps of one line, fifty thousand per year, for instance, the South Bend (Indiana) plough of which several hundred have come into the London district during the last year. Their agent informs me that sixty thousand of one line were made in one season. Where articles are made on so large a scale our Protection is insufficient, and besides they enter them for duty so low, and they are so much nearer to the North-West, and have an advantage in freight over us, which reduces the duty on their goods.
13. Woollens and cottons.—I am not a dry goods man. Hardware I do not see any difference in. 14. The home markets are much improved, as there is a greater demand for everything produced.
15. Wonderfully so. Factories and establishments are in operation to-day that could not exist against the establishments of the United States. Our own people are returning home and many others are coming with them. I am interested in an establishment employing over two hundred pairs of hands, which is prosperous to-day, and was in bankruptcy before the National Policy came into force.

16. There is a greatly increased tendency to invest in farm lands in the North-West, but in Ontario I do not see any change.
17. Yes, they are all prosperous now, whereas in 1878 there was nothing for them to do. The artisans were walking the streets nearly starving, while what little money we had left in the country was being drained into the United States to pay for goods we should manufacture ourselves. Allow me to draw your attention to the large number of buggy wheels that are coming into this city from Indiana, thousands of sets in a year, which could be made here. We are making them in Canada but the Protection is not sufficient to shut out the United States, where they are made on such an immense scale. This trade with us cannot become large till we have sufficient Protection to foster its growth here.
18. Increase the Tariff sufficiently to exclude foreign competition, the result of which will be to create home manufacturing and competition, thereby bringing about a diversity of labour and general merchants.

*General Remarks* :—Enclosed I hand you my answers to Mr. Orton's queries as to the Tariff's operation on the agricultural interests of this country, and have taken the liberty of making some suggestions, but feel justified in saying what I have, as my remarks are unprejudiced and arrived at from 25 years of active and practical life in this country.

J. S. FALLOWS,  
London, Ontario.

1. No.
2. It has advanced the price of oats, corn and pease, and made inferior barley more valuable for feeding purposes.
3. It has caused a large amount of Ontario flour to go into consumption in the Lower Provinces; the grower of the wheat getting a better price than he could have done if there was no duty. But the duty on wheat should not exceed from 8 to 9 cents per bushel, when flour is admitted at 50 cents a barrel.
4. I should think they were to the farmer's advantage.
- 5 and 6. No answer.
7. In some cases it may be necessary for the farmer to import small quantities of Indian corn; but he can well afford to pay a small duty on it, from the large amount of benefit he derives in the increased value he gets for all the other small products of his farm under the Protective Tariff.
8. Very much.
9. In a better condition to negotiate under the present Tariff.
- 10 and 11. No answer.
12. The price of implements may possibly be increased a little in some cases, but competition will soon reduce the price; and if the farmer does pay a trifle more for the article, he gets it back ten-fold by getting a better price for the products of his farm under the Protective Tariff.
13. No answer.
14. Yes.
15. Yes; by keeping out American goods, causing all the orders to be filled by manufacturing establishments at home, and giving an impetus to manufacturing interests that could not be got otherwise.
16. The price of land remains about the same. Think it would have advanced had it not been for the excitement in Manitoba.
17. The condition of farmers has improved, and the labouring classes get plenty of work at good wages.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—I am in favour of most all raw material for manufacturing purposes to be admitted free, or at a very moderate duty, so that the manufactured goods can be furnished to the consumer at as low a price as possible; and that the present Tariff be continued on manufactured goods where the article is complete within itself; but where it is necessary for the manufacturer to import parts or trimmings not made in Canada, to complete an article, they should be admitted at a very moderate duty.

SYLVESTER NEELON,  
Vessel and Steamboat Owner, Merchant, Miller and  
Manufacturer of Ship Timber, St. Catherine's, Co. Lincoln.

1. Only corn. 2. No bad effect, except on American Indian corn.
3. An increase on the price. 4. Not good. 5. The duty imposed by Dominion Government does not improve our market. The United States is our natural market for live stock. 6. Yes; favourably. The United States.
7. It would be an improvement to be able to get cheap corn. 8. No.
9. Yes; it is the general opinion that we are. 10. It does not affect us.
11. Produce of this kind is not raised in this Province, therefore the duty has an injurious effect. 12. Increased. 13. Woollens, no; cotton and hardware, yes.
14. No. 15. Yes, as regards the Dominion in general.
16. Not in this Province. Lands have decreased in price, chiefly on account of depression in trade and emigration. 17. Very little change.
18. In this Province, chiefly Free Trade with the United States.

*General Remarks:*—We believe the National Policy of the present Government the best for the development and improvement of the Dominion in general; but not calculated to advance the prosperity of Prince Edward Island.

JOHN S. MULLIN,

Farmer, Kensington, Co. Prince, P.E.I.

- 1 to 4. No answer. 5. The only profitable market for horses and live stock is in the United States. The only thing we get from Manitoba and the North-West is increased taxes.
6. Certainly, for the United States. The profits on horses compare proportionally with other stock. 7. The farmers cannot raise a sufficiency, therefore it is to their advantage to import from the United States.
8. I cannot see that it is, but has decreased. 9. It certainly would be better to have a Reciprocity Treaty. We want Free Trade as the only thing to benefit the farmers of New Brunswick.
10. The price of wool is low and manufactured wool is higher, from 15 to 20 cents per yard higher now. 11. I cannot comment on these, as very little thereof is raised in this part of Canada.
12. Horse waggons are increased from \$5 to \$6 and lumber waggons and some other implements proportionately. 13. All of these have increased in price. The farmer has to pay a high price for all specified here.
14. I might say that here we have no market, our whole dependence is the United States. 15. In fact the Tariff has driven all, or nearly all our youthful people to the United States, to seek employment not obtained here.
16. There is none. Land property has decreased to about one-third its former value.
17. No, their condition is rapidly on the decrease.
18. A change in Government, from Protection to Free Trade.

*General Remarks:*—I would say in conclusion, give us Reciprocity if you are desirous of retaining any of our youths in this Province.

JAMES McGUIRE,

Farmer, Golden Grove, Co. St. John, N.B.

1. It would be to our interest to admit coarse grains and cornmeal, because we don't produce enough for home consumption.
2. The duty on corn has had the effect of raising the price of the other coarse grains, therefore it is against us in this part of the Dominion.
3. I am not in a position to know whether it has had any effect or not.
4. It has increased the price, and consequently we have a better market.
5. I think it is right, but we notice no difference in this part of Nova Scotia.

6. We do not raise horses for exportation, because we do not get a chance; but we find them profitable for our own market—a good horse here will bring from \$100 to \$150.
7. We cannot raise enough feed for ourselves; therefore it pays to import corn and cornmeal.
8. We think the market is better under the new Tariff.
9. If Free Trade with the United States is a benefit, we are in a better position to get it under the present Tariff.
10. It will have a tendency to be better.
11. We do not cultivate these.
12. I do not know that there is any difference in the price or quality.
13. We think that the price of cottons is a little higher, but hardware is lower, especially nails.
14. We think it has increased and improved.
15. Employment plenty and wages good, yet our young men are emigrating to the North-West and the United States.
16. Real estate is low, in consequence of so many of our people going to the North-West and other places.
17. We think they have.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—I have endeavoured to answer the questions as well as I could. My opinion is that our Dominion is prospering under the present National Policy.

WILLIAM McKEEN,  
Farmer, Gay's River, Co. Halifax.

1. Yes. As Canada grows more than she consumes no duty that can be imposed can be of any benefit, and the less shackles that are placed on the freedom of trade the better.
2. The effect has been to deprive the farmers of Ontario of a cheap supply of food for fattening purposes, and to compel them to feed grain of more value in the market but of less value for fattening purposes. The principal food for fattening in this part of the country being barley, as pease are a failure by reason of the pea bug, which the National Policy has failed to exterminate.
3. No effect, as the prices of those products are governed by the European markets, except in times of extreme scarcity.
4. In consequence of the failure of the pea crop and the duty on American corn it does not pay to raise hogs. Farmers steer clear of this kind of property to a great extent since 1878.
5. If the increased duties have improved the price of horses by giving us the Manitoba market, it stands to reason that as Manitoba is a part of Canada the Canadian who has horses to sell is that much richer; while the Manitoba Canadian is that much poorer by being forced to buy in the dearer market rather than the cheaper.
6. It always pays to raise first class horses, and it is as profitable to raise as any other stock. The principal market for good horses in this part is the United States. Within the last year a great many horses of the classes, good, bad, and in different, have been taken to Manitoba.
7. This question is much the same as question No. 2, and is answered there.
8. No. The market for this kind of produce is no better under the Tariff, nor as good as it has been at times before the present Tariff was thought of. To-day, at the nearest market to where I write, you can buy eggs for 10 cents a dozen in April, which would not pay a well regulated hen the first cost of the material, let alone the trouble of laying them.
9. Freedom of trade between individuals, communities and nations, is beneficial. But as Canadians have given away all the good things they had to offer in exchange for Reciprocity when they ratified the Washington Treaty, and now we have nothing to give but to say to the Americans "We will make you come to terms;" so that we are now worse off than before the present Tariff, on the ground that "a soft answer turneth away wrath but grievous words stir up anger."

10. Wool is a drug on the market. It is the Tariff that has done it.
11. Tobacco and sugar beet, none grown in these parts.
12. The cost is increased on all implements used by the farmer, no perceptible difference as to quality. The blacksmith has to be recouped for duties on the raw material which he buys from the importer, the carriage maker, ditto, foundry man the same. Nails are dearer and the quality poorer, and so on to the end of the chapter.
13. They are increased. It would be of little use to specify, as they are all increased some more and some less.
14. We always could sell all we could raise, sometimes for lower prices sometimes for higher, according as the markets of the world fluctuated which always governed the home market.
15. I know of no employment given to our industrial classes otherwise than what they had before the Tariff came in force, as no new industries have been started in these parts, and as for retarding emigration I may say that I never saw it brisker than it has been since the advent of the Tariff. I could name half-a-dozen families who have emigrated to Michigan from my own immediate neighbourhood, besides a number of young men who have emigrated to Minnesota, Dakota and Michigan, but I do not know of one who has returned.
16. Farms sold as high in this part of the country in 1878 as at present. Land sold high here during the years 1875, 76, 77 and 78. During these years, the same as at present, where there was a man who wanted to sell there was a man ready to buy. On the whole, the price of farm property is lower with a further tendency downward.
17. The agricultural labourers wages have been much the same for the last ten or fifteen years; in that respect he is no better off, and as the cost of living has been increased since 1878 he is, the difference in the cost of living, worse off. A good crop will always improve the condition of the farmer, whether before or after 1878.
18. Such changes as will cause, 1st, a removal of all unnecessary restrictions on trade; 2nd, to put down monopolies with a firm hand instead of fostering them; 3rd, to give our lands free to active settlers, instead of selling to speculators; 4th, economy in all departments of Government; 5th, no favoritism in awarding contracts. With such changes the farmers of Canada would hold their own with any of the same class in any country in the world.

ALEX. McKELLAR,  
Reeve, Hendrick, Co. Middlesex.

1. No, it would not; we can grow enough for home consumption and considerable to spare.
2. The duty has had no effect on the grains mentioned in the question.
3. No effect; we can get all the wheat and flour we need in our own country.
4. It has had the effect of raising the price of our pork.
5. The demand for horses has been increased during the last few years, the price has also been much improved.
6. We find it profitable to breed horses; the profits on horses are better than on other stock. We find our principal market for horses in the United States and the Province of New Brunswick.
7. In this section of the country we can raise enough coarse grain to fatten our stock. No, it would not pay to import corn.
8. Yes.
9. Reciprocity would benefit this Province, and we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. Wool has increased in price.
11. It does not affect it any in the Province.
12. The cost of farm implements is much the same.
13. The Tariff has not increased the price of these articles any.
14. As regards this Province, we depend upon a foreign market for our surplus produce.
15. The present Tariff has not been very beneficial to this Province, owing to our isolated condition.
16. Increased.
17. Yes.

18. We need the freights lowered on our railroads so as to enable us to carry limestone and lumber through the country.

*General Remarks:*—We also need daily steam communication with the railway systems of the Dominion; this would encourage various industries and keep our floating population at home.

ROBERT DEWAR,

Farmer, New Perth, Co. King's, P.E.I.

1. Any measure of the Legislature that would be a means to increase, or secure a supply of human or animal food, and cheapen its cost to its respective consumer, should surely be granted, and allowed to exist for the general good.
2. Indian corn and meal, we only get from the States into St. Martin's, the price of which is increased considerably by Tariff duty, being principally required for working teams, with what oats are, or can be grown about. Buckwheat is cultivated to some extent for human and hog use; rye, corn, barley and pease, except a few in gardens, have not hitherto been cultivated in St. Martin's.
3. Of course the imposition of a duty cannot be expected to make the article cheaper, but gives the importer and retailer, with the duty, an opportunity of placing a higher percentage on its sale, making it much dearer to its consumer. As to wheat the fall sown wheat which calls early for the sickle is and must be superior in yield, and quality, and command the best price in the market coming in early and making the best flour.
4. St. Martin's sons and daughters are not likely for some time to surfeit their epicure neighbours with such delicacies as dried hams, bacon and seasoned lard, as the few members of the hog or swine family that are bred in St. Martin's find a ready market in the homes of their respective owners, where Tariff duties or taxes do not affect them.
5. If the high duties at present imposed on the American horses and live stock shut them out, the Canadians having consequently no rivals to dread, must be given more remunerative prices for their animals, thereby making it a profitable species of industry to raise stock for such a market where such an immense influx of emigrants now exists whose wants of such will be considerable for a time.
6. The people of St. Martin's cannot indulge in such industry, finding it difficult enough to sustain the few they must keep for teams, which with a few cows and sheep, which in too many cases have to be put often on short allowance, in the spring for lack of hay from their limited, starved out grass lands, being unable through poverty to purchase or procure fertilizers to improve them.
7. If he cuts his coat according to the extent of his piece of cloth he might expect to succeed, but in keeping more mouths than he is prepared to keep well and sufficiently fed, he will come short, they will have to be put on short allowance, and it is presumed it will not be found so profitable a speculation to feed them on American corn at a high price, a good supply of farm yard manure and fertilizers are the best means to ensure him abundance of grains and fodder for his stock.
8. The consumption has increased proportionally with the population, and with the increase of such necessaries as vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter; but the prices of such have not as yet improved in St. Martin's.
9. It appears that the best rule to be observed in this case is to live and let live, give and take freely, and by following the Golden rule of only doing to our neighbours only what we want them to do to us, will it is presumed be found the best means of preserving peace and prosperity, which should be the main object in all cases.

10. It is an article indispensably necessary which every household and family cannot do without; a good supply of such for day and night use, and especially during the long severe winters in this country, therefore good supplies of such should be encouraged on the most reasonable terms, unobstructed through taxes.
11. No such crops have as yet been cultivated in St. Martin's; the less that is known of tobacco the better, like spirituous liquors. I fear the people of St. Martin's must do without beet root sugar of their own make.
12. The few farm implements that have lately arrived to this neighbourhood were American manufacture, costing about the usual prices, &c., being scythes, hoes, rakes, forks, which appeared of fair quality and did what was required of them.
13. The impression is that they rate higher than they were sold for some time since; there are so many classes of such goods now offering that the extent of increase cannot be accurately stated.
14. Not being a merchant or exporter I have had no experience in such trade, and therefore cannot accurately answer such query. The belief is that Canadians can obtain ready sale and fair prices for all suitable produce that they send to the home market.
15. Nothing noticeable has occurred in this part of New Brunswick, no new factories have started up, or sources of employments to mechanics, or labourers, which caused several through lack of employment to leave St. Martin's and go to Boston and other places in search of employment, and it appears that none of them have returned.
16. No cleared farms with buildings on them or otherwise have been recently sold in St. Martin's. It does not appear that such property would fetch a higher price at present in this market.
17. The majority of such in St. Martin's are the next class to paupers, who spend the winters in woods as employees to lumberers, and the summers in the ship-yards, and most generally have to take flour, meal, tea, molasses, boots and shoes, woollen and cottons, articles for clothing to pay in place of cash at a high percentage on first cost and cannot afford to work or expend on their farms, and generally the planting work has to be performed by the wife and children.
18. The great barrier to general prosperity in agriculture in New Brunswick, and elsewhere in this Dominion at present, appears to be the lack of rich manures and fertilizers on poor exhausted, worn out over-worked lands, which their occupants or owners are unable to afford them, through poverty and want of capital. It being well proven from long experience, that the man who starves his land wilfully that land is sure to starve, and in the end bankrupt him. Poverty never aids prosperity much, a poor man with only a few head of cattle fed sparingly only on poor hay fodder, cannot have rich manure that would ensure him remunerative crops of vegetables or grain on his poor land, which when let out to grass or meadowing through lack of good top-dressing the crop is poor and sapless causing him to keep half starved stock, not enabling him to send a pound of good beef to market, the result being a hard struggle for existence.

*General Remarks* :—If the vast sums of public money that have been hitherto paid out under the Inland Fishery Protection Laws in this Dominion so unprofitably and undeservedly to a large staff of ignorant worthless officers, who not knowing their history, or the particulars relating to their fructification or procreative proceedings do not give them, the fishes under their charge, the treatment they naturally require, which my long practical experience enables me to state emphatically. That the sort of protection practised has proved a complete failure which is a most serious public loss. If the money above referred to were distributed among the needy and necessitous agriculturalists of the Dominion much more good would be the result. It would enable some poor farmers to improve their stock, purchase

manures and fertilizers, seeds and good farming implements, &c. It was a most senseless act of the Government to be paying such large sums, where no just value was had.

SAMUEL DALEY, Sen.,  
Farmer, Fisherman, Gardener, &c., and Non-Medical Professor,  
Great Salmon River Mills, St. Martin's, Co. St. John, N.B.

---

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—I do not feel in a position at present to answer all the questions here set forth; but I have to say that on the whole I believe the present Tariff is an injury to New Brunswick, especially the Tariff on flour, corn, meal and cottons.

JAMES CURRIE,  
Farmer, Barnesville, Co. St. John, N.B.

---

1. None except corn for feeding purposes. 2. We raise large quantities of coarse grain, excepting corn, which is not adapted to this section of Ontario. 3. It has had the effect of raising the prices of spring and fall wheat, thereby benefiting the Canadian farmer.
4. It has had the effect of raising the prices of live hogs, dried hams and bacon.
5. Horses are dearer in this section than they have been for many years, particularly working horses for Manitoba.
6. We find it profitable to breed horses. Most profitable to breed horses in this section of Ontario. For good work horses in Manitoba; for other horses in the United States.
7. It will pay the Canadian farmers better to sell their coarse grain, for which there is a good foreign market, and import American corn for feeding purposes, but it should be duty free.
8. The market is much improved in that respect. Turkeys sell from 14 to 15 cents per pound, when formerly they only brought from 7 to 10 cents.
9. Yes. We are than when produce was admitted free. 10. Beneficial.
11. None grown in this section. 12. The prices are about the same, but the Canadian manufacturers produce a better article now than formerly.
13. Most decidedly not increased. 14. Yes, very much. 15. Yes, and encouraged emigration to this country. 16. No perceptible increase. 17. Materially improved, now they have plenty of money. 18. None required that I know of.

*General Remarks*:—Having been for years largely engaged in fattening cattle for the European market, and in order to succeed against Yankee competition in that market, I am compelled to import American corn, which I do on a large scale for feeding purposes. All persons engaged in this enterprise know that corn is not raised to any great extent in Canada, and that, of late years, the prices of other coarse Canadian grain have been so high and the American corn much cheaper feeders have, on account of the close competition with the Yankee abroad, been obliged to purchase his corn in his country. With this one exception, which I believe should be remedied by taking the duty off corn imported for feeding purposes, the present Tariff has and will be if continued the salvation of our young Dominion. Farmers are getting good prices under it for everything which they have to sell. The working man can now, on account of the increased demand for and value of labour, secure for himself and family a comfortable living, which he could not possibly do before the inauguration of the National Policy.

JOHN STAGG,  
Farmer and Cattle Feeder, Co. Leeds.

1. No, because Custom duties in the United States are too high.
2. A higher price for oats, rye, barley, pease and corn. 3. The products are too small here to cause any effect whatever.
4. Good effect for agriculturalists 5. Yes, market prices being higher.
6. Yes, in United States and Manitoba, good market for our horses. 7. Yes. No.
8. Yes, a great deal. 9. Yes, provided Reciprocity should be the same on both sides.
- 10 to 13. No answer.

A. H. B. LASSISERAYE,  
Parish Priest, St. François du Lac, Co. Yamaska.

---

1. I am of opinion that it would not be in the interest of agriculturalists in Canada to admit any kind of farm produce, which can be grown in Canada, duty free. If the produce of the Canadian farm is met by American competition in the markets of Canada, where farming is but in its infancy, as compared with the great farming centres of the United States, the result must be that, instead of farming being a profitable and remunerative occupation in Canada, the industry can only be prosecuted at a serious loss.
2. The effect has been, in this part of Canada, that the farmers have been encouraged to give more attention to growing coarse grains since the imposition of the present duty, than ever previously, with a view to be independent of imported grains. In this particular oats and barley may be mentioned, which is consumed by the poorer class of the people, as well as for cattle feed.
3. The farmers in this part of Canada now grow more than double the quantity of wheat grown five years ago. I am not aware of any particular effect as regards any different kind of wheat. Spring wheat is chiefly grown here.
4. The increased duties on these articles prevents as large an importation as in former years, and our own farmers will soon be able to fully supply the demand.
5. I cannot give any opinion as to horses. The market for other live stock is steadily increasing, and farmers seem to have less fear of successful competition from outside. 6. See answer No. 5. 7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain necessary to fatten his stock, and at less cost than the same can be imported.
8. The market for these articles is generally improved, particularly in regard to butter and eggs, both of which are produced largely in excess of the demand for home consumption.
9. Canadian farming has not developed to that state of maturity (particularly in this part of Canada) which would warrant a reciprocity of trade in agriculture. With the present Tariff we are certainly in a much better position to negotiate Reciprocity with the United States, should it be considered desirable to do so. The admission of American produce, duty free, would for ever prevent the accomplishment of a Reciprocity Treaty while such a policy existed.
10. The Canadian farmer finds a ready market for his wool nearer home, and the production is greatly increasing.
11. These articles not being grown here, would not undertake to give an opinion.
12. The cost of farming implements is not increased, and the quality is giving fully better satisfaction. Mowing, thrashing, and other machines of Canadian manufacture, give universal satisfaction, both as to cost and quality.
13. Not increased in price, so far as I can ascertain.
14. The home market for all kinds of farm produce has been increased under the present Tariff. The protection afforded by the present Tariff to the various industries of the country (particularly the manufacturing) has been the means of an increase in the price of labour, without making the prosecution of the industries any less remunerative to the capitalist, and therefore the labourer is placed in a position to make a larger demand on the products of the farmer.

15. It has, and has also been the cause of many new industries, unknown previously to this country, springing into existence. The emigration to the United States of miners and mining labourers has been retarded, and Canadian miners are returning in greater numbers.
16. There is a marked increase in the tendency for investment in farm property, and likely to continue so under the present Tariff. The reason being that at present the farmer finds a ready market at home for all the products of his labour.
17. The condition of farmers in this part of the Dominion has not been as good for eight or ten years, as at present.
18. A more liberal distribution of premiums to farm products would greatly stimulate the prosecution of the industry.

*General Remarks* :—I should like to enlarge on these remarks, but want of time will not at present permit my going more fully into particulars. I may, however, further add that farming being in its infancy in Canada, in other words, a mere nursery as yet, legislative aid and legislative protection are the only means by which it can be raised to that state of maturity which would enable it to occupy the independence now enjoyed by the neighbouring Republic, where farming is in a more advanced state.

H. F. McDOUGALL, M.E.C., A.S.,  
Member Prov. Board of Agriculture, Co. Cape Breton.

1. I should say no.
2. Better prices for oats, pease, &c.
3. Wheat better; flour better. The more wheat grown in the country the better it is for the farmer.
4. We have a better price for them.
5. Horses and live stock are booming; so much for the National Policy.
6. The National Policy has made breeding horses and other stock; what it should be, and if the United States did not want our stock they would not come to buy it.
7. Yes. It will not pay to import corn.
8. I think it is.
9. I do not think he would. I know we are.
10. I think it has not improved the price of our wool.
11. I cannot say.
12. They have not increased in price, and we have a much better article, as we have as good men in Canada as there is in the United States.
13. No.
14. It has, and well the farmers know it; many of them have got out of debt by the operation of the Tariff.
15. It has.
16. The value of farm lands have not decreased in this part, on account of the rush for Manitoba.
17. Very much.
18. Assist home manufacture. The more capitalists in the country the better.

*General Remarks* :—The National Policy has been of very great benefit to this township. In 1878 many of our merchants and others were under water; but now they have got their heads over it. The National Policy was powerful to save, and well the Grits know it; but there is some of them would rather sink than see the National Policy sustained, which it will be in this township.

JAMES HAMILTON,  
First Deputy Reeve, Notawasaga, Co. Simcoe.

1. Yes. Especially corn, as the more the farmer feeds of it the better.
2. It has increased the price of corn, oats are not imported but exported. Rye, barley and pease I do not know.
3. I cannot say.
4. I think it has improved the prices.
5. I do not think it has improved the market price.
6. I think it is profitable, especially at the present time, as the demand is so great from the United States market. Wholly in the United States.
7. I do not think he can, as a farmer should sell all the products of his farm on foot, consequently it would pay to import American corn.
8. I do not think it has.

9. I certainly think he would be, as my motto is, buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. 10. It has lowered the price of coarse wools, by allowing fine wools to come in free. Coarse wools are only produced here.
11. I do not know. 12. They have increased to about the amount of duties.
13. Woollens the same; cottons advanced from 10 to 15 per cent.
14. It has not so far as my knowledge extends. 15. It has not through this section, as they are constantly emigrating to the United States.
16. There is a much easier feeling in money, or money brings a much lower rate of interest. Consequently a greater inclination to invest in farm capital.
17. Yes, as the demand for farm products from England and the United States has been better. 18. Equalization of taxes, that is, make a man pay taxes on all property he may own, money, horses, cattle, land &c., not make the land owner pay all the taxes, although he may be mortgaged for one half or more that he may possess.

H. C. BLINN,

Pres. M. C. Agric. Society, Stanbridge East, Co. Missisquoi.

1. Most decidedly not. 2. It has raised the price of oats and pease, and encouraged farmers to grow more.
3. I do not think the duty affects the price of wheat. 4. It has encouraged farmers and others to raise their own pork, and supply our own markets.
5. We have no horses to sell yet outside of our own neighbourhood.
6. This is a new country; we have yet to buy some. 7. Farmers can raise all coarse grains for fattening purposes, and far more if they had a market for it.
8. I cannot say, we have no regular market for those yet, the country is new.
9. Yes; and in my opinion in a much better position now with the present Tariff.
10. Does not affect the price of wool. 11. We have not commenced to grow flax, tobacco and sugar beet for the market in this section.
12. All kinds of farm implements are cheaper and better. 13. About the same in price. 14. Yes, by keeping out Indian corn, &c., from the United States.
15. It has encouraged industrial classes, especially our settlers, to clear up land to raise grains. 16. There is, and lands have increased in value.
17. Yes, wonderfully so. 18. I cannot see any changes are required. All is done that can be done.

J. RICHARDS,

Reeve, St. Joseph's, Richard's Landing, Algoma.

1. Not in my opinion. 2. As no more of those grains are sown in this section than is required, it is difficult to say what effect the duty has had, though I think it has enhanced the price to the farmer.
3. To these as to the preceding questions I cannot state definitely, as this is a very new section of the Province, and prior to the imposition of the duties there was not enough grown to make a market. Then the Island is cut off from the rest of the Province for six months each year by the close of navigation, leaving no possibility of our selling or buying except amongst ourselves before 1878 or 1879, but there can be no doubt as to the advanced price of these articles by the duties imposed thereon through Ontario. 4. No answer.
- 5 and 6. There are none raised here for sale; last fall a few horses were disposed of, mostly to the Railway Syndicate. I know of none going from here to either the United States or Manitoba.
7. It pays the farmer better to grow all his grain than to import, as corn can be grown as cheaply here as in the United States, and the farmer does not run his land out so soon as he would by growing all wheat, and importing corn.

8. There were none selling here before the present Tariff.
9. In my opinion, the country is not yet ripe for Reciprocity, but it must be evident to all that we are in a much better position to negotiate such a Treaty now than before the present Tariff.
10. None for sale here. 11. Not any raised here. 12. The prices remain unchanged, only a few yet bought here. 13. The price of cottons has advanced about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. 14. Yes.
15. Emigration to the United States has fallen off, various industries have sprung up, thereby giving employment to all classes of labourers, and we find many Canadians returning to Canada, which must be traced to the effects of the present Tariff.
16. Farm property has decreased here in value since 1878, that is farms with the same amount of improvement; the reason is the North-West craze.
17. Yes, more especially the labouring classes. 18. A more rigid restraint on railroad and steamboat companies and monopoly of freight rates.

*General Remarks* :—There can be no doubt as to the beneficial results of the present Tariff, although in our almost isolated position we cannot, with our present means of transport, take advantage of all the benefits to be derived therefrom; but one thing is very evident to all, that the country is very much more prosperous than before the imposition of the Tariff. Since 1878 the country has made vast and rapid strides ahead of anything ever previously obtained in so short a time.

JOHN ROBINSON,  
Farmer, Sandfield, Algoma.

1. Perfectly immaterial to farmers in this section.
2. Formerly corn was imported by the car load and sold from 35 to 40 cents per bushel; the duty prevents its coming in just now. Barley, oats and pease are in no way affected in price by the Tariff. 3. I cannot say, have known them all higher under Free Trade. 4. Same answer as No. 3.
5. All our high priced horses go to the United States, some inferior animals have been shipped to Manitoba; the only good horses going there are farmers taking their own teams.
6. The only horses that it pays to raise are those fit for the American market, anything else pays better to raise than an inferior horse.
7. No; there is no grain as profitable to feed as Western corn, free of duty.
8. All our poultry and eggs go to the United States, so the Tariff cannot affect them. There has been 4 cents duty on butter for a number of years before the present Tariff. 9. Decidedly benefited. Cannot see that the present Tariff has brought us any nearer Reciprocity.
10. None whatever, never sold wool as low as this season. There is no duty on the 8,000,000 pounds imported, tell us why.
11. Fibre is on the free list; we don't grow tobacco; we use our sugar beets for feed.
12. Boyle and Storey of the implement factory here, tell me that the Tariff has increased the cost of every implement they make, and I believe them, they should know. 13. All higher, three suits of Scotch tweed cost each \$2 higher than formerly; cottons, from  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 cent higher; stoves, from \$5 to \$10 dearer.
14. No, none of the tall chimneys sprung up in this quarter, one that smoked (a sash and door factory) for the past ten years is out now.
15. There are fewer mechanics and tradesmen employed in this quarter than formerly. More people have gone to the United States from Elderslie during the past three years than at any previous period. I don't know of any that the Tariff has brought back.
16. No farms have decreased in value since the county valuation in 1878, because of the bad year 1879, and the Manitoba fever since.

17. The year 1879, was the worst year farmers have had for a decade; for the past two years the general condition of the farmers is much improved. \$10,000,000 worth of farm products exported yearly over the exports of 1879, ought to make us better off, and that did it.
18. A change that will leave us free to sell our products to the best advantage; a change that will leave us free to buy whatever we want, wherever we can get it best and cheapest; a change that will only tax us for the requirements of our state; a change that will give me the full benefit of my industry and prevent a privileged class from taxing my labour to increase their wealth. Wealth is a product of labour not of legislation, legislation can only enrich one class by robbing some other class.

HENRY BROWN, J. P.,  
Ex-Reeve, Elderslie, Co. Bruce.

---

1. No, not while they place a duty on our exports of farm produce.
2. Prices better, markets more stable and coarse grain more extensively grown.
- 3 and 4. No answer. 5. It has secured to us the Manitoba market.
6. The Western States and Manitoba take each about an equal number. Manitoba, I believe, receives nearly all its horses from Ontario.
7. Sometimes it pays to import American corn, but as a general rule we can raise profitably all the grain required. 8. No answer. 9. I think so. The present Tariff improves our position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty. 10 and 11. No answer.
12. Prices in general have decreased; our own factories being more largely employed.
13. No answer. 14. Increased. 15. Most decidedly, it has retarded emigration to the United States. 16. Farm property about the same as in 1878 in value. Free grant land in Manitoba keeps down the price of land here. 17. The improvement is general among all classes; most particularly with labourers.
18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—The present Tariff cannot be much improved under present circumstances and conditions. Long may it continue.

NELSON HEASLIP,  
Reeve, Bexley, Victoria Road, Co. Victoria.

---

1. No. 2. It has effected a better return for the farmer. 3. It has a tendency to get better prices. There is very little difference in the different classes.
4. It has the effect to make better times, and pay off the mortgages now existing.
5. Yes. 6. Manitoba at present. 7 to 9. Yes. 10. It raised the price of prime, &c.
11. It has had no effect. 12. They are just as good, and prices are about 25 per cent. less on reapers, mowers, stoves, &c.
13. Very little change. I think they are cheaper now. 14. Yes, better prices for everything farmers have for sale. 15. Better wages and plenty work for all who are here. 16. Yes, farm property fell in price, on account of the failures in crops, but has again an increased tendency. 17. Yes. 18. To keep and put a Tariff on all farm provisions raised in and brought over from the United States.

THOMAS SCHURLER,  
Township Clerk, Mildmay, Co. Bruce.

---

1. I think not. 2. We get a better price. 3. No material difference here.
4. Better prices obtained. 5. Not felt here. 6. Yes, it pays better than other stock.
7. Yes. No. 8. Yes. 9. Yes, we are in a decidedly better position now.

10. No effect here. 11. No effect here. 12. The Tariff makes no great change here as regards prices, on account of the importation of Eastern Canadian goods. 13. The difference is very slight; the retailer pays the amount of Tariff; he therefore does not get quite as much profit as formerly on account of competition. 14. Yes; by keeping out American produce. 15. Yes; all factories established in Victoria are fully employed. 16. Yes; on account, principally, I think of railroad construction. 17. Decidedly; yes. 18. No changes at present, unless it is an increase of duty on American produce. What we want here is population, and that will come, I think, with railroad construction.

*General Remarks* :—I believe the present Government are doing their best for the prosperity of the Dominion, although it has kept the Island back by keeping the lands locked up, and not building the Island line.

THOS. INGWELL,

Farmer, Sooke, Sooke District, B.C.

1. Certainly not. But this reply must be taken *per se*, and not as bearing upon general Reciprocity. 2 and 3. It has, so far, produced no perceptible effect. 4. Answer as before. 5. Yes; horse breeding now engages much attention, and the quality is yearly improving, but the mares are not up to the mark. 6. Yes; I think that horse breeding properly carried out, pays, or would pay better than anything else, the climate is so exceedingly favorable; but too many men seem to think that a good stallion is required—any sort of dam. Fatal mistake. Home market. 7. Certainly he can. Not to be thought of. 8. Unaffected. 9 and 10. Speaking as a sheep owner, yes. We have at present no woollen factories; distance shuts us out from Eastern Canada. San Francisco only remains as our market. Here we are met by an impost duty, which reduces the value of the wool (to the grower) to, say nine (9) cents per lb. net; but sheep owners are in such a minority as to efface consideration for them in taking account of general interests. A splendid sheep country, but cattle got hold of it, and there is actually legislation against sheep. As to the question of Free Trade, I may say that I do not believe in it, unless it be reciprocal. 11. We do not cultivate any of these. 12. The price of all farm machinery, including waggons, ploughs, &c., is very high. Most of such things still come from the States, though the goods of Eastern Canada are slowly forcing their way. 13. The freight is what presses upon us in the interior; and this to such an extent that we scarcely take account of first cost. I admit the want of thrift exhibited, but we are a thriftless people; gold has been our ruin. 1st. By leading us into reckless extravagance in early days, as long as the mines lasted. 2nd. And now, by keeping up the price of labour beyond all proportion to the price of produce. Gold does this in two ways: by tradition, and because it can still be obtained along the Fraser, Thompson, and other rivers in sums varying from 50 cents to \$1.25 per diem, and chances of a pocket full. 14 and 15. Do not apply to us. 16. The Tariff has no effect, but farms are increasing in value, owing to railway construction. 17. Yes; but owing to local causes and chiefly to railway work. 18. Well, I am all for Reciprocity with England and the United States, and generally with all nations.

*General Remarks* :—The local—i.e., Provincial—legislation against sheep, and in favor of cattle is absurd and unjust. I know of no other country in the world in which sheep-raising is discouraged by law. The answers must be read as applicable only to the *interior* of British Columbia, the interests of which section are far from being identical with those of Vancouver Island and the coast districts.

J. MARTLEY,

Formerly Captain H. M. 9th Regiment, Grange, Clinton, B.C.

1. No, as it would be detrimental to our own farmers.
2. No effect.
3. The effect not noticeable.
4. No change.
5. No answer.
6. Our farmers do not raise stock for the purpose of exportation.
7. He can. It would not.
8. We cannot notice any change in our locality.
9. We would. Since the adoption of the National Policy we are in a better position to negotiate successfully for Reciprocity.
10. None.
11. None.
12. Cost about the same, articles of a better quality.
13. Have not increased in price.
14. It has increased by the employment of more labour.
15. It has.
16. There is. Increased on account of general prosperity.
17. Most undoubtedly.
18. I do not know of any change.

*General Remarks*:—Since the adoption of the National Policy business in all branches has increased. The farmer now finds a ready market, with good prices for the produce of his farm at home. The labourer finds ready employment with an increase of wages, without any increase in cost of living.

W. W. DOHERTY,  
County Councillor, Campbellton, Co. Restigouche, N.B.

1. No.
2. It helps us, and we would rather that it were higher.
3. It certainly increases the price of flour, which we import largely, but the farmers do not mind that.
4. It gives us what we had not before, a good market for our own.
5. All our horses and most of other live stock at one time came from Oregon and Washington Territory, but now we are raising our own.
6. Yes, and breeding heavy work horses pays best. All such can be sold for work on railway and the coal fields within the Province.
7. Yes, very little corn is imported here, our own pease being largely used for fattening swine.
8. Yes, and we as farmers would prefer it higher.
9. Certainly not; but our coal, fishing and lumber interests would be improved by Reciprocity.
10. In this particular it hurts us as having no woollen factory in the Province; it nearly all goes to the United States, and the price rules very low.
11. Neither of these is an article of commercial production in this Province.
12. Increased at present. As from our remoteness from Ontario nearly all our implements are English or American. Railways will alter this.
13. All slightly increased in price, but farmers do not object as long as they have good markets.
14. Yes; because to a certain extent it shuts out foreign produce to our markets.
15. Yes.
16. Yes. Lands have increased in value, partly because farming pays, and partly by the commencement of railway construction.
17. Yes.
18. Increased protection to home manufactures will ensure a large resident operative population, who will be consumers, and a speedy completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, taking care to prevent a monopoly in freight and passenger rates.

*General Remarks*:—Our Province being isolated from the rest of the Dominion, our wants and requirements may be exceptional, and in answering the foregoing questions I simply give my individual opinion from a farmer's standpoint, which is respectfully submitted.

HENRY FRY, J.P.,  
Farmer, Maple Bay, Co. Cowichan, Vancouver.

1. It would not injure us, as their markets are better than ours.
2. Oats, barley and pease no better since the National Policy.
3. No better, as Liverpool rules the Canadian market.
4. No effect. The disease in pigs has caused the rise in price.
5. No, our best horses go to the United States.

6. Grade cattle more profitable than horses. United States for best horses.
7. Import corn if there was no duty. 8. No. 9. Not in as good position since the National Policy. 10. Wool lower since the Tariff.
11. Tobacco and sugar higher under the Tariff. There is none cultivated in this section. 12. Farming implements higher, and the quality not so good.
13. Hardware increased, nails and all other kinds the farmer requires; woollens and cottons no different. 14. No.
15. Emigration to the United States increasing, Canadians not returning to Canada.
16. Decreased 30 per cent, and no purchaser. 17. No. 18. Free Trade.

WILLIAM ESPLEN,

Director, North Bruce and Arran Agrl. Society, Burgoyne, Co. Bruce.

1. If we can buy an article free from duty, we can buy it far cheaper.
  2. Since the National Policy is in force we can't buy corn, not to make it pay. There are very few few oats raised in our market.
  3. Our market is ruled by the Liverpool market, the National Policy can't rule our market. 4. Since the duty is on we get less for our hogs.
  5. We can't raise horses to pay for home market.
  6. It will pay to breed horses when there is a good demand in some other country. The United States has been our best market.
  7. It would pay well to buy corn if we could buy it without paying duty.
  8. The National Policy did not make it any better. 9. Free Trade would be very good. 10. Wool has been low ever since National Policy.
  11. Hardly any raised in our part for market. 12. It is increased, for the farmers have to pay the duty on implements.
  13. We must pay more for cottons since the National Policy is in force.
  14. It has not increased. 15. It has given no encouragement to any class, it has not retarded emigration to the United States, or encouraged Canadians to return to this country. 16. Farm land has decreased, for most everybody wants to sell.
  17. The labouring class is not improved, for everything they buy is dearer.
  18. Reasonable Tariff, Free Trade, less money wasted, and less humbug.
- General Remarks*:—I did not answer the questions as plain as I should have done, but I hope you know the meaning of it.

JOHN SOMMER,

Farmer, Tavistock, Co. Oxford.

1. It would not. 2. There has been more corn grown here since the National Policy, and a better market for it. All other coarse grain sells better.
3. Prices fully maintained and demand good, spring wheat not grown much here.
4. Good price for hogs and pork, better than we had before the National Policy.
5. Horses never sold better than at present. Manitoba requires all we have to spare and at good prices.
6. Breeding a good class of horses at present is a profitable business, and in fact there is an outlet for all classes in Manitoba.
7. It pays best to raise our own grain, we have plenty of chance to raise corn and pease. 8. The home market is very much improved for eggs and butter.
9. I am not so sure that Reciprocity would benefit us at present, as we have all the outlet we want in the North-West, but I am sure we are in better position to get a fair Treaty.
10. I do not think it helps wool much. 11. These articles are not grown much in this part, some talk of trying sugar beet.
12. Farm implements are not any higher in price than before the National Policy, and as for quality they are fully as good as before, I think on the whole they are somewhat lower in price.

13. I never knew hardware cheaper, such as iron and nails, than at present.
14. It has been improved by giving us our own markets.
15. The present Tariff has improved all kinds of business, and given both better wages and more employment to labourers.
16. There have been more farms sold in this county this year than in several years before, but prices have not gone up much as so many are going to the North-West.
17. It has, most undoubtedly. I believe there have been more small mortgages paid off in the last two years in this county than in any ten before.
18. Leave the Tariff as it is at present, give it a longer trial before changing it, and then we may see what would be an improvement.

*General Remarks:*—I have every confidence that the good judgment of the people will put the present Government in power for the next term, when they are asked to do so.

JAMES McKNIGHT,  
Reeve, Windham, La Salette, Co. Norfolk.

1. I do not think it would. It might in some instances retard our industry.
2. Not much. Our farmers have been stimulated to raise more oats. We do not raise much barley or pease. Oatmeal is much more valuable as food than Indian meal.
3. Not much. The price of flour is now about as low as formerly.
4. Not much. Hams and pork &c., are about as cheap as formerly.
5. I think so. There is now a better demand for horses than formerly.
6. It may be considered profitable to breed horses. Our market for them is at home, and the demand increases as our mining operations and railroads extend.
7. So far as we are concerned it altogether depends upon the stock raised, and we manage to feed our own stock.
8. Improved rather.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would of course be very beneficial. I think we are now in a more favourable position to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. Wool is as cheap as formerly.
11. We do not cultivate such crops.
12. No difference.
13. Decreased in price, if there is any difference.
14. I think so decidedly.
15. No doubt it has; our mining, shipping and fishing industries are greatly benefited. Every one can now find employment at home. But happen what may, some people are of a roving disposition, always unsettled, and seeking what they cannot get anywhere.
16. Much the same as usual, but there is more energy and industry.
17. Decidedly.
18. It is hard to say.

GEORGE MACKAY,  
Farmer and Magistrate, Marion Bridge, Co. Cape Breton.

1. Yes. Under a good Reciprocity Treaty. Nothing perceptible.
3. Nothing in this county.
4. Ruled by the St. John market.
5. Not here.
6. No.
7. He can. I could not say about American corn.
8. No.
9. I would say under the present Tariff.
10. No.
11. It has none here.
12. I am not posted.
13. Cotton warp about 20 cents on the dollar.
14. No. Not here.
16. Farm property is decreasing, because our sons do better out West.
17. No.
18. I cannot say.

GEORGE H. WHITE,  
River Charlo, Co. Restigouche.

1. Yes. Under a good Reciprocity Treaty.
2. Nothing perceptible.
3. Nothing. Regulated by the Montreal market.
4. Nothing. Ruled by Montreal market.
5. Not here.
6. No.

7. I think he can. But American corn would be advantageous. 8. Not here.  
 9. Yes. This section of the country at least. 10. None here.  
 11. None grown here. 12. I do not know. 13. I cannot say. 14. Not here.  
 15. No. We scarcely knew of emigration to the United States until 1880. Now every young man that can leave home is off—and many that should not without taking their friends with them. 16. No. Decreased immensely.  
 17. Not at all here. 18. Too busy to lecture on such questions.

*General Remarks* :—In the year 1880, a number of young men from this county went to Wisconsin and Michigan, and in 1881 increased the immigration until now scarcely a young man that can at all forsake his parents remains, and of late it is quite common to see "Notice—farm for sale." Very few going to Manitoba.

DONALD KERR,  
 Farmer, River Charlo, Co. Restigouche.

1. It would certainly be injurious, unless Canadians have equal privileges  
 2. Oats are the only kind of grain raised in this quarter in large quantities for sale, and the farmers have received higher prices under the present Tariff.  
 3. Wheat never imported; Canadian flour always used; I think prices have advanced. 4. Farmers have benefited by increased duties, receiving higher prices for hogs and meat.  
 5. Horses and stock only raised for home consumption; prices not altered any.  
 6. The raising of horses and stock for sale only commencing in this country.  
 7. No answer. 8. The prices have improved, the country being more prosperous under the present Tariff.  
 9. I think Reciprocity would be a benefit. Canada ought to be in a better position to negotiate a Treaty under the present Tariff than formerly.  
 10. None, as far as this country is concerned, all being used in home manufactures.  
 11. None raised here. 12. Prices decreased; larger quantities purchased; quality improving every year.  
 13. Prices of woollens and cotton about the same. Hardware decreased.  
 14. Yes, largely, on account of the improved and prosperous condition of the country. 15. It has not affected this county as yet. 16. Not much in land, although the value of farm stock has slightly increased since 1878.  
 17. Yes; farmers receive better prices for all produce, and labourers get higher wages. 18. No changes required, as everything is prospering at present.

WM. MONTGOMERY,  
 President Restigouche Agricultural Society,  
 Dalhousie, Co. Restigouche.

1. It would not, because the Americans would swamp our markets, and reduce the price of all farm produce.  
 2. It has had the effect of raising the prices of all coarse grains, chiefly pease, oats and rye; barley not as much as the others; corn is not grown plentiful enough to make much difference.  
 3. The prices of wheat and flour have been increased. I cannot specify.  
 4. Dressed pork has become from 2 to 3 cents per pound dearer in our markets. The others have increased in proportion.  
 5. Yes, the duties improved the prices of horses, cattle, sheep and all live stock.  
 6. Until eighteen months ago it was not profitable to breed horses, but since the Tariff it pays very well. At present prices, the profits on horses compare favourably with those on other stock. Our principal market has hitherto been in the United States; now Manitoba is about on an equal with that country.

7. Most decidedly, yes. It does not pay at all to import American corn.  
 8. I cannot say. I do not think so. 9. I cannot say whether he would be benefited or not; but I think that if he would, we are in a better position now to negotiate for it than before.  
 10. I do not think the Tariff affects the price of wool much. 11. No answer.  
 12. I do not think there is any increase in price, and the quality is just as good as ever, if not better.  
 13. I have not noticed any increase in price. 14. The Tariff has greatly improved the home market by keeping out American produce, and giving Canadians a chance to compete favourably.  
 15. It has. There seems to be a tendency to remain at home, and for those in the United States to return. Our chief emigration now, is to Manitoba.  
 16. There is, because those investing feel that they are safer than heretofore. Farm lands, I think, have slightly decreased in price, but this is owing to the great rush for Manitoba, and not to the Tariff.  
 17. Their condition has improved 25 per cent. or more. 18. We want legislation that will give our cattle and beef the preference over American in the English market, and that will establish for us a large trade with the Old Country.

*General Remarks:*—What the Canadian farmer wants, is Protection on coarse grains and a preference for Canadian cattle in the English market. This will enable us either to sell our grains or to turn them into money by stock-raising; for the keeping of stock must soon become the chief agricultural industry of Ontario, as wheat is not nearly as profitable as it used to be, and weakens the land, whereas, raising coarse grain and feeding stock improves it.

ISAAC PRESTON, JR.,

Vice Pres. Eastern Division Agrl. Society, Bethany, Co. Durham.

1. Yes; because in most cases it would be no injury to the farmer, and it would be a benefit to the manufacturing interest.  
 2. It could not be worse on Indian corn; on oats not so bad, rye, barley and pease no benefit. 3. No benefit, as the price is governed by foreign demand.  
 4. Give us free corn, and we will meet the Yankees without the present Tariff.  
 5. Our best horses go to the United States, who pays the duty.  
 6. No answer. 7. It would pay better to import corn. 8. No tall chimnies in this locality. 9. Yes; we are not in any better position. 10. Bad.  
 11. I cannot say. 12. Increased to the extent of the duty imposed upon all material used in the manufacturing of the same.  
 13. Increased on all articles mentioned, except corn. 14. No. 15. No. 16. Decreased generally in this locality. 17. Yes. 18. A change that will allow farmers to sell in the dearest market, and buy in the cheapest.

HUGH McDOUGALD,

Deputy Reeve, Elderslie, Co. Bruce.

1. I consider a duty necessary in the interest of the country, especially when the Americans charge duty. 2. The duty does not affect coarse grain in this part of the county, as we have no market but the lumbermen who buy our grain.  
 3. My opinion is that the duty has increased the price of wheat and flour.  
 4. As there is no permanent market here, I cannot say what effect it has.  
 5. The duties have increased the price of horses and cattle all over the Province.  
 6. I find it very profitable to raise horses, prices are very good at present, we have no trouble in finding a market at home for horses and all kinds of cattle.

7. He can: I never have imported American corn. 8. It has improved through the effect of the present Tariff. 9. I would like to have Free Trade. The Government is in a better position to negotiate a treaty with the present Tariff.
10. The price of wool is low, I cannot say what effect the Tariff has on it. 11. None whatever that I am aware of. 12. Ploughs, harrows, farm implements and all kind of machinery are as cheap now, as before the duty was increased.
13. The prices range about the same, I have not noticed any difference.
14. The farm produce has increased on the whole, and has improved the condition of the country. By Government works, which give employment to labourers.
15. As to the first part of the question, I cannot say, as I live in a very remote part of the county. It has encouraged Canadians to return to Canada.
16. I have not noticed any, as land is free grant in this part of the county.
17. The farmers have improved in wealth and the labouring classes have also improved, as they get good wages and can afford to live well.
18. I do not know of any at the present time, perhaps it would be as well to let "well enough alone."

DERMOT KAVANAGH,  
Reeve, Dungannon & Faraday, Co. Hastings.

---

1. It would not. 2. Better prices on all except barley, as there is not a great deal of it used. 3. No answer. 4. We get better prices.
5. Stock of every kind very high; it helps some no doubt. 6. Horses pay the best. All kinds of stock pay well. The United States.
7. He can. We do not raise stock enough. 8 to 11. No answer. 12. All farming implements are cheaper. 13. About the same; no dearer, anyway. 14. Yes.
15. Yes. 16. It would, only for the North-West fever. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

SAMUEL GRANDY,  
Reeve, Yelverton, Manvers, Co. Durham.

---

1. It would be better to admit all free than have it remain as it is now.
2. According to market reports, oats are cheaper in Canada than in the United States. Corn is driven out of the market in Canada, which the poor in this section used largely instead of flour, on account of its cheapness.
3. It keeps the price of wheat a little lower than prices in the United States.
4. It does not effect us here. 5. No. 6. In the United States.
7. It pays better to import American corn. 8. No. 9. Yes. I do not think we are.
10. It gives us cheap wool. 11. I do not know. 12. Cost increased and quality bad.
13. All increased in price, and quality of woollens and cottons very bad. 14. No.
15. It has, to a few, but has not retarded emigration to the United States.
16. No; farms were never cheaper than now. 17. Yes; but no thanks to the National Policy for it. 18. Free trade.

*General Remarks:*—Your National Policy is a fraud from first to last! I cannot support it.

SAMUEL RITCHIE,  
Reeve, Wilberforce, Monmouth, Co. Haliburton.

---

1. Certainly not. 2. A better and a more steady market for all kinds of coarse grain.
3. It has increased the price somewhat, and made a more reliable market.
4. Largely increased the price of pork. 5. Horses are in good demand and bring a good price. 6. No answer. 7. Yes, to the best advantage.
8. Splendid. 9. I think not, I would prefer the present Tariff. 10 and 11. No answer.

12. About the same as before; an improvement in the quality. 13. I don't see much change. 14. I think it has. 15. Certainly, more employment and better wages. 16. Land has improved in value for the last three years. 17. Greatly improved. 18. I would say, let well enough alone.

*General Remarks*:—I am a carriage maker, employing ten or twelve men. I find that the National Policy has had a decidedly beneficial effect on my business. More business and better and prompter pay.

ADAM MCGOWAN,  
Deputy Reeve, Hungerford, Co. Hastings.

1. I think it would be to the interest of farmers to admit Indian corn free, as considerable quantities of it were fed to cattle when it was free, enabling farmers to realize some little profit on the cattle as well as on the manure, which is a matter of the greatest importance to Ontario farmers.
2. No. Indian corn is never used, it being too dear; our cattle are sent away lean, largely to Buffalo and other points and there fattened. Oats have been somewhat lower in the average for the last three years than for the three years previous. Pease have been higher. Rye, corn and barley, little grown in this section. 3. No answer.
4. All hog produce have been dearer, I think in consequence of the duty.
5. Our surplus stock seems going largely to the United States, except working oxen which are going to Manitoba, and extra good cattle, which are shipped to the Old Country.
6. Yes. I have done well with horses, and I think they pay as well as anything. It is principally American buyers that visit this section and take our good horses.
7. I think it does unquestionably pay to feed American corn, if it can be only got cheap enough. The great trouble with the farmers is that they don't feed enough.
8. I don't know much about that. 9. Yes, certainly. I think the Yankee's have not felt the pressure much as yet. 10. Wool has been an absolute drug to the farmers for the last six or seven years and gets worse. 11. No answer.
12. Yes, all farm implements are dearer than they were four years ago. 13. No answer. 14. I don't think so, the population of our village has greatly decreased in the last nine years.
15. There has been a very large emigration from this section for the last two years last year mostly to the United States, this year to Manitoba.
16. Farm lands have increased very much in value, I think at least 10 per cent., on account of the great exodus of the people out of the country.
17. Yes. I think the farmers are better off than in 1878, in consequence of good crops for the last two years, and better economy in their management.
18. Reciprocity with the United States if possible, at any rate, remove the duty as much as possible from iron, lead, hardware, sugar, tea, cottons, and wholly from Indian corn. I don't think it makes any difference so far as the Ontario farmer is concerned, whether the duty is left on wheat, pease, butter, cheese, oats or anything. We have to look to our outside market.

*General Remarks*:—My reason for thinking it would be better to import corn for feed free, is, that pease and oats are largely used for human food and are worth more, pound for pound, than corn. There is more fattening matter in corn than in either.

JOHN PEIRSON,  
Reeve, Burgoyne, Co. Bruce.

1. No. 2. Increase in the price of oats, corn, rye and pease.
3. Little or no change if any, for the tetter. 4. A shade higher for the seller, with increased wages for the labourer.

5. It has increased the price of live stock at least 10 per cent.
6. Both places ; no great profit in either place. 7. Can raise all that is required.
8. I think it has. 9. We are in this part better off with the present Tariff.
10. Little or no change. 11. I can't say. 12. No dearer, and of a better quality.  
Such as reapers, ploughs, and machinery of all kinds.
13. No increase that I can notice. It has increased by the duty upon American corn ; has raised the price of rye, oats, pease, and other coarse grain and roots.
15. It has increased the price of wages for labourers, and caused many to return to this part of Ontario as they receive better advantages.
16. Farms have increased in value, and capitalists are more willing to invest their moneys in improvements. 17. They have, 50 per cent.
18. Little or no change is required under the present Tariff.

*General Remarks* :—I have the pleasure to suggest to you, that the present arrangement of your Tariff is such that it must meet the approval of every honest minded man, no matter what his politics may be.

P. M. GUNTER,  
Reeve, Tudor, St. Ola, Co. Hastings.

1. No. Cape Breton has a surplus of all kinds of produce, but no wheat.
2. No effect, the mines consume the surplus of coarse grains, and there has never been competition with American coarse grains.
3. Very little effect, the price of flour has not increased. Very little American flour used in this county. 4. Good effect, the price of pork is better, and more profitable to the farmers under National Policy.
5. No. Our mines get all the surplus horses here, very little affected by duties.
6. Cape Breton County is not a horse breeding county, a few find their way to the American market, farmers don't raise horses for sale as a general thing.
7. I think farmers in Canada can raise grain for stock as cheaply as the Americans.
8. Not here, as very little American vegetables, butter or eggs find their way here.
9. I think he would, and we are in a better position now than formerly.
10. Good ; woollen manufacturers pay a better price for home wool than formerly.
11. None in this section of the country.
12. Not increased, and we get as good farming implements of Canadian manufacture as American, and the prices are coming down. Mowers, horse rakes, &c., &c.
13. Not to any appreciable extent, farmers seem to be perfectly satisfied with the existing Tariff. 14. Yes, the duty on coal has improved the home market wonderfully. Money is plentiful 15. Yes ; the several industries springing up in the Dominion have tended to keep the working classes at home.
16. Yes, farm lands have increased in price since 1878, on account of the increase of prices of farm produce supplied to coal mines.
17. Yes, considerably. Though the time has been short since the National Policy came into operation its enemies have to admit an improvement.
18. I think the present Tariff is calculated to help the farming interests very much, but it will take time to make any great change.

*General Remarks* :—Farmers in the Eastern part of the Dominion are well pleased with the protection afforded them. The prosperity of the coal mining industry is the prosperity of the country, while the cost of living has not increased to any appreciable extent, and I think it would be a great disaster to the country to repeal the duty on American goods. I may have answered these questions in more of a local point of view than I should, for I am more interested in my own county than the Dominion in general.

C. W. MOFFATT,  
Farmer, Little Bras d'Or, Co. Cape Breton.

1. I do not think it would. It might in some instances retard our industry.
2. Not much. Our farmers have been stimulated to raise more oats. We do not raise much barley or pease. Oats are more valuable than Indian meal.
3. Not much. The price of flour is as low as formerly. 4. Not much. Hams and pork, &c., are about as cheap as usual. 5. I think so. There is fully a better demand for horses than formerly.
6. It may be considered profitable to breed horses. Our market for them is at home. 7. So far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, it altogether depends on the stock raised more or less.
8. In these articles we are not affected in any way. Prices are as usual.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would of course be very beneficial. I think we are in a favorable position to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. I never saw wool cheaper than it is now. 11. We do not cultivate such articles.
12. No difference perceivable. 13. Scarcely any difference. 14. I think so. Upon the whole.
15. No doubt it has. Our mining, shipping, farming and fishing industries are greatly benefited. Everyone can now find employment, but happen what may, some people are never satisfied, and are continually moving round from place, to place, in fact resting nowhere. 16. Much the same as usual; but there is now energy and industry. 17. Decidedly. 18. It is hard to say.

MURD. McODRUM,  
Farmer and Magistrate, Marion Bridge, Co. Cape Breton,

—;—

1. I think that the National Policy as far as the Tariff is concerned, bears very heavily on our Province.
- 2 to 14. It would be much better for farmers in our country to have Free Trade. We find that Ontario, Quebec and the North-West afford us no market. Our trade is with the United States. Our farm produce of almost all kinds finds a ready market there. Potatoes, poultry, butter, eggs, meats, and things that we can raise to much advantage and we can ship them very profitably. If we had Free Trade with the United States it would be much to our advantage. The Tariff is a big curse here. I think we are in a worse position now to negotiate for a Reciprocity Treaty than before present Tariff was imposed.
15. No answer. 16. None. Decreased. 17. Not any. Made worse.
18. That which would affect us most beneficially would be Free Trade.

*General Remarks:*—The Maine farmers are thriving far beyond us, because they have not this Tariff to grapple with, if for instance we have, say a thousand barrels of potatoes to ship, there are four hundred dollars duty, whereas the Maine farmer puts that money in his purse, and so on with almost all our farm produce.

B. N. GOODSPEED, J. P.,  
Peniac, Co. York, N.B.

—

*Translation.*

1. Only Indian corn for green fodder, which cannot grow to maturity in the country.
2. Excellent for the Canadian producer. 3 to 4. I cannot say.
5. I believe it has. 6. I prefer the raising of horned cattle. 7. Both are necessary.
8. Yes. 9. As to the first question, I cannot say; as to the second, yes.
- 10 to 13. I do not know. 14. Yes. 15. Yes. 16. Yes, the value has increased.
17. Yes. 18. I cannot now say as to the Dominion Law.

LOUIS BEAUBIEN,  
Montreal, Co. Hochelaga.

1. No. 2. The price of these cereals have all augmented, with the exception perhaps of oats which have for many years ruled higher here than in Montreal, say from 45 to 50 cents the bushel.
3. The price of wheat and flour has augmented at least 50 cents the barrel since 1878. No winter wheat grown here, and very little spring wheat.
4. The prices have greatly increased since 1878, although perhaps not higher than they were some years previous to that date.
5. Yes; the price of horses has greatly increased, but our local demand absorbs all that are raised here.
6. In my opinion there is more risk in raising horses than cattle. In this locality the farmers raise sufficient to meet their own wants, but few are exported.
7. The farmers in this locality have never been in the habit of importing grain for feeding cattle.
8. In this locality very much, on account of the home market created by great increase of population in Drummondville, which I should say had doubled since 1878, caused by establishment of different manufactures since the building of the railway. 9. Yes. 10. Wool is higher than it was in 1878.
11. The tobacco crop has largely increased in this locality, and prices are more remunerative. Flax and sugar beet scarcely grown here for market purposes.
12. The prices are if anything reduced, and quality improved, for mowing machines, horse rakes, ploughs, &c.
13. The prices of these articles are no higher now than before the Tariff, except perhaps in the worst year of the crisis when the country was flooded with bankrupt stocks. 14. Yes, by improving the home market.
15. In this locality the position of the farmer and labouring man has greatly improved, and there is no emigration to the United States. Since 1878 iron smelting works, saw mills, and woollen factories have been established giving employment to many hundred hands. 16. Certainly not diminished. 17. Yes.
18. I have no suggestion to make as to the Tariff law, but if the Local Parliament were to encourage more the introduction of pure bred animals, it would doubtless have a very beneficial effect.

E. J. HEMMING,

Advocate and Farmer, Drummondville, Co. Drummond.

1. No; because Canada can raise a sufficiency of agricultural produce.
2. Pease, oats and rye have increased in value. 3. Wheat and flour have advanced in value. 4. No answer.
5. The increase of the duties on horses and live stock has greatly enhanced prices; horses especially sell better.
6. At present the raising of horses is more profitable as compared with the raising of other stock. The United States is the chief market for horses.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain necessary for fattening his stock, and more. 8. Yes, greatly. 9. No answer.
10. Previous to 1878, wool sold as well, and flannels are not higher than at that time.
11. It has, in my opinion, diminished the cultivation of tobacco.
12. The general effect of the Tariff has been to lower the price of agricultural implements, and they seem to me not to be so good in quality.
13. No answer. 14. Yes, greatly. Yes, and more especially in connection with the river trade and the North Shore Railway.
15. Here the Tariff has given increased employment, and emigration has diminished.
16. The value of property has greatly increased owing to the influx of many settlers from Lower Canada. 17. Yes.
18. In my opinion it would be necessary to establish in the counties, schools in which the young could be taught every thing relating to that profession or calling, in which our country is destined to take the lead on this continent.

L. P. LABROSSE,  
Mayor, Reeve, Alfred, Co. Prescott

1. I do not think it would be of any advantage to our farmers.
2. The effect has been that we sell better; the Tariff protects us.
3. The result is that we grow more wheat. It enables us to improve our lands for that purpose. 4. The increase of duties on American live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard has been of benefit to the Canadian farmer; we sell more readily, and at an increased profit of 25 per cent.
5. Horses sell better; we get at least 30 per cent. more for them.
6. We ought in this locality to improve our breed of horses as much as possible, and each farmer ought to raise as many as the extent of his land will permit, but without neglecting horned cattle and sheep, the raising of which is highly profitable. 7. Yes, to the first question. 8. Yes, greatly.
9. I think the Government is in a very good position to obtain favours from the American Government. 10. I cannot say. 11. I think a reduction of the Excise duty on tobacco would develop a new industry, and give great profits to growers.
12. Agricultural implements have greatly improved. We can purchase them 25 to 30 per cent. cheaper than before. 13. I cannot answer affirmatively.
14. I think it has. 15. The present Tariff, by raising prices of grain, has promoted settlement on new lands; it has also created several branches of industry, and thus emigration to the United States has greatly diminished.
16. In this locality in 1878, money was easily invested at 8 per cent.; it is now difficult to find over 6 per cent. for small sums on mortgage. There is plenty of money in the hands of the farmers. Prosperity reigns in our rural districts.
17. Yes, greatly. 18. Promote a sound system of cultivation in every possible way. This is the most patriotic work to which the Government could devote itself.

EMERY FÉRÉR,

Farmer, St. Eustache, Co. Two Mountains.

1. No; so long as our products, whether in grain or stock, pay duty on entering the United States. 2. Oats and pease are the only cereals exported from this section, and the levying of a duty thereon, and on American corn, cannot but benefit us.
3. I do not think the duties on wheat and flour from the United States have greatly affected the prices of those articles here. 4. For the past two years pork and live hogs have sold higher, to the benefit of our farmers.
5. We raise but little stock for sale here. I cannot give a positive answer to this question. 6. I do not consider it profitable to raise horses for sale here. Our chief market is the United State. I consider that milch cows are twice as profitable as horses.
7. Yes. American corn is almost unknown here. 8. I think the present Tariff has had no effect on the price of vegetables, fowl, eggs or butter.
9. I think a Reciprocity Treaty would benefit our farmers. We must be in a better position to negotiate, for before the Tariff the Americans could sell us their products without paying any duty.
10. There is hardly any trade in wool here. 11. Flax and sugar beet are grown in very small quantities here. I do not think the Tariff has any effect on those articles. The higher the duty on foreign tobacco the better for our farmers, particularly if the Excise and license duty were taken off Canadian tobacco.
12. No notable change in prices has taken place here. The quality improves year by year. 13. I cannot give a positive answer. 14. By promoting manufactures and industries of every kind, the number of consumers of our products is increased. 15. I cannot say. 16. The value of land here is about the same.

17. Yes; greatly here. 18. What we need here is the removal of all Excise and license duty on Canadian tobacco, and that encouragement be given to the manufacturing of that tobacco.

J. LOUIS LEMIRE,  
Mayor, La Baie des Febvres, Co. Yamaska.

1. No. 2. A good effect. 3. The yield of wheat here being just sufficient for our wants, no effect has been produced by the Tariff.  
4. Higher prices and a benefit to the farmer. 5. Yes.  
6. It is advantageous to raise horses and cattle also. Horses are still sold for the United States, and many for our Canadian western country.  
7. We raise all we need, and do not require to import. 8. Yes.  
9. We do not require a Reciprocity Treaty. We are better off as we are.  
10. I am not aware of any. 11. Favourable. 12. No; prices are lower, and the quality at least equally good. 13. No notable change in prices.  
14. Yes; the market for grain is higher and better. 15. A great deal. Not only has emigration ceased, but many Canadians are coming back.  
16. Property has greatly increased in value, and large investments are being made in land. 17. At least 100 per cent. 18. I cannot suggest anything

UBALDE ARCHAMBEAULT,  
Farmer, St. Timothé, Co. Beauharnois.

1. It would not be in their interest to admit any American products free.  
2. To raise the price of pease, corn, barley and oats. Rye, in place of being used for fattening as before, has been sold, in consequence of the good prices obtained by exporting it. This has doubtless to some extent influenced the prices of other grains, especially oats, which have taken the place of rye for fattening, and a larger quantity of rye has been raised and less oats.  
3. The prices of spring wheat and flour have been advanced. Fall wheat, not much grown here, must have been enhanced in value by that advance.  
4. A considerable advance in prices of live and slaughtered hogs, and, of course, on hams, lard and dried bacon.  
5. The monopoly of Manitoba and the North-West must have increased prices in Canada, and as immigration into that section is increasing, it is reasonable that the demand for horses should increase in the same proportion. In the same way as to other stock, Manitoba and the North-West will have to buy from us.  
6. It would be an advantage to raise a larger number of horses and of improved breeds; the profits would be greater than on other animals. The United States.  
7. As a rule he can, and at less cost than importing corn, except perhaps in few cases of farmers situated close to a railway depot or shipping point on a line of navigation. A portion of the pease and barley grown are, in spite of all the farmer can do, unfit for the market, and those cereals are well adapted for fattening.  
8. Yes. The local demand has increased in consequence of the increase in the number of persons who do not produce those articles, and of the advance in wages, and the fact that owing to higher and steadier wages the consumer and the producer himself can better afford to use them. 9. I think not. But in any case the best way to get it is to maintain the present Tariff. 10. It has sold a little higher.  
11. Flax and sugar beet are not grown here; the price of tobacco is about the same. Farmers are the large majority of the population, and should not be taxed for the benefit of a few manufacturers. 12. It has diminished, and the quality has improved.

13. No perceptible increase in prices of woollens. In cotton goods the wholesale price has risen a little, but not enough to affect retail prices considering the quality. Articles in hardware are as low, generally speaking.
14. Yes, by preventing the importing of American goods. It has also greatly increased local consumption.
15. Yes, certainly, and it has caused most of those who have returned to remain.
16. The value of land has increased at least 20 per cent. Farmers who had mortgaged their lands have been enabled, under Protection, to meet their payments. The number of sellers has diminished, and that of purchasers has increased with the prosperity of our farmers. 17. Very greatly indeed.
18. A removal of the duty on Canadian tobacco, which causes great dissatisfaction. The crop is an uncertain one and liable to many casualties, and if the duty were removed farmers would grow it in larger quantities and give more attention to improving the quality. The revenue it affords is not sufficient to justify the maintaining of this tax.

*General Remarks* :—I have consulted neighbouring farmers in framing these answers.

PHILIPPE GAREAU,  
Postmaster, Commissioner for Affidavits, and Farmer,  
Curran, Prescott County.

1. No. 2. Oats and pease sell better and at reasonable prices. Rye, corn and barley are not an article of large trade in this county.
3. Flour has not advanced in price, but sells better. Only spring wheat grown here. Within the last two years the quantity of wheat ground at my mill has largely increased. I do not grind any wheat for myself, except that derived from the mill. 4. Last year prices were the same as in 1876 for live and dead hogs. I fatten a large number of pigs, and it pays at present prices. I had given up fattening, because when we wanted to sell, the market was over-stocked. I began again in 1879, and it pays now. 5. Horses sell well and are in good demand. Horned cattle have advanced 40 per cent., and we have a monopoly of our own market.
6. Horses can be raised with profit, but horned cattle yield a surer profit. Most of the horses are sold for the United States.
7. Yes; he can and should. I have bought American corn and made no profit from it. We have pease and oats to sell, why should we import grain for fattening purposes? 8. Very much. Prices are far better than before.
9. Farmers do not need American produce and would derive no benefit from a Treaty. We are in a better position to secure a Treaty than we were before the Tariff. 10. No effect on raw wool. 11. Tobacco is more largely grown and sells very well. We are all gratified at the reduction of duty on twist.
12. I bought a mower in 1878, and another in 1881. I paid the same price for both, but the latter was stronger and better finished than the first.
13. There has been no noticeable advance in prices.
14. Yes; there is a better sale, the market not being so glutted. Hay sells 25 to 40 per cent. better than prior to the Tariff.
15. From 1876 to 1879, day labourers had from 25 to 50 cents a day, with board. We now pay from 75 cents to \$1 per day, with board, and men are more scarce.
16. Lands have advanced 50 per cent. in the County of Maskinonge, because with better prices for produce, lands are the best investment now.
17. From 1874 to 1878 farmers and workingmen got into debt, but now they pay their debts and live more comfortably.
18. Farmers could not be better off than at present. Prices are good, and I know of no better occupation than theirs, the remuneration being certain, though not so large as that obtained in other branches of industry. I see no change to be desired so long as things remain as at present.

LOUIS CARLE, Sen.,  
Manoir, St. Ursule, Co. Maskinonge.

1. Indian corn. 2. It has caused an advance in the prices of those grains.
3. But little sensible effect. Wheat is often higher at Chicago than at certain points in Ontario. The duty is felt somewhere, but only exceptionally.
4. Pork is a little higher, and sells more freely. 5. No answer.
6. Here horses do not pay as well as cattle. The United States.
7. In some cases he can raise all he needs. In some cases the corn is better. As a rule farmers must use oats to fatten their stock. 8. Yes. 9. Yes, certainly, we have more to offer, and the United States have greater reason to wish for a Treaty. 10. No answer.
11. The Excise duty on tobacco would have killed the industry had it not been reduced. 12. The difference is not perceptible. Quality certainly not inferior. 13. Generally speaking there is not a sensible difference.
14. The demand for produce has greatly increased since 1878. Things are widely different. I think the Tariff has been the chief cause. 15. Yes.
16. Yes. Property has advanced 25 per cent. since 1878. Simply because produce sells better. 17. Undoubtedly. 18. No answer.

N. E. LACOURSIERE,  
Notary, Sec. Treas., St. Casimir, Co. Portneuf.

1. Yes, to enable us to export our produce on the same conditions. 2. No effect.
3. As Canada does not produce enough wheat for home consumption and the effect has been to make us pay a higher price for flour. 4. I cannot say.
5. As regards exporting to the United States, the effect has been to lower the prices of our horses. 6. Yes; 20 per cent. on horned cattle. The United States.
7. He can raise all the grain required. 8. No.
9. Yes. It would have been easier when American products were admitted at low duty. 10. No effect. 11. On flax and beet no effect. It prevents the growing of tobacco. 12. I cannot say.
13. Increased cottons 25 to 30 per cent. The advance on the others is smaller.
14. No. 15. In no other way whatever. 16. The value of land is about the same.
17. No. 18. I cannot say.

AIMÉ SÉNÉCAL,  
Mayor of Parish, Varennes, Co. Verchères.

1. No. 2. An advance in the price of Indian corn; in oats, rye, barley and pease, no noticeable difference. 3. An advance in the price of both qualities.
4. An advance in prices. 5. Yes. 6. Breeding horses is profitable. But raising them in large numbers would ruin farmers, absorb the produce of the soil, induce the neglect of cattle and sheep, and involve the importing of foreign grain. Farmers grow rich by raising cattle and sheep, and poor by raising horses, no matter how high they sell. Chief market, the United States.
7. Yes; it is useless to import corn except in case of scarcity. 8. Yes.
9. I think not. We are, however, in a better position to negotiate it.
10. I do not know. 11. Bad effect on tobacco. Excise should be reduced to 2 cents per lb., and producer allowed to manufacture (except cigars) plug and snuff. 12. Cannot say. 13. It has had no noticeable effect.
14. Yes; by preventing importing of foreign products and teaching us self-reliance.
15. Yes; greatly. 16. Yes; better prices have induced better cultivation and given enhanced value to land. 17. Yes; greatly.
18. Make agricultural instruction compulsory in primary schools, &c. Impart more thorough education so as to do away with self-sufficiency, which results from semi-education.

*General Remarks:*—The Tariff is beneficial and its good effects are everywhere apparent.

T. BEAUCHAMPS,  
Notary, St. Julienne, Co. Montcalm.

1. No; except Indian corn. 2. Indian corn was largely imported and used before the duty was put on, as it was cheaper than our own corn. Prices of oats and pease advanced. 3. No difference in this section.
4. No difference as to live hogs. 5. The horses sold here go to the United States.
6. Present prices of horses are profitable. Higher profit on other animals. The United States. 7. No. Much more. 8. Yes; as to vegetables and butter.
9. No. Yes; in a better position now. 10. Wool is now cheaper.
- 11 to 13. No answers. 14. Yes. 15. Yes; but emigration to the United States has not fallen off. 16. The value of land has greatly increased, owing to the facility of getting money at low interest. 17. Yes.
18. The establishment of agricultural schools in the several counties.

E. A. CAMPBELL,  
Agent, St. Hilaire, Co. Rowville.

1. Yes, wheat and corn, for we grow hardly any. 2. An advance in price of corn. It is a loss to us purchasers. A high duty on oats and other American products would help us. 3. It has benefited Ontario, perhaps, but injured our Province much. 4. Beneficial, for we have more than enough and can export.
5. I am not well informed, but think it has.
6. Our breed is not improved and we lose by trying to raise for sale.
7. Yes, but the low price prevailing of late years was beneficial. 8. Yes, certainly.
9. I do not know. It is more desirable now than it was when American produce entered free. 10. I know not. 11. As regards tobacco, it should be raised; much the same as to beets. 12. Not many used here. 13. The same prices, I fancy. 14. It has increased it on the whole beneficially.
15. It has given employment and increased wages 25 per cent., but the desire to emigrate has continued to increase. 16. The value of land seems to advance, and it is because produce sells at paying prices.
17. It has so much improved that we have not one beggar in the parish.
18. I cannot now say.

VICTOR LECLERC,  
Farmer, St. Bazile, Co. Portneuf,

1. Indian corn, for there is none raised in the country, and it is needed for fattening.
2. The effect has been only on corn, which can only be got with difficulty, it is so dear. 3. No answer.
4. An increase of prices, to the benefit of the farmer, except as to lard, which ought to be free, as we do not produce enough for our wants.
5. Yes, horses sell 50 per cent. higher. Prices of other live stock higher.
6. No, on account of the long winter and dearth of fodder. Profits of other stock are greater. The United States.
7. To import American corn. 8. No. 9. No answer. 10. Prices are lower.
11. Larger quantities of tobacco are grown, and the duties having been reduced for the grower, still more will be raised. 12. Prices are lower; quality equally as good. Spades, ploughs, axes, forks, thrashing mills, saws, &c.
13. Woollen goods are cheaper; cottons also, considering the quality. No increase as regards hardware. Most articles are cheaper.
14. Yes, farmers have better sale for their produce.
15. No. 16. No change. 17. Yes. 18. No answer.

JEAN BEAUDRY,  
Merchant, St. Charles, Co. Bellechasse

1. In the interest of Canadian farmers it would be better not to admit any kind of American produce free of duty. 2. In the part of the country where I live, the imposition of a duty on American Indian corn and other cereals has produced no change whatever, as regards prices.
3. The duties imposed on wheat and flour imported from the United States seem to have produced a slight rise in those articles.
4. The effect of the increased duty on live hogs has been to keep the average price more steady in our market. 5. In my opinion, yes.
6. It is certainly very profitable to breed horses, and the profits realized are greater than on other stock. Our market is the State of Maine.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise all the grain required to fatten his stock.
8. I think so. 9. I think the Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, and that we are in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty with the present Tariff than we were when American produce was admitted free. 10. The prices are higher.
11. The Tariff has certainly encouraged the cultivation of tobacco in this section of the country. As regards flax and sugar beet, I think it has produced no effect; for the reason that the cultivation is an experiment.
12. The cost of farm implements has diminished since the Protective Tariff, and the quality is as good. The following have diminished in price:—Mowers, reapers, scythes, spades, ploughs, &c., &c. 13. The Tariff has not caused an increase in the price of woollens and cottons in common use amongst farmers.
14. Since the Tariff has been in operation a large number of new manufactories are in operation in the country, and give work to thousands of families, which causes the increase and improvement of the market for our farm produce.
15. Yes; the present Tariff gives encouragement to our various industrial classes, and has thereby retarded emigration to the United States, and a large number of Canadians have returned to this country.
16. In this section of country farm property does not attract more capital under the present Tariff, and the value of lands has not increased.
17. The general condition of farmers, and of the labouring classes, has much improved since 1878.
18. In my opinion it is not necessary to make any changes in the law to make agriculture a more desirable and profitable occupation; the position of the farmer is now an enviable one. We sell our produce 20 and 30 per cent. higher than in 1878.

THOMAS LAMBERT, J.P.,  
Farmer, St. Joseph, Co. Beauce.

1. No. 2. A good effect as regards our oats, rye, Indian corn, barley and pease. We get 40 cents in place of 35 cents we got before the Tariff.
3. It has raised the prices of our flour and wheat. We do not grow any fall wheat.
4. It has raised the prices in our market. 5. It has greatly raised the prices.
6. It is much more profitable to raise horses than any other stock. Manitoba is our best market. 7. He can, and can do without American corn. 8. Yes. 9. No.
10. To raise the price of raw wool. 11. No effect.
12. The price has diminished. I instance reapers, &c. 13. It has raised the price of raw wool. The prices of woollens and cottons have fallen.
14. It has enhanced prices greatly. I instance butter, cheese, meat, grain, &c.
15. It has given such abundant employment that we have much difficulty in finding help, and many Canadians are returning to the country.
16. Yes, and the value of landed property has greatly increased since 1878.
17. So much so that every one has money in his pocket and there is hardly any buying on credit. 18. I do not know of any. But we want a railway all along the south shore.

LS. MOUSSEAU,  
Retired Merchant, La Baie des Febvres, Co. Yamaska.

1. Everything we cannot produce should be admitted free. 2. As we produce no Indian corn it should be admitted free. 3. As to the Province of Quebec, which produces hardly any wheat, every facility should be given as to that article.
4. Lard alone, of which we do not produce enough, should be admitted free.
5. No answer. 6. The duties to be paid in order to export our horses to the United States are prejudicial to the raising of those animals.
7. To import American corn for fattening. We raise the other grains.
8. No answer. 9. A Treaty would be an advantage. The present Tariff will enable us to get justice from our American neighbours. 10. It has not been injurious.
11. The amendment of the law as regards Canadian tobacco has met the approval of all parties. 12. They are cheaper, because they are manufactured here, and they are quite as good.
13. Hardware goods, such as spades, shovels, scythes, &c., are cheaper and equally good in quality. 14. Farmers now get better prices.
15. The improvement has been more sensibly felt in manufacturing centres.
16. The depression is beginning to disappear as the working class find employment and the producer gets better prices.
17. For the above reasons it has certainly improved. 18. Grant to Canadian settlers on new lands the same amount as is granted for immigration.

*General Remarks:*—Foreign immigrants get more protection than Canadian settlers. Our people might better be brought back from the United States.

EUGÈNE GOSSELIN,

St. Charles, Co. Bellechasse.

1. Yes, American wheat, because our locality does not produce enough for local wants. 2. Excellent; and about equally so in relation to all the several kinds of grain mentioned. 3. No special effect as regards this locality.
4. Excellent; the farmer has been greatly benefited by having a better market.
5. Hardly any American horses are imported into Canada, except by Manitoba; and as to that section our market has benefited thereby.
6. Yes, in view of the backward state of agriculture, and the little care exercised in raising stock. The United States.
7. Yes, he can, and have a surplus. It is not necessary to import any corn.
8. It is greatly to our advantage to promote the export of those articles as much as possible. 9. Yes, certainly. Our position is much better than previous to the Tariff. We are in a far better position to negotiate for a Treaty.
10. The price of wool remains low. 11. The duty should be maintained on imported tobacco; but there should be no duty on Canadian tobacco. The duty has greatly injured the cultivation of tobacco.
12. The Tariff has promoted the manufacture. Prices are lower for those implements, such as mowers, rakes, &c. The quality is good. 13. No.
14. It has. It has promoted manufactures, and sensibly increased the number of consumers, by giving work to a larger number.
15. Certainly. 16. The country being more prosperous, money is more plentiful, and real property is more valuable as a matter of course; the fact is undeniable. Property has increased one-fourth in value.
17. Yes, evidently. 18. The tax on tobacco cannot be maintained, nor any other tax on agricultural products. The more manufactures prosper, the better for agriculture. The one cannot get on without the other.

*General Remarks:*—Any legislation promoting manufactures, utilizing agricultural products, such as beet root sugar, starch made from potatoes, &c., &c., would greatly benefit farmers. It would, if it were possible, be of great benefit to promote those industries by means of bounties or otherwise. Well qualified agents for promoting those industries would be still better than emigration agents.

MARC E. DUCHARME, J.P.,

Mayor, St. Marc, Co. Verchères.

- 
1. I do not think it would, at least as regards this section, for we have no trade with the United States in agricultural products. 2. No effect
  3. No wheat or flour imported from the United States.
  4. We got all those articles from Quebec or Montreal. 5. I do not know.
  6. The number of horses is small. There are hardly any for sale. 7. We produce here all we require to fatten our stock.
  8. Yes. 9. I think so. 10. No effect here. 11. We hardly raise any.
  12. I do not know as regards this section. 13. The prices are about the same.
  14. I think it has. 15. It has done great good to the working classes, and checked the craze for emigrating to the U.S. 16. I do not notice any change here.
  17. Yes. 18. Encourage colonization by getting roads made. Put an end to the state of servitude in which the people are kept in consequence of timber limits being granted to certain parties.

P. N. THIVIERGE, Curé,  
St. Bonaventure, Co. Bonaventure.

---

1. No; it would be against their interest. 2. A good effect, for it was, and is, calculated to advance the price of Canadian cereals.
3. They must have contributed to increase the prices of those articles in Canada.
4. A good effect, by increasing prices. 5. Yes; they have improved prices in our markets. 6. Yes; when prices are good, otherwise other stock pays better.
7. It would not be bad to import American corn. 8. Yes.
9. Perhaps; but with the present Tariff. 10 and 11. I do not perceive any.
12. Neither increased nor diminished. Quality as good.
13. Neither increased nor diminished. 14. I do not know why, but the markets of the country have greatly improved. 15. Yes.
16. The value of land has advanced, and is advancing. 17. Yes.
18. Continued good prices is what is required.

P. O. GRENIER, N. P.,  
Farmer, Ste. Rose, Co. Laval.

---

1. Yes; as regards articles Canadians do not produce. 2. See Sessional Papers.
- 3 and 4. To raise the price of both. 5. No apparent effect.
6. Breeding horses is not very profitable. The United States.
7. Yes; and importation not advantageous. 8. Yes. 9. No. 10. No apparent effect, for the duty is not high enough. 11. None. 12. I do not know.
13. No. 14. Yes. Increased demand and less competition. 15. Yes, certainly.
16. Yes; for there is more capital in circulation and produce sells better.
17. Yes; greatly. 18. Encourage the growing of tobacco by removing all duties for five or ten years.

R. A. LAPORTE, N. P.,  
St. Alexis, Co. Montcalm.

---

1. No, none; because the effect would be to lower the prices of what our farmers sell.
2. Prices have not increased except as to oats, which have advanced 10 per cent., and this has benefited our farmers. 3. Prices of spring and fall wheat have hardly changed. Flour is a little higher, but has greatly fallen within a few weeks, speculators who were trying to force prices up, having been obliged to sell.
4. A good effect as regards live hogs and hams. Our farmers get 25 to 30 per cent. more than they did in 1878, for their pork.

5. It has been a great benefit; our farmers get 25 to 30 per cent. more for the horses they have to sell. 6. There is a good profit to be made in raising horses, provided the Tariff is not changed.
7. He can, and more cheaply than if he had to import American corn.
8. Yes, and our farmers are quite satisfied. 9. The Tariff is of great benefit to our farmers. They are far better off than in 1878, when everything came free.
10. An advance of about 10 per cent. 11. The duty which was levied on tobacco did great harm. We desire its removal. 12. Prices are much lower, and the quality is as good. Axes, forks, shovels, scythes, &c., are 15 to 20 per cent. cheaper.
13. Woollens and cottons have advanced 15 to 20 per cent., and hardware 15 per cent. within two years. 14. It has greatly improved the markets for our farmers.
15. Yes, wages are much better, and farmers can pay their laborers higher wages. There is more money. 16. Land has increased 30 per cent. in value under the present Tariff, as compared with 1878.
17. Yes, farmers and working men are in a far better position. 18. No answer.
- General Remarks* :—Many to whom I have spoken think, as I do, that it would be good to reduce the duty on hardware and flour imported from the United States. This would be a great help to our farmers.

EPHREM AUDET,

St. Lazare, Co. Bellechasse.

1. No. 2. To increase slightly the price of oats. The price of corn, pease and barley is about the same. The removal of the duties, especially on corn, would greatly injure Canadian agriculture.
3. The effect is that it sells higher. The chief cause, I think, is the falling off in receipts of late years. 4. As regards bacon, &c., to cause farmers to get remunerative prices and enable them to make a larger outlay and increase their crops.
5. To increase prices 20 to 25 per cent. All kinds of stock are now in great demand.
6. Hitherto, I have preferred other stock, but now that we have a great market in Manitoba, I think the profit on horses will be as good. 7. Yes; he can. The free admission of American corn would impede the progress of agriculture.
8. Yes; as to butter and eggs. As to the other articles I cannot say.
9. Yes. We are in a better position to negotiate for a treaty, but such a treaty would be injurious to Canadian farmers. 10. None that I know of.
11. A large increase in the cultivation of tobacco. I do not see any change here as regards the other articles. 12. Prices not increased. Reapers, rakes and ploughs of good make have not undergone any alteration.
13. The prices in our country stores, for these goods, are about the same.
14. It has raised the price of the leading articles derived from agriculture, and encouraged farmers to produce in greater quantity.
15. Yes; and it has prevented families from emigrating. A certain number of persons still go away in the spring, but they return in the fall.
16. The value of land is going up, for within the last two years the rate of interest has fallen to 5 and 6 per cent.; from 7 and 8, as it was before.
17. A great improvement is taking place. 18. Maintain the Tariff as at present, except as regards lard, which ought to pay the same duty as butter.

*General Remarks* :—Farmers here, as a rule, are Protectionists, though they do not always act as such. Agricultural societies, model farms, &c., have done good, but the best way to encourage agriculture is to open new foreign markets for Canadian products. I think that when things sell well, every one is eager to buy.

GABRIEL CLOUTIER,

Farmer, St. Pierre, Co. Montmagny.

1. No. 2. No answer. 3. Wheat has sold higher, but farmers grow more than formerly, I mean spring wheat.
4. Pigs, pork, &c., sell higher, and farmers give more attention to fattening pigs.
5. It would be better to have no duty on horses. 6. It is very profitable to raise and sell horses. The United States.
7. He can. It would not be more advantageous. We can grow all the corn we need.
8. The price of butter has risen. The price of eggs has fallen. 9. No.
10. An advance in price. 11. A good effect on tobacco. 12. Prices of all agricultural implements are lower.
13. Woollens have advanced. Cottons are lower. Scythes, forks, spades, &c., are cheaper. 14. Yes, especially for wheat, woollen goods, pork, &c. &c.
15. All find employment, wages are high, and there is no reason for emigrating to the United States. 16. Yes. Land has increased one-third, owing to the ready sale of produce and the good prices obtained for it.
17. Greatly. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—Diffuse agricultural instruction; have lectures on agriculture in winter time by practical farmers. Improve stock by free importation of breeding animals and reduction of freight thereon. Increase the duties on woollens, leather, beef-cattle, pigs, butter, cheese, &c.

EVARISTE GIROUARD,  
Mayor, St. Benoit, Co. Two Mountains.

1. Our farmers here buy flour largely, and would be glad to see it admitted free.
2. It has caused no change in prices of those articles here.
3. The advance on those articles has been coincident with the imposition of the duty, but I attribute it rather to the usual fluctuations of the market than to the alteration of the Tariff. 4. No effect whatever here.
5. Horses have advanced in value within the last two or three years. I do not know the cause. 6. The horses which have been bought here by outsiders were intended for the American market.
7. Yes, he does grow enough, and he can do without American corn.
8. It has, in my opinion, improved the market for butter. 9. I think so.
- 10 and 11. Not felt here. 12. Prices and quality the same. 13. No notable change. I am a merchant and I cannot cite a notable instance.
14. Yes, by removing foreign competition. 15. Not notably in our section.
16. The value has increased. 17. Greatly. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—In all my answers I have reference solely to our own locality. We are far from the manufacturing centres, and the Tariff may not have helped us, but it certainly has not done us harm.

THOMAS P. PELLETIER,  
Merchant, Trois Pistoles, Co. Temiscouata.

1. None, except cotton, which we cannot produce. 2. A slight advance, I think, on oats, barley and pease. 3. I do not see any difference in prices of flour and wheat. 4. Live hogs, pork and lard have slightly advanced.
5. Horses especially sell much higher. A large number are sent to Manitoba.
6. Raising horned cattle pays better. The risk is not so great. 7. With intelligent culture we can raise all we need, even corn. 8. Greatly.
9. I think not. It would destroy our manufactures, which give employment to our consumers. 10. There is no trade here in wool.
11. The excise duty on tobacco is very injurious to that branch of cultivation.
12. Prices have advanced but little. Quality as good. 12. Cottons have risen 15 to 20 per cent. 14. All farm produce finds higher prices.

15. Very few are leaving for the United States, and many are returning.  
 16. Property has advanced 20 per cent., because produce sells more readily.  
 17. It has greatly improved. 18. Give improved means of communication and promote the export of live stock and meat to France and England.

LOUIS ROUSSEAU,  
 Farmer, St. Germain, Co. Drummond.

1. No. 2 to 4. No answers. 5. Yes. 6. No. 7. Yes. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. Yes.  
 10 and 11. No answers. 12. The same prices. Equally good. 13 and 14. No answers. 15. Yes. 16. Yes. Land has increased in value through the abundance of capital. 17. Yes, greatly. 18. No answer.

ANT. SÉGUIN,  
 Warden, St. Eustache, Co. Two Mountains.

1. It would be against our interests. 2. To increase the selling prices of our oats, corn, barley and pease at least 10 per cent. 3. No effect. 4. A good effect.  
 5. It is an advantage for Canada. 6. The United States. 7. We can grow all we need and more. 8. Yes, greatly. 9. It depends on the conditions. We are in a better position than previous to the Tariff. 10. No effect. 11. A good effect.  
 12. No increase, and quality equally good. 13. No increase.  
 14. Our local markets are 25 per cent. better. 15. Yes, the new Tariff facilitates the establishment of manufactories and thus helps and gives employment to our people. 16. Yes, farms have greatly advanced in price. Many capitalists are seeking to invest in farm property. 17. Greatly.  
 18. More model farms, and agricultural instruction.

M. G. BLAIN,  
 Agricultural Society, St. Edward, Co. Napierville.

1. I do not see any advantage in admitting their produce free.  
 2. To advance prices of oats, barley and pease. 3. It has largely contributed to advance the price of flour. 4. To advance the price of hogs.  
 5. It has greatly enhanced the price of horses. 6. In our locality it is not more profitable to raise horses than other stock. 7. We can do equally well by fattening our stock with our own grain. 8. Yes.  
 9. We think a Treaty could not be less advantageous now, than when produce was admitted free. 10. None.  
 11. Tobacco is not grown in sufficient quantity to warrant a duty. The duty greatly reduces the cultivation of tobacco, flax and beet roots.  
 12. We cannot see any increase. 13 and 14. Prices are about the same.  
 15. No difference in our locality. 16. The value of land has increased, because produce sells better than in 1878. 17. The condition of the farmers is better.  
 18. The most necessary change to be made is a reduction of one-half in the salaries and the number of Government officials.

F. X. GAVAGE,  
 Mayor, Farmer, St. Augustin, Co. Two Mountains.

1 to 18. No answers.

*General Remarks* :—Enclosed you will find the questions on the Tariff, sent to me by Mr. Landry. In my opinion it would take a skilled politician or a person engaged in commerce to answer them. I feel myself incompetent to deliver a judgment in these matters, so I leave the space for answers blank, and herewith return

the paper with these remarks. Protection has been the war-cry of the Conservatives, many of them have made an idol of it, and the Liberals curse it. I am myself perfectly neutral. I cannot say which is best. I know duties are needed in order that Government may be carried on, and in our section the moment a duty is imposed on any article the cry is, "Pay up John." Meantime things must only take their course, let the result be what it may.

P. S. JONCAS,  
Berthier.

1. We do not think so here. 2. Our products have not diminished in price but have all increased. 3. No difference. Spring wheat holds its price. No fall wheat here. 4. Better than formerly. 5. Yes.
6. Yes, they sell very well. Cannot tell the relative profits. Horses are bought by traders from Montreal and elsewhere.
7. The farmer raises all he wants. No need whatever of American corn.
8. It is in my opinion. 9. He might. But it should be a genuine Reciprocity Treaty. We are as well off as the Americans themselves.
10. Wool sells well as things now stand. 11. As to flax and beet root I cannot say. Increase the duty on American tobacco. Remove all duty from Canadian tobacco. 12. No perceptible difference, except it be an improvement.
13. No perceptible difference. The quality is perhaps better. 14. Yes.
15. It has not been noticed here. 16. Yes, the value of farms has somewhat advanced. Money is more plentiful; interest lower.
17. Very much. There is no comparison. 18. To promote it as much as possible.

PIERRE LACERTE,  
Sec. Treasurer, St. Maurice.

1. No. 2. Better prices have been obtained by farmers for all coarse grains.
3. No sensible effect in this section, for we do not grow wheat enough for our consumption, and the price of flour is regulated by the English market.
4. I cannot say. 5. Yes. 6. Raising horses is very profitable, but I cannot say that the profits are greater than on raising sheep and horned cattle, and particularly milch cows. Up to this time our chief market has been the United States. 7. Yes, and he can do without American corn. 8. Yes.
9. Yes, and we are in a better position to negotiate. 10. We get a better price.
11. No marked effect as to flax, of which we grow very little. Sugar beet growing is only just beginning. Tobacco growing has greatly increased.
12. Prices, as for instance of ploughs, reapers and rakes, have become lower; quality equally good.
13. It seems to have raised woollen goods about 5 per cent., and cottons  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  cent per yard. 14. Yes, and prices are better. 15. Yes, without a doubt.
16. Yes, and land has advanced 25 to 30 per cent. since 1878. 17. Greatly improved.
18. I have no suggestion to make.

GEORGE CARON,  
Merchant and Farmer, St. Léon, Co. Maskinongé.

1. Yes, certainly, those articles which we are obliged to import, for after all it is the consumer who has to pay.
2. Indian corn is imported here in great quantities. Putting a duty on it causes a corresponding advance in the price; and the consumer pays the difference. As to barley, pease, oats and rye, I do not see any difference.
3. A corresponding advance in price, which advance is paid by the consumer. I do not see any difference in spring wheat or fall wheat. But little wheat is sown, and a large quantity of flour is imported. 4. I cannot say.

5. The American market governs the price of horses in ours.
6. It pays well to raise good horses. Cows and sheep pay better. The United States.
7. He can raise all he requires, except Indian corn. 8. I do not think so.
9. It would be of great benefit to the farmer. We are perhaps in a better position to negotiate a Treaty. 10. No answer. 11. It is hard to say. Hitherto hardly any has been grown.
12. Farmers pay higher prices for implements, in consequence of the Tariff. We manufacture them of as good quality as those manufactured anywhere else.
13. It has raised the price of all those articles used by farmers. 14. I do not think it has. 15. The prosperity induced by two good harvests has created new industries and given employment to our working classes. Emigration to the United States has diminished within a year, because there are hardly any persons left to emigrate. Those who return go back to their farms.
16. Farm property has advanced since the last two good harvests. The recovery of business since the two good harvests has restored confidence in the money market. 17. It has improved within a couple of years, owing to two good harvests—the only cause. A single bad crop would create distress. Two bad harvests would cause the same disastrous results witnessed in every country where the crops fail. The prosperity of an agricultural country—such as ours—cannot be based on a Protective Tariff, which has the effect of impeding agriculture by placing most onerous duties on farm implements and other articles indispensable to the farmer. 18. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—The Government, under the false pretext of creating new industries, promoting agriculture, and diffusing abundance and prosperity, had no object in view but to create a revenue. The present system of Protection only protects a few manufacturers at the expense of the consumer. All the farmer does is to pay taxes under all sorts of forms.

J. L. LAFONTAINE, N. P.,

Farmer, Roxton Falls, Co. Shefford.

1. A great many American products might be admitted free of duty, because they have not enough of them for themselves.
2. It has raised the price of corn, but not of oats, rye barley and pease.
3. I do not see any effect as regards wheat, as we have neither the one nor the other to sell; but the flour we buy must be dearer to the amount of the duty.
4. To increase prices in our market. 5. I cannot see that we have a monopoly here; as to Manitoba and the North-West, I do not know. 6. It is profitable. The profits on other stock are as 100 to 60. The United States.
7. He can. It is profitable to import corn when we get high prices for pease, barley and oats from other countries. 8. It has done nothing for those articles.
9. Yes. Our position is not better to-day than when American products were admitted free. 10 and 11. No effect.
12. The Tariff has caused them to remain at the same prices, whereas they should have been cheaper, with an increased demand. Quality unchanged in many cases. 13. It has raised the prices of cottons and woollens, horse blankets and blankets, and yellow cottons have advanced only to the amount of the duty.
14. It has had no effect in increasing prices of farm products, except those we cannot grow with profit. 15. It has given such employment, but it has not checked emigration to the United States.
16. Farm property does not attract capital under the influence of the Tariff. The value of land has increased since 1880 only. The reason is that everything has advanced in price the world over.
17. Only since 1880. 18. Allow the farmer to buy where he likes, because he sells wherever he can, and the wealthy capitalist pays no taxes.

*General Remarks* :—The railway companies do not give fair play to local traffic. When prices are high (say for pease) all the cars are delivered where there is competition, because if one company does not furnish them another will, and any station which has but one railway cannot get cars. When the market is low we can get cars in abundance.

HENRY ROY,  
Farmer, St. Sebastien, Co. Iberville.

1. No. 2. It has raised the prices of all those cereals in the Province of Quebec.
3. It has raised the prices, especially as to spring wheat, for there is none here
4. Prices have greatly increased. 5. Yes.
6. Horses are not as profitable as other stock. The United States.
7. Yes; he grows all the grain he needs to fatten his stock. 8. Yes.
9. No. 10. I see no change. 11. Prices have greatly increased.
12. I see no change. 13. I do not see any advance except in cotton, the others are about the same. 14. Yes; by raising the prices of our produce. 15. Yes; it has given such employment and encouragement.
16. Yes; farm property has advanced under the Tariff. 17. Yes.
18. I see no necessity for change.

*General Remarks* :—I consider that the present Tariff has improved the position of all classes in the Province of Quebec.

LEON DESLAURIERS,  
Farmer, Pointe Claire, Côte St. Remi, Co. Jacques Cartier.

1. We can do without American produce. Our farms produce an abundance.
2. The duty does not injure us, for we have them all at home.
3. To facilitate the importation of flour and wheat would be beneficial to the country. 4. I do not see any change needed by the agricultural class.
5. The increase of duty is injurious to our trade.
6. Breeding horses is more profitable. The United States.
7. He can raise all he requires. 8. As regards all those articles the Tariff does no harm. 9. The present system is quite as beneficial as a Reciprocity Treaty. 10. No effect in my opinion.
11. The removal of the duty would be beneficial.
12. Since the present Tariff property and its products have greatly advanced.
13. About the same. 14. Greatly increased.
15. It has given great advantages to the working classes, in keeping many from leaving home and bringing a good many back. 16. Capital is doing great service, and property has advanced 20 per cent. since 1878. 17. Yes.
18. I think the money paid by Government to the agricultural societies would be better spent if it were awarded to the best kept farms, having the best stock, farm implements, &c. To increase the number of prizes would be better than the present system.

FELIX LAVOIE,  
St. Martin, Co. Laval.

1. No, I do not think so; for the Canadian farmer can raise all he needs, except wheat and flour. 2. A good effect.
3. To raise the price of flour and destroy the milling industry, by reason of the disproportion between the duty on wheat and the duty on flour.
4. To maintain good prices. 5 and 6. No answer.
7. Yes, he raises the grain required to fatten his stock. 8. No answer. 9. No.
10. No answer. 11. A good effect, but the growing of tobacco should be freer.

- 12. Prices are lower and the quality is better. Mowers, rakes, ploughs, &c.
- 13. I think not. 14. Yes; by reducing competition.
- 15. Various industries have undoubtedly been benefited by it, but the Lower Canada miller has lost. Emigration has not slackened. 16. No answer.
- 17. Yes, a little. 18. I have my views about the matter, but it is a question for legislators and political economists.

*General Remarks*:—Our lands in Quebec have been ruined by exhaustion, and it will take twenty-five years of intelligent culture to enable them to grow wheat with profit. Therefore, if we admit wheat free we benefit the miller and the farmer.

Duty on 4½ bushel of wheat (the making of 1 bbl. of flour)...@ 15 cts. =	Cents. 67½
Duty on a barrel of American flour, only.....	50
Balance in favor of American miller.....	17½
The above speaks for itself.	

J. C. PAQUET,  
Merchant Miller, Pont Rouge, Co. Portneuf.

- 1. No, except wheat, because the Province does not produce what it consumes.
- 2. A good effect. It has caused our oats, rye, barley, pease, &c., to sell at a higher price and more readily. 3. It has raised the prices by so much.
- 4. It has raised prices about a third. 5. It has improved prices and the market for Canada. 6. Yes, it is profitable to raise horses.
- 7. Yes he can. No, it would not. 8. Yes. 9. Yes; and we are in a better position to do so. 10. I do not know. 11. A good effect.
- 12. It has increased. The quality is equally good. 13. It has not raised or lowered the prices of those articles, except cotton which has advanced a little.
- 14. Yes, and in a most satisfactory manner. 15. Yes.
- 16. Yes, and the value of land has considerably increased through the abundance of money. 17. Yes, and greatly. 18. I am not a farmer, and cannot say.

*General Remarks*:—The Tariff, on the whole, has produced a good effect in this Province, it has revived our industries, given employment to the working classes, improved our market for farm produce, and created prosperity.

I. MILOT,  
Notary, Yamachiche, Co. St. Maurice.

- 1. No, so long as the United States levy duties on our products.
- 2. A pretty considerable advance in prices. 3. An increase of at least one-fourth.
- 4. Some increase as in preceding case. 5. Yes, greatly.
- 6. Many think horses pay best, but I think other stock more profitable because it costs less to raise them. Our market is Montreal, where we sell to Canadians, many of whom deal with the United States and Maaitoba.
- 7. Yes, and I do not think it would be better to import American corn. There is very little imported in this country. 8. Yes, and for all other farm products.
- 9. Perhaps he would, but he no longer wishes for it since his position has been improved through the effects of the present Tariff. He thinks "a bird in the hand worth two in the bush." But the Americans would, of course, be more amenable to reason now than under the former régime.
- 10. An increase of 10 cents per lb. 11. Very little grown here; I cannot say.
- 12. No. Quality not to be surpassed. 13. No change, except as to cotton for weaving which has risen 5 cents per lb.
- 14. Yes, by enabling our farmers to get prices much more remunerative on our markets. 15. I answer yes, to all points of this question. 16. Capital is plenty and land has greatly advanced in this county since 1878. 17. Yes, greatly

18. Our condition is now so good that I should dread any premature change.

*General Remarks:*—I have spoken for myself only. I have not consulted with the other directors of the Agricultural Society.

J. N. A. ARCHAMBEAULT,  
President, Verchères,

- 
1. No. 2. I think the duty levied on Indian corn has greatly increased the prices of oats, rye, corn, barley and pease, and also of buckwheat in this part of the Province of Quebec.
  3. The effect of enabling us to sell wheat and flour higher. Hardly any fall wheat grown here, nothing but spring wheat. 4. They sell much higher. 5. Yes.
  6. I do. 25 per cent. more on horses. The United States.
  7. He can. It would not pay better. 8. Yes. 9. No. 10. I do not see much change here. 11. It has had a good effect on the cultivation of flax and tobacco.
  12. Increased a little; quality equally good.
  13. I see no change in woollens; cottons have advanced a little. No change in hardware. 14. Yes, and all farm produce sells 25 per cent. higher.
  15. Yes. It has done so.
  16. Yes, farm property has increased 50 per cent. since 1878, because we can sell our produce at better prices. 17. Yes. 18. I do not know of any.

*General Remarks:*—I entirely approve of the Tariff, as to its effect on agriculture, and I consider that the Government could not have adopted a measure better calculated to secure the prosperity of all classes in the country.

ALEXANDRE CREVIER,  
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Co. Jacques Cartier.

- 
1. I know of no kinds of American agricultural produce which are necessary.
  2. I am ignorant of the effect of the Tariff upon many of the grains. The effect of the Tariff has been to increase the price of oats.
  3. I know that these articles are dearer, I do not know whether this is caused by the Tariff or by the great demand for them in Europe.
  4. All these articles have increased in price. 5. Yes, in this country these animals are selling better, and I know that there is a trade in them in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.
  6. As to horses, it is more profitable to raise them than other stock. They are bought for both places, I cannot tell the difference. 7. The farmer can raise with advantage all the grains. No, it would be less profitable to import American corn.
  8. Yes, these articles command higher prices. 9. I do not know whether a Reciprocity Treaty would be more advantageous than the existing Tariff. Yes, our position is better.
  10. Wool in this locality is cheaper; but I think this is caused by the tanneries who buy the unshorn hides.
  11. I do not know the effect of the Tariff on these articles. 12. I do not know the effect of the Tariff on farm implements; the quality is as good and better.
  13. I do not know any effect that the Tariff has produced on these articles.
  14. Yes, the Tariff has improved the market; farm produce is selling better.
  15. Yes, the Tariff has much encouraged the industrial classes, and has diminished emigration and encouraged settlement.
  16. Yes, farm property attracts capital under the present Tariff. The value of lands has increased by not less than one-third, because farm produce sells better and money is more plentiful.

17. Yes, much improved. 18. I do not know what changes in the law are required to make agriculture a more desirable and lucrative profession.

*General Remarks* :—The fewer the taxes which are imposed the better for property in the country.

MAXIMIN GAGNON,  
Farmer, Rivière du Sud, Co. Montmagny.

1. Yes, because Ontario profits under the present Tariff, and the other Provinces suffer from it.
2. The imposition of a duty on Indian corn has injured agriculturists in respect to the fattening of their cattle. As to the other grains, I believe that it has done neither harm nor good.
3. In the part of the country I live in, the duty on wheat and flour has been injurious to us, for it makes us pay dearer for them; as to the different kinds, not being a trader in flour or wheat, I have not examined into their effect.
4. Considering the imposition of duties upon Indian corn and other coarse American grains, the duties upon these articles cannot have given any great advantages to Canadians.
5. There were so few imported that the duties cannot make much difference.
6. It is advantageous to raise horses in equal proportion with other stock. Our chief market for horses is the United States.
7. The Canadian farmer cannot with advantage, raise the grain necessary for fattening his cattle. It would be more profitable to import American Indian corn.
8. Not so far as I know. 9. Yes, the free admission of all farm produce would be preferable. 10. I do not know.
11. Upon the cultivation of tobacco, the present Tariff is very oppressive and injurious to the farmers. As respects flax and sugar beet, I know nothing.
12. It has remained almost stationary. 13. I do not know.
14. The present Tariff has not had the effect of improving the home market for farm produce. I attribute the increase to the foreign demand.
15. Not so far as I know. Emigration to the United States has not slackened; I even think that it is ever increasing.
16. At the present time farm property is attracting capital; but I do not attribute this to the present Tariff. I attribute it rather to the era of prosperity in which we live, without considering that the present Tariff has contributed anything towards it. 17. Decidedly—the harvests having been better, and the demands from foreign countries more numerous.
18. To encourage further settlement by the opening of railways in unsettled sections, and to allow all things necessary to agriculture to enter free.

*General Remarks* :—The great scourge in the Dominion is emigration, the great remedy is the means of colonizing it. The present laws respecting the sale of Crown Lands are not faithfully observed. There is too much speculation as to these lands, to the injury of *bonâ fide* settlers who wish to establish homesteads.

FRANÇOIS THÉRIEN,  
Secretary-Treasurer St. Calixte de Kilkenny, Co. Montcalm.

1. No. 2. I consider that the duties imposed upon maize and other coarse American grains has had the effect of raising the price of oats, rye, Indian corn, barley and pease in this part of the Province of Quebec.
3. The effect produced by the imposition of a duty upon wheat and flour imported from the United States, is that the price of spring wheat is increased. I can say nothing as to fall wheat for there is none here.

4. The price has greatly increased. 5. Yes. 6. I think that the raising of horses is not as profitable as the raising of other stock. Our principal market for horses is the United States.
7. Yes, the Canadian farmer raises all the grain necessary for fattening his stock.
8. Yes. 9. No. 10. I see no change. 11. The prices have greatly advanced.
12. I see no change. 13. So far as I see, cottons are the only articles which have increased, the rest remain about the same.
14. Yes, by increasing the price received for our produce.
15. The Tariff has had the effect of giving employment and other encouragement to our various industrial classes. 16. Yes, agricultural property has increased under the present Tariff. 17. Yes. 18. I do not see that any change is necessary.

*General Remarks:*—In fine, I consider that the existing Tariff has benefited all classes in the community.

LEON DESLAURIERS, Jun.,  
Farmer, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Co. Jacques Cartier.

1. In principle no. As an exception to the rule it is beneficial to facilitate the introduction of new plants or varieties, vines, fruit trees, suitable to the climate, potatoes, &c.
2. To render our market better for Canadian produce, and to facilitate its sale, which previously was not always easy or profitable. This with respect chiefly to oats, maize, barley and peas. 3. See the trade returns.
4. To permit of the Canadian farmers raising and fattening pork with profit. People had almost been brought to abandon this business, as it did not pay its cost. 5. I cannot say, in our Province only a few stallions are imported for the improvement of the trade.
6. Here we find our market in the United States. The raising of horses of good breeds pays better than that of beasts for slaughter of superior kind.
7. Assuredly, we can raise everything here. The advantage to be derived from American maize is nothing in comparison with the loss that would be entailed on Canadian grains in our market by this importation, so long as the American market remains almost closed to us by the existing Tariff.
8. Not in this section as I know. 9. This admits of no doubt, clearly, and the Americans themselves acknowledge it. 10. I do not know.
11. The cultivation of these articles cannot be too much encouraged. The two latter well protected for a few years would end in being so profitably cultivated, that they would bear later on heavy Excise duties, provided the protective duties were continued.
12. Canadian implements are better made, the variety is greater, and the price has lessened. 13. Canadian woollens and cotton goods are much better, more varied and cheaper since Protection has allowed of greater competition among manufacturers.
14. This is clearly the case, and for all produce. After a few years of this policy the encouragement as now given will have caused to spring up new industries, which will give work to the poor, and thus create a good market for all agricultural produce.
15. Yes the effect is already making itself felt, but years of the new policy will be required to heal the wounds inflicted upon our agriculturalists by the ruinous system followed since the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.
16. The value of land in the Province of Quebec has increased gradually and surely. The present Tariff does much to cause this.
17. Infinitely better. To-day confidence is assured, debts are paid, and money laid by; whilst in former years it meant ruin more or less certain, and the depopulation of our country parts.

18. To protect especially all industries for which the raw materials can be raised here. In my opinion alcohol can with certainty be extracted profitably from the sugar beet, and its cultivation would result in infinitely greater advantages such as the better preparation given to the soil, and by the residues more alcohol made here may cease to be extracted from grain imported from the United States. This ought to be done in order that the useful for the raising of cattle. This ought to be done in order that the United States. This is an anomaly tending to the profit of a few individuals and for which agriculture suffers in many ways.

EDWARD A. BARNARD,  
Director of Agriculture, Cap St. Michel, Co. Québec.

1. No, because the Canadian farmer sells his grains more easily under the existing Tariff. 2. It has had the effect of enabling us to sell our grains as a whole at a higher price, especially oats, wheat, maize and pease.  
3. We pay a slightly higher price for wheat and flour than previous to the imposition of these duties.  
4. To give to the farmers the benefit of being able to sell at a higher figure.  
5. They have increased the prices. 6. It is advantageous to raise horses, the farmer realizes 25 per cent. more than what he obtains for all other stock. To the United States. 7. The farmer raises sufficient and does not require American maize. 8. Yes, greatly improved. 9. The present Tariff has produced a good effect. 10. A good one. 11. A good effect.  
12. The Tariff has had the effect of lessening the prices of these instruments; the quality is satisfactory, especially of harvestors and reapers.  
13. The price is about the same as before the Tariff.  
14. Yes, by giving us the benefit of selling our produce more easily.  
15. Yes, to a great extent. 16. Yes, property has increased one-third in value owing to the abundance of money. 17. Yes, greatly improved.  
18. By encouraging settlement.

*General Remarks:*—I have consulted a great number of farmers and business men, all of whom approve of the foregoing answers.

FLAV. LETOURNEAU,  
Farmer, Co. Rouville.

1. I do not think so. 2. The imposition of a duty on rye and maize has had the effect of slightly increasing the price of those grains; but as to oats, barley and pease the effect has been almost nothing. 3. Very little.  
4. Almost nothing. 5. The price of horses and other living animals has increased 30 per cent.  
6. It is profitable to raise choice horses. I think that with the good prices we are obtaining now the raising of horses pays as well as the raising of other animals. The market is the United States.  
7. The farmers can raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his cattle, even Indian corn. 8. Yes, it is much improved.  
9. I think that we shall now obtain a more favourable hearing.  
10. No difference, the wool being all used for home consumption. The price has not changed.  
11. But little flax is cultivated in our locality. The Tariff duty on tobacco has had the effect of increasing its price, but in reality competition makes this article as cheap as it formerly was.  
12. The price of farm implements has increased, especially mowers and harvesters.  
13. The Tariff has slightly increased the price of cottons and woollens, but now the cottons have gone back to their usual prices on account of the manufacture carried on here.

14. Yes to a great extent. The labourers having higher wages and being employed in a somewhat permanent manner, buy more; consequently the farmers receive higher prices, and from this comes general abundance and sensible improvement.
15. Yes, to a great extent. Without this Tariff our fellow countrymen would have emigrated in large numbers. Many are returning to the Dominion.
16. The value of land has increased from 30 to 40 per cent. in certain localities. The reason is that agricultural produce having increased, animals commanding higher prices, the manufacturing industries of cheese and butter yielding larger profits, they have doubled the revenue derived from their farms. Hence the increase. 17. Much improved, all appear satisfied.
18. For the present I do not think it is necessary to make any change in the law. The improvement of live stock, example set by practical farmers, agricultural meetings, education among farmers, will soon make the occupation more lucrative and more highly appreciated.

S. BERTRAND,  
Notary, St. Mathias, Co. Rouville.

1. No; because it would be to act directly contrary to the prosperity of all Canada.
2. The imposition of this duty upon American grain has truly had the good effect of causing the price of our grains to rise, which we are now selling at a greatly increased figure. 3. I know of no effect which the imposition of these duties has produced. 4. To increase the price of Canadian pigs and lard, by favouring Canadian farmers. 5. Yes; this has much improved the price.
6. The market price is such at the present time that it is advantageous to raise horses; but generally speaking other stock remunerate the farmers as much, and even more.
7. Yes; there is sufficient grain raised in this country to fatten cattle.
8. The Tariff has made an improvement, although in my opinion it could only be perceived in respect to vegetables, which we import, and very little is required to be imported. 9. Yes; greatly benefited. And the Tariff is such as to initiate a Reciprocity Treaty.
10. Our sheep are exported alive, and I do not know what effect the Tariff can produce on wool. 11. I do not know.
12. The price of axes and scythes has not increased, and perhaps some other instruments have lessened in price. 13. No increase has been effected.
14. Yes; a marked increase. 15. Yes; it has favoured the working classes and has caused many Canadians to return to the Dominion who had gone to the States.
16. Yes; and the value of land has increased since 1878.
17. Yes; considerably improved. 18. I know of no change required.

CHARLES BOUTEL,  
Director, Agr'l Society, Farmer, Victoriaville, Co. Arthabaska.

1. I would suggest the admission free of duty of flour, and maize or Indian corn.
2. We require the American maize. It is impossible to cultivate this grain in Canada, so as to pay. 3. Flour has risen 50 cents. 4. I cannot say.
5. It would be to our advantage to have the American market open for the sale of our horses; preferable to Manitoba.
6. It is profitable to raise horses. Our best and chief market is the United States.
7. It is not possible to cultivate maize so as to return a profit. 7. No.
9. Yes, a Reciprocity Treaty will be always desired by the farmer, who finds his most natural market in the States. 10. Wool has increased in price.
11. I cannot answer. 12. No.

13. The Tariff has increased by one-third manufactured cottons and woollens; and the manufacturers alone benefit from this Tariff. 14. No.  
 15. No; emigration is greater than ever towards the United States and Manitoba.  
 16. Landed property has diminished in value. 17. No.  
 18. Put the farmer in the position of selling free to the United States his potatoes, oats and butter, as well as bread, and all will go well as respects the purse of the farmer.

J. E. CASGRAIN, N. P., }  
 LAURENT MORIN, Mayor, } L'Islet, Co. L'Islet.

1. No. 2. No ascertained effect. 3. No effect.  
 4. To increase the price of these articles on the Canadian market.  
 5. The prices have greatly improved.  
 6. The raising of horses is more profitable than that of other stock. The market is found in the United States and Manitoba.  
 7. The farmer raises all the necessary grain. 8. Yes.  
 6. I think not at the present moment. 10. None. The price has risen somewhat.  
 11. A considerable effect upon tobacco, not easy to ascertain that upon flax and beet root. 12. The price has slightly lessened, the quality is as good as ever.  
 13. Very slightly increased. 14. Yes. 15. Not in our locality.  
 16. Yes, the value has increased. 17. Yes. 18. Difficult to answer.

CYRILLE BERNIER,

Cap St. Ignace, Co. Montmagny.

1. I cannot answer this question in detail, but as for the maize and the wheat I think that they ought to be admitted free, because Lower Canada does not raise sufficient for home consumption.  
 2. As for the maize it is only useful in the condition of flour—it causes the flour to be dearer. Oats are dearer than last year; there is no rye; Indian corn a little dearer.  
 3. The price of barley is not affected; pease a little dearer this year. As for wheat and flour, the duties imposed have made us pay dearer. As for the classes of wheat I cannot state the difference because we buy flour, but not wheat.  
 4. I cannot answer this question, it would take more time to obtain the information.  
 5. I can say nothing on this question.  
 6. Some persons like horses the best, and find that they pay better than other stock, but I cannot express any opinion. Our market for horses is with the United States.  
 7. Yes, I think they raise enough grain to fatten his stock.  
 8. In our place there is no great difference.  
 9. The farmer would reap a great advantage from a Reciprocity Treaty. I think it would be more easy to obtain one.  
 10. Not to my knowledge. Before the Tariff I sold for 40 cents, while to-day it sells at 35 cents to 40 cents.  
 11. Respecting flax, beet root and sugar, I see no difference. But as for tobacco, with all the duties it is almost impossible to cultivate it. It is a very bad law.  
 12. I can say nothing in answer to this question.  
 13. It has increased cotton goods—and manufactured woollen goods have also increased in price. 14. I do not think so, and I never did.  
 15. Perhaps in the towns there may be some change, but in my locality I see no difference. The Canadians emigrate as in time past, and I see no one coming back.

16. Property attracts capital on account of the two good harvests we have had. The value of land has increased, but for the same reason according to my idea.
17. The condition of the farmers is almost the same. We have had a good harvest and the grain has brought more, but flour and almost everything we use is bought at a dearer price, and the workingman is still worse off, for they all pay more in order to live. I speak only of my own locality.
18. I cannot point out all the requisite changes, but open the market by a Treaty with the United States, in order that there may be a vent for our produce. Remove the duty from tobacco, and protect the farmer like the manufacturer.

JEAN BAPTISTE MYRE,

Farmer and Mayor, St. Louis de Gonzagues, Co. Beauharnois.

1. I have my doubts about it. 2. To increase the price as respects oats, barley and pease, which is in our favour. We do not cultivate rye, and but little maize, consequently we take no interest in them in the Province of Quebec.
3. I believe that the effect has been to increase their price. As the farmers in the Province raise no fall wheat and hardly enough spring wheat for our own use, it is more advantageous for us that the prices should be low.
4. I do not know. I believe that it has been favourable to us. 5. Yes.
6. More advantageous; the profits from the sale of horses are greater; there is a better market in the United States.
7. The farmer in this Province raises the grain necessary for fattening his cattle.
8. Yes. 9. Yes; so far as trade in general is concerned; but for farmers it is doubtful. We are in a better position to negotiate.
10. A good effect. 11. I do not know. 12. I believe that, generally speaking, we have better instruments, and they cost less than formerly.
13. I do not believe that it has increased their price. 14. Yes; by increasing prices, and bringing more money into the country, our pockets are filled with it since the new Tariff has come into force.
15. Yes. 16. Yes, to a great extent, because there is more money to be made out of it. 17. Yes, decidedly. 18. Since we are so well off, let us remain so.

*General Remarks:*—I have never closely studied these questions, and consequently I am not in a position to judge correctly of them.

LIGUORI L'ASSELIN DIT BELLEFLEUR,

Farmer and Mayor, St. Constant, Co. Laprairie.

1. No, I would not admit them. 2. Oats, maize, barley and pease ought to be admitted free of duty. 3. I have no answer to give.
4. Live hogs have doubled in price, and bacon and lard increased one-third.
5. In our Canadian markets the price of horses has increased one-third, and for other animals the increase has been one-half.
6. The raising of horses pays us well, but the raising of other stock pays us better.
7. Sufficient grain is raised for fattening our live stock.
8. Yes, it has much improved it. The increase is about two-thirds.
9. We are in a better position with the present Tariff; it is preferable.
10. Wool is worth 35 cents per lb. 11. The Tariff has an injurious effect upon the cultivation of tobacco. 12. No answer.
13. With respect to woollens, the price remains the same; in the case of hardware it is almost the same.
14. I think that the improvement which has taken place depends upon the protection afforded. 15. The present Tariff now affords encouragement throughout the country.

16. Landed property has increased in value one-fourth. I find this is due to Protection. 17. Their earnings have doubled.

18. I cannot approve of all the Tariff; I think it can be made better.

ISIDORE PILAU,  
St. Timothé, Co. Beauharnois.

1. No. 2. An increase in prices. 3. No effect. 4. Price of bacon increased.  
5. Yes. 6. The United States. 7. He can raise everything. 8. Yes.  
9. The existing Tariff ought to enable us to secure better terms. 10. No answer.  
11. All duties should be removed from Canadian tobacco. 12. No answer.  
13. Almost in the same condition.  
14. Agricultural produce has increased in price. 15. Yes.  
16. Farm property is more sought after, and has increased in value. 17. Yes.  
18. No answer.

ARSÈNE CHALIFOUR,  
Farmer, Grandines, Co. Portneuf.

1. No. 2. Oats, barley and pease have slightly increased in price.  
3. No effect produced on the price of flour. 4. Canadian pork has increased in price.  
5. Yes. 6. No answer. 7. Yes he can raise all the grain necessary to fatten his stock. 8. Yes. 9 and 10. No answer.  
11. Canadian tobacco ought to be placed on the free list. 12. No sensible change,—perhaps price slightly diminished. 13. No perceptible difference.  
14. It has produced a better market. 15. Yes. 16. The value of lands has increased.  
17. Yes. 18. No answer.

GEORGES DORÉ,  
Farmer, St. Ubalde, Co. Portneuf.

1 to 18. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—Inasmuch as my ordinary avocations are entirely removed from the subjects of the series of questions you put me respecting the Tariff, I am not in a position to answer them as one acquainted with the matter. Nevertheless, I can inform you that according to the reports, and the little I know, what has been done in 1878 with regard to the Tariff has been generally greatly approved of, with the exception of what concerns tobacco, which has caused a great outcry, as hampering a small industry which has been recently introduced among our farmers.

L. St. AMANT, N.P.  
St. Alban.

1. It would be for the interest of agriculturalists of this part of the country, that American wheat should be admitted free—because the production does not equal the consumption.
2. The imposition of this duty has had an excellent effect, by preventing competition with those grains and other cereals cultivated here.
3. Fall wheat is not sown here; spring wheat in but small quantities. We are, in consequence, obliged to import foreign wheat.
4. The price of these commodities has been increased, and the result has been an excellent one for our farmers.
5. It does not signify as to horses and other animals here, but it is important to retain the market of the North-West for our horses, by keeping up the duties.
6. Horses pay best at present, but when the raising of cattle is better understood, it will pay best. The United States is our best horse market.

7. Yes; more than enough. No need to import.
8. We are satisfied with the Tariff in this connection.
9. Yes; because without the Tariff we were at the mercy of the Americans, while to-day, although we should have greater advantages under Reciprocity, we can, so to speak, go ahead of them. 10. The price of wool keeps low.
11. To develop more and more the cultivation of tobacco and the sugar beet. Flax is not grown here. 12. The price of mowers, harvesters, hay rakes and threshers has lowered. Their quality is as good—even better. 13. The prices of all these articles have decreased. 14. As foreign goods no longer crowd our markets, the price received for our agricultural produce has much increased.
15. The working and industrial classes have greatly benefited through the Tariff. Emigration to the United States has slackened.
16. Abundance of capital having caused the rate of interest to go down, the value of lands has increased. 17. Yes; greatly improved. 18. No answer.

L. J. CARTIER,

St. Antoine, Co. Verchères.

1. It would be to the interest of Canadian agriculturalists only to admit free of duty those products to which we have nothing corresponding.
2. It has been the means of enabling the farmers to obtain for their oats, rye, barley and pease, higher prices on the market, and to increase in consequence their profits in the raising of these grains.
3. The imposition of such duties has enabled the farmers to obtain for their wheat a selling price, averaging 20 cents per bushel more than during preceding years, which has resulted in an increase in the extent of land employed in the cultivation of this grain. We only raise spring wheat here.
4. In 1878, pork sold at 5 cents per pound; in 1879, 6½ cents; in 1880, 7 cents; in 1881, 8½ cents. This increase in price is, I have no doubt in a great measure the result of increasing the duties on American pork, which is all to the advantage of our agricultural industry.
5. Several sales of horses were made this year for Manitoba; but this market is only opening for our neighbourhood, and this first result, is due to the imposition of such duties.
6. The raising of carriage horses is certainly profitable for us. As to the profits, they are only balanced by those we receive from the raising of milch cows. Up to this year our principal market has been the United States.
7. He can do so; and in fact the farmers do not buy American maize; a few of them did it, but only when this grain entered free of duty. 8. Yes.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty would be perhaps premature; the advantages we should derive would not counterbalance the drawbacks. In any case, we are now in a better position than formerly to negotiate such a Treaty.
10. As yet we are only producing the quantity of wool necessary for local consumption. 11. The cultivation of tobacco has increased, that of the two others does not appear to be affected.
12. The price of ploughs, rollers and seeders has not increased; that of mowers and harvesters has lessened. 13. No, if the quality is considered.
14. Yes; as it enables the farmer to obtain higher prices. 15. No, the current has set, and can only be checked by several years of a Protective Tariff, to allow agriculture to creep out of the slough into which it has been cast.
16. Not yet, but capitalists foresee in the near future a great increase in the value of lands. This will be the result of the existing Tariff.

17. The condition of the agricultural class does not seem to have appreciably improved. The farmers are not, as yet able to pay their debts, but they do not contract new ones. 18. Continue the present Tariff for some years longer.

J. D. SCHEMOUTH,  
Professor of Agriculture, Ste. Anne de la Pocatière,  
Co. Kamouraska.

1. No. 2. The effect has been to encourage greatly the farmers to sow a greater quantity of the various cereal grains mentioned, owing to the high prices they have obtained for them on the markets.  
3. The price of the various kinds of flour has increased. 4 to 6. No answer.  
7. He can raise profitably all the grain necessary to fatten his stock.  
8. Somewhat. 9 to 14. No answer. 15. Yes. 16. The value of land has increased.  
17. Slightly. 18. No answer.

JOSEPH PELLETIER,  
Farmer, St. Pamphile, Dionne, Co. L'Islet,

1. We ought to admit some of them, because of these we have not enough.  
2. The effect has been a considerable increase. For maize, 25 cents per bushel; oats, 15 cents; barley, 10 cents and peas 30 cents per bushel.  
3. The effect will be greatly to increase the price of these articles, and we wish them to be placed on the free list, because we cannot raise here the fall and spring wheats. 4. The effect has been good. 5. Yes, and greatly so.  
6. The raising of horses is profitable, but as to the profits made upon them they are not greater than the profits made upon other stock, and the most convenient market for us is the United States.  
7. We raise certain grains in sufficient quantities to fatten our stock, but as maize fails us it would be good to import it from the United States.  
8. It has much improved this market. 9. We do not desire a Reciprocity Treaty because our markets and our industries would suffer from it.  
10. It has been to increase its price upon the market. 11. We do not cultivate these articles, but nevertheless such a duty is of a nature to cause such cultivation to progress. 12. The increase is but little, but their quality is superior.  
13. There has been an increase in the price, but the quality of woollen, cotton and hardware goods is superior to that of the same articles in the United States.  
14. The Tariff which obliges the Americans to pay a duty upon all articles imported and placed on our markets, places us in the position of being able to sell our agricultural produce to great advantage and at a high price.  
15. Yes, the present Tariff has been favourable to our industrial classes, and the decrease in the emigration to the United States is remarkable.  
16. Certainly, and the value of lands (farms) has increased from 25 to 30 per cent., taking into account the high price at which our agricultural produce is sold in our markets.  
17. Most certainly yes; prosperity is being experienced by all.  
18. Looking at the answers we have just given, we leave to you the task of reducing or leaving as they are the duties now imposed.

*General Remarks:*—Although the present Tariff has had the effect of being very favourable to us, yet there are certain articles upon which the duties should be lessened, such as wheat, flour and maize. We have not enough of these products to suffice for our own needs, and at any rate if we could produce them, they would not be of a satisfactory quality, especially the wheat. My advice with respect to these articles, is to reduce the Tariff duties upon them, in order that we may procure them of a better quality, especially those coming from the United States.

PIERRE LEFEBVRE, J.P.,  
St. Philippe, Co. Laprairie.

1. I think that wheat and flour should be free, the other articles should be subject to a duty. 2. I think we have received no injury. Of oats, rye, maize, barley and pease, we raise all that is necessary.
3. I think that the duty upon wheat and flour, whether spring or fall, should be abolished, and the articles made free.
4. I think that these duties are as beneficial as can be desired.
5. The animals and horses which we have to sell have increased much in price.
6. The raising of horses pays well, but the raising of cows and sheep pays much better. Our chief market is in the United States.
7. It is more profitable to raise our own grain, and we raise all that is necessary for our needs. 8. Yes, much. 9. Yes, we are in a much better position.
10. A good effect. 11. Good. 12. No change. 13. I do not see that it has.
14. The Tariff as a whole has benefited agriculture, because we have more contentment. 15. Yes, much. 16. Yes, because the markets are better.
17. Yes, the whole are much improved in condition.
18. I think that if the Government would grant a subsidy to farmers, for the establishment of butter and cheese factories, it would be beneficial.

F. FILION,

Chatham, Co. Argensteuil.

1. I think not, for then the price of our produce will fall. 2. The effect has been excellent; all our grains sell better since the making of the new Tariff.
3. There has been a slight increase in price, which is beneficial for our farmers.
4. All our farmers now sell their meat at a higher figure; it is a great benefit for them. 5. Our Canadian horses have secured good prices, which are sustained.
6. I am unable to answer this question. 7. We can profitably do our own fattening with our own grains and vegetables.
8. There is no doubt on this point. All our articles are selling much better, with an increase of over one-third the former price.
9. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States is not desirable for us, seeing that the Americans desire it most keenly. 10. Our woollens are selling well.
11. The cultivation of tobacco has made great progress; it is beginning to be exported to New York and other places.
12. It is clear that prices have gone down. We can manufacture all we require.
13. All these various articles are as cheap as they were three or four years ago.
14. Our market is much better. There are certain American agents who scour our country parts to buy up our farm produce, and we make money.
15. Our industries have almost doubled. Unfortunately, our Canadians still take passage to the United States.
16. Assuredly much capital has been invested in farm property during the past four years, and the value of old lands is beginning to recover.
17. Yes, greatly so; and if this excellent system continues for some years to come, a great change will be seen in our beautiful Canada.
18. I am not capable of answering the first question.

*General Remarks* :—Agriculture will become, in a few years' time, a lucrative profession, owing to the advance made in butter and cheese factories. Farmers are leaving the old beaten track. During the past six years a gigantic stride has been taken in this direction, and within the next two years another step will have been taken. Cheese and butter factories are destined to lift the country out of the rut into which it had fallen. In all our parishes, vegetables are raised, which form a source of wealth. Ten years ago, Canada imported from \$300,000 to \$400,000 worth of cheese; at present we export from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 pounds of cheese, and an equal quantity of butter. In five years from this these figures will have doubled. The Government ought to make roads in order to open our new lands; they should not sell our lands to speculators; let them encourage tree planting in the poor lands

in the old counties where wood is scarce—then droughts would become rare. Especially let them encourage cheese and butter factories; this is the key to the easy circumstances and welfare of the agricultural classes, and consequently to the wealth of the country.

CHARLES TURGEON,  
Retired Schoolmaster, St. Isidore, Co. Dorchester.

1. No.
2. The imposition of a duty on maize has increased its cultivation in Canada, and has raised the price of oats, barley and maize.
3. I find no change.
4. Our farmers were brought to the point that they would not raise hogs; they relied upon the importation of hogs which were sold at a low figure, while to-day they find the profits are great to raise and fatten them, and it makes their grains sell dearer, and the people reap a great benefit from it.
5. Our Canadian horses are sold for the North-West and the United States since the new Tariff, and the prices have increased more than one-third.
6. I find that the raising of horses is profitable. Our principal market is Manitoba.
7. The farmer can easily raise all the grain necessary to fatten his stock.
8. Yes.
9. The farmer, with a Reciprocity Treaty, will not be able to sell his produce as well. Our produce is selling better since the new Tariff.
10. Nothing in this neighborhood.
11. Nothing in this vicinity.
12. The price has not increased, and the farming implements made in Canada are superior to those made in the United States.
13. I find no change in this locality.
14. The Tariff has increased the price for agricultural produce; that is because our neighbours are on the same footing as we are as to paying duty, Before the Tariff we paid, and they paid nothing to export their produce.
15. Since the Tariff day labourers have increased their wages from 25 to 30 per cent, and are constantly employed, while before the Tariff they only worked half time. Emigration is less active, and several families hereabouts have returned. I can speak accurately on this point, because I am ticket agent for the Vermont Central Railway.
16. Since 1878 property has increased from 30 to 40 per cent.
17. Yes.
18. None.

*General Remarks* :—In my opinion, and that of a great number of farmers, it is desirable that the new Tariff should still remain in force for several years; that is to say, for so long as matters go on well under the present system, for the farmers, since the Tariff, sell all their produce at a good price, such as grain, wood, horses, &c., and money is in abundance for all their general purposes, and farmers are able to improve their lands much better.

JOSEPH PAQUETTE,  
Flour and Grain Merchant, St. Madeleine, Co. St. Hyacinthe.

1. I do not think so; it would injure our farmers.
2. It has had the effect of increasing the price of the grains mentioned.
3. The duty imposed upon American flour, in my opinion, has not increased the price, wheat coming duty free to our mills, and it favours those who are in want of work and a few manufacturers.
4. This gives our farmers the advantage of selling at a higher price, and the means of raising stock in greater numbers, and in this way giving them the advantage of cultivating largely by means of the abundance of manure.
5. I believe so, for since the new Tariff, horses and other animals are being sold profitably.

6. I consider that there is not a great difference in the profit, between raising horses and other stock, inasmuch as horses cost more to bring them to a saleable age than do horned cattle and other stock. The risks are greater in raising horses. These animals are generally sold here.
7. We raise enough, seeing that every year we export some.
8. I think so, for these articles are sold at a profit.
9. It might be that we would make a profit on some articles, but generally speaking we would be injured:—First, as respects our manufactories; secondly, with respect to Canadian emigration, to which there is always an unfortunate tendency in the direction of the United States.
10. I think that prices are somewhat less high, but as our manufactories use up our wool, we pay less for our tweeds, flannel, &c., than before the new Tariff. We are well repaid for the difference.
11. There is in fact no flax raised here; tobacco is much more cultivated.
12. The prices are almost the same; our farm implements are made here; their quality is excellent.
13. I see no difference in the price; only the quality of these articles is better.
14. Yes; because that prevents American competition on our markets, and by the increase of our factories employing many workmen, which produces a much greater increase in the consumption than before the new Tariff.
15. No doubt.
16. The value of landed property has increased and attracts capital. I think that this increase is owing to the present Tariff, because it protects the farmer and workman, and commands the confidence of capitalists.
17. Yes; greatly so.
18. Give the farmer all possible protection.

M. SENECAI,

St. Charles, Richelieu, Co. St. Hyacinthe.

1. Things are better under the present Tariff, because produce is sold more easily.
2. Oats sell dearer for some years past, as do pease and oats ground together.
3. Wheat sells as usual this year, flour is dearer.
4. Live pigs are selling dearer than for some three years past, the farmers are selling them in greater quantities and with profit.
- 5 and 6. Horses are selling dear this year, especially those which are sold in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The farmers can raise these animals with profit to themselves. Several Americans have come into our country parts in order to buy them, they pay from \$100 to \$125.
7. The farmers can raise all the grain necessary for fattening their stock, without buying American maize.
8. In our section butter is selling well, because a great quantity is consumed in Fraserville.
9. I think that the Government would do well to keep the same Tariff for the benefit of the farmers.
10. I cannot say, because we have no market for this article.
11. A great quantity of tobacco is raised; you have done well in abolishing the Excise duty on Canadian tobacco.
12. The price of farming implements has lowered, their quality is as good as ever. Ploughs, harvesters, &c.
13. Woollens and cottons do not seem to have increased, because we have no factories within the limits of Lower Canada.
14. The Tariff has increased and improved the market for agricultural produce. Hay is selling dearer, potatoes and all animals of improved breed.
15. The existing Tariff has given employment to our working classes, I mean in my own county, but it has not put a stop to emigration to the United States.
16. For some years past the value of real property has been increasing; but what the farmers are in want of are day labourers, one must pay dear for them and, in fact, cannot get them.
17. For the past three years the farmers are doing well, money is more plentiful and the rate of interest is lower.

18. Several changes are still required in the law, but that will come in time. The emigration to the United States should be stopped. The authorities should be more severe as to the sale of liquors. Woollen and cheese factories should be protected. The Government ought to fix the rate of interest at 6 per cent., which would give great encouragement to the farmers. Let the penalties be severe, because lenders always find means to lend at 8 and even 10 per cent. The Parish Councils should be abolished and only the County Councils retained. This should be arranged with the Local Governments.

NOEL CHOUNARD,

Farmer, St. Modeste, Co. Temiscouata.

1. Do not believe that it is in the interests of farmers to admit free of duty all kinds of agricultural produce.
2. The effects of the imposition of a duty upon maize and other American cereal grasses has been to raise the price of these same cereals in that part of the country I live in, particularly of oats, maize, barley and oats.
3. This part of the country where I reside does not raise a quantity of wheat sufficient for consumption. The imposition of a duty upon American wheat has had the effect of making us pay more dearly for flour.
4. We have sold living pigs and pork at a dearer rate since the increase of duties on these articles. 5. I believe that they sell a few horses here for Manitoba and the North-West Territories.
6. I cannot say whether it is profitable to raise horses, and I do not know exactly the profits as compared with those realized on other animals. Our chief market is, I believe, in the United States.
7. I believe that the Canadian farmer can raise all the grain necessary for fattening his stock. I think it better to retain the duty upon American maize.
8. Yes. 9. I am not prepared to answer this question, but we are in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States than we were when American produce was admitted free. 10. The woollen trade is not of much magnitude here, it is only a local business of not much importance.
11. Little cultivation of flax, tobacco and the sugar beet.
12. The price of farming implements has diminished owing to the Tariff, and their quality seems to me to be just as good.
13. The Tariff has not increased the price of woollens, cottons and articles of hardware in common use among the farmers.
14. Yes, by causing agricultural produce to sell for a higher price. 15. No answer.
16. The value of lands has perceptibly increased in our neighbourhood.
17. Yes. 18. To retain the National Policy and the Protective Tariff.

H. MIGNAULT, M.D.,

St. Denis, Richelieu, Co. St. Hyacinthe.

1. No, because that would prevent the disposal of our produce.
2. I believe that the effect of the imposition of a duty upon maize and the other cereals is very advantageous to us.
3. I think that it would be a good thing to admit wheat free of duty when coming from the United States—but I would impose a duty upon flour.
4. Very excellent effect. 5. We find ourselves in a very good position, for these animals sell well.
6. It is profitable to raise horses, and our principal market is in the United States.
7. In this part of the country we raise enough to fatten our stock. 8. We find a great improvement. 9. We would be the better for it, and the country is in a better position to negotiate with the United States. 10. A good effect.

11. We believe the effect to be a good one.
12. I do not think that the price has increased from the effects of the Tariff, and the quality is good, especially mowing machines, harvesters and rakes.
13. We are paying dearer for these articles than in 1878.
14. Yes; and in the most profitable manner, for everything sells well and is easy to dispose of. 15. I am persuaded that it has done so.
16. Yes; landed property is attracting capital and the value has greatly increased.
17. Yes; much. 18. I see little change to be made. There is entire satisfaction.

N. SYLVESTRE,

Major in the Militia, St. Barnabé, Co. St. Hyacinthe.

1. No, except raw cotton. 2. The increase in price of all the cereals, to the advantage of the Canadian farmer.
3. An increase in the price of wheat and flour. 4. A good effect. 5. Yes.
6. It is profitable to raise horses, and the profits are the same as upon other animals. The principal market is the United States.
7. Yes; there is no necessity for importing any grain for fattening stock. 8. Yes.
9. No, on the contrary, a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would be very disastrous for us, although we should be in a better position with the existing Tariff, than we were when American produce was admitted free.
10. No answer. 11. The Tariff would have a good effect upon flax, if we had a ready mode of dressing it.
12. The price has diminished, and the quality of the articles is as good as ever.
13. Lessened the price. 14. The market has improved, thanks to Protection, which excludes foreign products, and gives us consumers. 15. Yes.
16. Landed property is attracting capital, and the value of lands has increased 33 per cent. 17. Yes; much improved.
18. To diffuse the knowledge of agriculture among the people, to stimulate its taste for agriculture by every possible means, to encourage agricultural societies, which in general contribute much to the improvement of the breeds of animals, &c., &c. Cheese factories ought to be encouraged. There certainly remains much to be done in favour of agriculture, but the first and greatest step has been taken—with Protection the remainder will come of itself.

CALIXTE BOURK,

Farmer, St. Pie de Guire, Co. Yamaska.

1. It would be to our own interest to admit wheat and flour free of duty. We raise no wheat here.
2. The result of the imposition of a duty has been that oats are selling 20 cents better than under the old Tariff. No effect upon other cereals.
3. We are paying \$6 and \$7 per barrel for flour, instead of \$4 or \$5, which we paid previously.
4. The imposition of this duty has left us the monopoly in the market as respects these articles. The increase in the price realized varies from 25 to 40 per cent.
5. The present Tariff has improved our condition. It would, however, be desirable that the duties upon horned cattle should be still further increased.
6. The raising of horses gives reasonable profits. Our principal market is Manitoba.
7. We can raise all the grain necessary for fattening our stock. I think, however, that it would be advantageous to import maize, if the Tariff favoured us in this respect.
8. No improvement in those products has been perceptible in our markets. It may perhaps be otherwise when dairies are established.

9. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would be to our advantage in a few years. For the present, the Protective Tariff serves our interests better, in that it allows us to improve the quality of our produce, so as to be able to sustain competition with American farmers later on.
10. We can now raise sheep more profitably. 11. The duties on tobacco injure the producer without benefiting the consumer.
12. The price of farming implements has decreased slightly, and their quality is better. 13. Woollen and cotton goods have lessened in price.
14. The market has greatly improved, especially in meat and grain.
15. As capital is wanting in this locality, no effect has been perceived in the way of encouraging the working classes; however, a continuation of the present Tariff will perhaps cause us to witness this effect at a later period.
16. Farm property is lessening somewhat in value, owing to the current of emigration towards the Western States, Manitoba and the North-West.
17. The farming class has improved in condition more than has the working class.
18. I am of opinion that an agricultural university, maintained by the Dominion Parliament at its own cost, and under the control of a council chosen from among the farmers of all the Provinces of the Dominion, would do much to improve the profession. The root of the mischief is that moral and intellectual order is weakened. The taste for extravagance, intemperance, the despising of manual labour, and the craze for official employment, are so many evils, which the law is, so to speak, powerless to repress. Education is the only thing I see capable of causing a reaction of feeling, provided this education is aided by religion.

E. A. ROY,  
Farmer, Co. Bellechasse.

1. No, because there is a sufficiency of agricultural produce for Canada and for her needs, and much more.
2. I cannot state the effect of the imposition of a duty upon the article mentioned, in that part of the country wherein I reside; but so much I can say, that we have a great quantity of barley, pease and oats and other grains, much more than the country requires; but I cannot specify as to the grains separately.
3. I cannot state the effect upon these articles produced by the duties imposed upon them. But I cannot say that flour and wheat is selling very dear. I cannot state positively what the cause may be, but I believe it is the scarcity in other countries. I do not know the difference between spring and fall wheat.
4. The effect of the increase of duties on these articles I do not know, but I am fully aware that they are selling well.
5. I cannot say why horses and other living animals sell well—whether it is owing to the increase of duties, and to the monopoly of the market; but I can say that animals are selling well.
6. Yes, I find it profitable to raise horses at the price they are now selling, and compared with other animals, the profits on horses are greater. As for the principal market, I do not know where it is, but we always sell them to the United States.
7. The Canadian farmer raises profitably all the grain necessary to fatten his stock, and much more, without having recourse to any foreign country.
8. I do not know whether it is the existing Tariff which has improved the market, but things are selling well.
9. I know perfectly that we did well under the Reciprocity Treaty that we formerly had with the United States, but I do not know whether it would have the same effect at the present time. I cannot also tell whether the present condition of the country is more favourable for negotiating such a Treaty with the said United States than when American produce was admitted free.

10. I do not know the effect of the Tariff upon wool, but it sells cheaply; I do not know the reason.
11. A duty upon tobacco raised by Canadian farmers would not produce a good effect. There ought not to be any duty upon tobacco grown in the country, in order to encourage Canadians to cultivate tobacco, which would be a source of wealth to the said farmers. Further, I believe that if there was a high duty upon tobacco coming from foreign countries, it would cause our tobacco to sell at a much dearer rate.
12. The price of farming implements, in my opinion, has neither increased nor diminished, but remains as before; and their quality appears to be as good as it was in 1878. I do not know whether it is owing to the Tariff that the prices have remained the same.
13. I cannot say whether the Tariff has increased or diminished the price of woollens, cottons and articles of hardware in common use among farmers, but I can state that these articles are selling for about the same that they formerly sold for.
14. I believe that the Tariff has had the effect of increasing and improving, as a whole, the market of the country for agricultural purposes. I cannot tell in what way, but things are going well.
15. Yes; I believe that the present Tariff has had the effect of giving employment and encouragement to our various industries; has diminished emigration to the United States, and has encouraged Canadians to return to the country.
16. Yes; I think farm property is attracting capital in a greater degree; but I cannot say positively that it is owing to the present Tariff. But I can say that the value of property has increased, in various places, one-third more than it was worth previously, because money is more plentiful and interest much lower.
17. Yes, greatly; and I wish it always to continue so.
18. The changes necessary to be made in the law, in order to make agriculture a more desirable and more lucrative occupation, would be, in my opinion, that the principal roads should be macadamized at the expense of the Government, in order that we might travel and cart at all seasons, carry our agricultural produce to the markets with profit, and transact all business that the needs of the farmer require. As the roads are left now, especially during the autumn and spring, they are impassable, and in consequence we cannot take advantage of the good markets which are held during those seasons. It is almost always during these seasons that goods sell better; and it is always at these times that the farmer needs most. If the Government would be good enough to do what was right regarding this request, we would be very grateful.

MOISE LONGTIN,

Ex-Mayor, St. Constant, Co. Laprairie.

1. No. 2. The effect has been to increase the price, and consequently render the cultivation of them more profitable.
3. The effect has been to cause it to be cultivated at greater profit.
4. To increase their value, and to enable them to be raised by Canadian stock raisers. 5. Yes, greatly so.
6. Yes, in proportion to the size of the farm. The profits are difficult to estimate the prices vary. Manitoba offers a more profitable future.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain necessary for fattening his stock. 8. No. 9. Not at the present time. 10. No answer. 11. The Tariff has had a good effect upon tobacco, and the sugar beet.
12. The price has increased, and as the result of competition these implements have gone back to their former price. 13. Not to my knowledge. 14. Exceedingly, because these articles have risen in price in proportion to their cost to the farmers.

15. Yes. 16. Greatly. Much increased. 17. Yes.  
 18. The Dominion Government ought to take, in a most particular manner, agriculture under its protection, and grant bonuses to farms and country industries. A commissioner should be appointed to take charge of this important branch, on which the well-being of society as a whole depends.

ANTOINE CASAVANT, M.P.P.,  
 Farmer, St. Dominique, Co. Bagot.

1. No, it is not in the interests of the agriculturalists of Canada. For Canada produces sufficient produce for her own use.  
 2. The effect of the duty imposed has been a great increase in the price of oats. Rye is not cultivated to any great extent. The duties on maize have had the effect of raising the price of pease in Canada.  
 3. The increase of duties on flour has had the effect of causing more grain to be sown in Canada, and the farmers to be well paid.  
 4. It has had the effect of increasing the price on our markets for live pigs.  
 5. Yes, greatly. 6. In general the raising of animals is very profitable here, and the principal market is at Montreal for the United States.  
 7. Yes, it is not necessary to import any grain.  
 8. Yes, generally speaking these various articles have all increased in price.  
 9. We are in a better position now under the present Tariff.  
 10. It has had no increasing effect on our stuffs. 11. For tobacco it has the effect of causing it to be cultivated in greater quantities, and in a very profitable manner, as for flax and the sugar beet it has produced no effect here.  
 12. The present Tariff has had the effect of decreasing the price of all farming implements. 13. The price of woollen goods remains the same; cottons and hardware have lessened in price in this neighbourhood.  
 14. Yes, under the present Tariff there is a great increase in the price of articles offered on the markets.  
 15. Yes; as also great encouragement for the working classes, and this has had the effect of bringing back to the country several Canadian families.  
 16. Yes, capital is much easier, and property has increased 25 per cent., and the price of produce has increased very much.  
 17. Yes, greatly improved. 18. It is desirable that agriculture should be protected, as well as agricultural societies; and that one measure of capacity should be used in the sale of our grains.

JOSEPH PARÉ,  
 Farmer and Mayor, St. Hubert, Co. Chambly.

1. Canada is in a position at the present time to manufacture all the agricultural implements in use in the country, agriculturalists can procure these instruments at prices comparatively low, consequently none of those instruments ought to be admitted free of duty.  
 2. Pease, barley and oats are selling at prices much higher than under the Mackenzie Government, and I do not hesitate to attribute this result to the present Tariff. Rye is not raised here. As to maize, the imposition of a duty cannot cause any disagreeable inconveniences, now that the farmer can raise all the maize which he can require.  
 3. Although flour has risen since the imposition of a duty, the consequences are not disastrous, since among farmers it is the exception to buy flour.  
 4. The effect of an increase in duty on live hogs, &c., has only produced good results among the farmers; pigs are selling dearer; it is a source of revenue for them, since all without exception raise pigs, either for their own consumption or for the purposes of trade.

5. The increase in the duty on horses especially has much improved the price. As to the monopoly I am not prepared to say that in this part of the Province the Canadian shares in it.
6. There appears to be a greater advantage in raising horses for trade here than other animals. When the breeds of the latter are improved, the advantages to be derived from their sale cannot fail to be as great. The market for horses is in the United States; we do not yet know of the Manitoba market.
7. The Canadian farmer can raise to advantage all the grain necessary for fattening his stock. I do not see any advantage for him to import American maize; our farmers have never bought American maize to fatten their cattle.
8. Yes. 9. We do not require a Reciprocity Treaty since our farmers are able to get on with Canadian produce. *Vide* General Remarks.
10. The imposition of a duty upon wrought woollens, and the admission free of unwrought have had the effect of developing our manufactories. As to the prices paid by the farmer it is perfectly well known that he pays less dearly under the present Tariff than under the old one.
11. The cultivation of flax here is confined to that required for individual consumption and not for purposes of commerce. The sugar beet is not cultivated, it has never been so. As to the cultivation of tobacco the legislation adopted during the present Session respecting this plant will have good results.
12. The farming implements bought from the factories here are ploughs, mowers, harvesters, &c., &c. These implements have much lessened in price since 1878.
13. The price of woollens, cottons and articles of hardware in use here has diminished.
14. The Tariff has assisted in improving the markets of the country for agricultural produce by preventing foreign produce from glutting our market.
15. It would seem ridiculous to maintain that the Tariff has not assisted in giving employment to the various working classes. Emigration is no longer felt here. As to the Canadians who have sought refuge in the United States it is only a few exceptional persons who return. Those who have left us have sold off everything and no longer have any home here, hence the indifference about returning to their native country.
16. The amount of capital now circulated throughout the country is an undisputed fact, which is owing to the present Tariff, from the confidence reposed in our Government. As to the value of land property, it has increased from 12 to 15 per cent. since the adoption of the present Tariff.
17. The general condition of the farmers and of the working classes has much improved since 1878. That is to say, at the present time they are prosperous.
18. I do not know of any change to make in order to render agriculture a more desirable and more lucrative occupation than at the present time at least.

*General Remarks*:—I would remark on the 9th question. I ought to add, that although the agricultural class in particular has no need of a Reciprocity Treaty, yet, if such a Treaty came into force, the circumstances, like the present state of affairs, are much preferable to those that prevailed under the Mackenzie Tariff.

ODILON HEBERT,

Merchant, St. Charles, Richelieu, Co. St. Hyacinthe.

1. By no means. 2. An increase in price. 3. An increase of 20 to 25 per cent.
4. A considerable increase. 5. Greatly improved the price. 6. Yes, but in a limited quantity. The principal market is in the United States.
7. Yes; the importation of American grain is not profitable. 8. Yes, greatly so.
9. No; however, we are in a better position for negotiating. 10. I am ignorant of it.
11. A bad effect, so far as regards tobacco. 12 and 13. No answers.
14. Yes, by increasing the prices, and the production. 15. Yes, to a great extent.
16. Yes, by encouraging a more careful mode of cultivation. 17. Yes. 18. I know nothing on this point.

J. VARIN,

Mayor, St. Theodore de Chertsey, Co. Montcalm.

1. It would be to the advantage of the agriculturalists of Canada to admit free of duty the raw products, which would serve to supply our factories.
2. There ought to be no duty on maize. 3. The price of wheat and flour has advanced; but, on the other hand, this will perhaps have the effect of compelling farmers to cultivate wheat.
4. Prices have increased, and consequently the production of pork in the country has been encouraged. 5. Yes. 6. It is more profitable to raise other animals than horses.
7. With the exception of maize, the farmer in Canada can raise profitably all the grain necessary for fattening his stock. 8. Yes. 9. A better position.
10. It has increased the price of wool. 11. No answer. 12. The price has diminished, the quality is as good as ever. 13. No answer. 14. Yes.
15. Yes, but emigration at the present time goes on at the expense of agriculture, and not of the manufacturers, who have hands enough.
16. The value of lands has increased. 17. Yes. 18. Protect the farmers as much as possible.

ANTOINE NADEAU,  
President, Dorchester Agricultural Society,  
St. Isidore, Co. Dorchester.

1. The answers to the following questions will show that it is not in the interest of the agriculturalists of Canada to admit free of duty American agricultural produce of any kind whatsoever. The correctness of this view of the case is more manifest when the fact that we hope to receive ere long the produce of Manitoba, the North-West, and the Lake St. John country is taken into account.
2. The effect of the imposition of this duty is nothing here this year, for the good reason that there is no importation of these cereals. We only know for certain that our own cereals have obtained remunerative prices and quite sufficient to enrich our farmers.
3. From information derived from reliable sources, the effect produced upon the price of wheat and flour coming from the United States, is not caused by the Tariff—but from a good or a bad harvest. Besides, the wheat raised here sells dearer than that from the West, because it is of a better quality.
4. No living hogs are imported here. The increase of duties upon hams, &c., has not appreciably affected the average prices of these articles on our market.
5. We cannot say if the increase arises from an increase of duties on horses and other living animals, or from the great demand there is for them; these prices are very high. From this place the export consists only of horses and sheep, and to the United States much more than to other places.
6. In this part of the country it is very profitable to raise horses, provided it is not done exclusively. Our horses are much sought after and paid for in proportion to the demand. The principal market is in the United States at present, as before stated.
7. The Canadian farmer living in the rich and vast plain watered by the Chambly, Yamaska, and St. Francis rivers can profitably raise all the grain necessary for fattening his cattle, and when he ploughs up his meadows, he will have for sale not only these grains, but even wheat in abundance. At the present moment our farmers have still on hand thousands of bushels of grain in spite of the large exportation during the year. It would be suicidal to attempt the importation of maize.
8. All the articles enumerated under this head sell at very high prices. This is more owing to the great demand in foreign quarters than to the Tariff.
9. In my humble opinion, the Canadian farmer is very well off as he is, and has no need for a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. If through the force of circumstances this Treaty must be negotiated, our position would be much

better than when American produce was admitted free of duty, but we are not yet prepared to enter into a contest with them. Their industries are of larger extent and more developed than ours; their population, their stored up riches, would soon render us subject to them.

10. Up to the present time the Tariff has produced no sensible effect upon the price of wool at St. Hyacinthe.
11. Here the Tariff has in no wise affected the cultivation of flax and the sugar beet. It has given a great forward movement to the cultivation of tobacco.
12. No sensible change in prices. The implements are multiplying, varying and improving in accord with the novel forms of cultivation which are being introduced into the country.
13. From the evidence of woollen manufacturers and merchants the Tariff has not increased the price of these articles.
14. The market has so improved that several articles especially, dairy produce, can hardly meet the demand, the quantity exported is so great.
15. It is easy to reply in the affirmative to this question. In our city and its neighbourhood, new factories are opening alongside the old ones, and all working together cannot fill the orders. Workmen are scarce in spite of the increase of wages. Few Canadians are going to the United States, many are returning.
16. Landed property, in this section is attracting so much capital, that its value has increased at least one-third; and notwithstanding this, many transactions in property have taken place within the past few months. Land is the safest investment. It is also that which gives the largest return at the present time.
17. It is reckoned that since 1878 the condition of farmers and workmen has improved from 30 to 40 per cent.
18. We do not know of any changes to make in the law to make agriculture a more desirable and more lucrative occupation. Honour the farmer as he deserves, and his noble occupation will become more and more desirable, and he will learn how to make it more and more lucrative.

*General Remarks* :—The era of agricultural prosperity commenced some years past will increase if, along with moral influence, the Legislature continues to promote the opening of new outlets for our produce. It seems also a case of urgency to combat certain theoretical ideas tending to the increase of the land tax. The cosmopolitan financiers, the money dealers of every kind wish to withdraw their operations and their profits from all burdens, as if they did not furnish the greater part of the occupation of legislators and Governments. They forget the soil is already burdened with municipal and school taxes, registrations, and partitions. Care should be taken not to discourage the peasant, as in France.

J. B. CHARTIER, Ptre.,  
St. Hyacinthe, Co. St. Hyacinthe.

1. No.
2. In our part of the country the effects of the Tariff have been almost nothing as to rye, maize and barley; but pease are sold slightly dearer, and especially oats.
3. The effect of the Tariff on these articles is to increase their price 10 per cent.
4. The price of perk in general has increased about 20 per cent.
5. Yes.
6. It is not more profitable to raise horses than other animals. Our principal market for horses is in the United States.
7. Yes, without its being necessary to import American maize.
8. The Tariff has produced no effect on these articles.
9. No.
10. No effect whatever.
11. No effect, except on tobacco which is now selling dearer.
- 12 and 13. No answer.
14. Yes, by preventing the competition of foreign produce.
15. Yes.
16. Yes, and the value of land is increasing greatly here, especially by reason of advantages given by railways.
17. Yes, considerably.
18. No answer.

F. ADELME COTÉ,  
Farmer and Mayor, St. Barthélemi, Co. Berthier.

1. No. 2. In our part of the country the effect of the Tariff has been almost null as respects rye, maize and barley; but pease are sold somewhat dearer, and oats more particularly so.
3. The effect of the Tariff on these articles has been to increase their price 10 per cent. 4. In general the price of pork has increased about 20 per cent.
5. Yes. 6. It is not more profitable to raise horses than other animals, and our chief market for horses is in the United States.  
Yes, without its being necessary to import American maize. 8. The Tariff has produced no effect upon these articles. 9. No. 10. No effect.
11. No effect, except perhaps on tobacco, which is now selling dearer.
- 12 and 13. No answer. 14. Yes, by hindering the competition from foreign produce. 15. Yes.
16. Yes, and the value of land has greatly increased here, on account especially of the advantages given by our railways, 17. Yes, considerably. 18. No answer.

NOÉ DUMONTIER,  
Farmer, St. Barthélemy, Co. Berthier.

1. I do not find that it would be in the interest of Canadian farmers to admit free of duty all kinds of American agricultural produce.
2. The imposition of a duty upon maize especially forces our farmers to cultivate produce for fattening purposes. This duty is right enough so far as pease are concerned, but as for oats, I believe that in removing the duty our farmers would reap much more profit from the price they will get from the Americans.
3. In view of our Canadian granary (the North-West), when the Canadian Pacific is completed, we shall be able to place a heavier duty upon wheat and flour; but meantime we should lessen the duty on wheat to encourage the flour mills. There is no difference in our case between spring and fall wheat.
4. One cannot desire a better effect from the increase of duties upon living hogs, hams, pork and lard, than the average price of these articles upon our Canadian market.
5. The increase of duties upon horses and other living animals has much improved prices, and I believe that we have the monopoly of the market throughout the country, though I cannot say as to Manitoba and the North-West Territories.
6. It is profitable to raise horses, but I cannot venture to compare the profits with those on other animals.
7. Our Canadian farmers can raise to advantage all the grain necessary for fattening their cattle, and in my opinion it would not be profitable to import American maize. 8. The present Tariff has greatly improved the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter.
9. I do not see how a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States could benefit us now; but we are, I think, in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty under the present Tariff than we were when American produce was admitted free or under a low duty.
10. The effect of the Tariff upon wool is good, keeping the price always firm.
11. For tobacco the new Tariff is good, as well as for flax and the sugar beet. The culture of flax is neglected because there is no price for the seed. And as for the sugar beet, the price is not high enough and the growing of it a new thing.
12. The price of farming implements has not increased but diminished, owing to the Tariff, and the quality is much superior, and this applies to all implements.
13. The Tariff has lowered the price of woollens and cottons, but as for articles of hardware, I believe that it has increased it somewhat without being able to say to what point it has been increased.

14. Our agricultural market has increased and has much improved from the effect of the present Tariff, chiefly owing to the new factories established since this Tariff.
15. The present Tariff has given much more employment and other encouragements to our various classes of workmen, but in my opinion has not greatly checked emigration to the United States, nor encouraged Canadians to return to their country. It is to be remarked that those who go there, emigrate without understanding and without wishing to understand, for if they worked here as they work there, they would be better off.
16. Landed farming property attracts much more capital under the rule of the present Tariff, and the value of lands has increased since 1878. The reason is that our farmers have much money, which they can only place at a small interest, and in the easy circumstances they are, they purchase farming property at an increase of one-half at highest and one-third for the average. They prefer such purchases to leaving their money doing nothing. From the revenue of the land they get their interest and have always the property as capital.
17. The condition of farmers and the working classes in general is improved since 1878 by one-half.
18. Pressing changes in the law, as regards the Province of Quebec, would be a stringent law compelling the farmer to sow grain to manure the lands and for the welfare of our animals. Gypsum is likewise necessary, for in the places where it is used, the farmers find themselves well repaid in the heavy and somewhat barren lands. A model farm for each county would be of great utility, from the example given and from the instructions afforded our farmers, causing them to abandon the routine of cropping adopted for the most part. I submit that oats without a duty will return a larger price. I offer this idea in the interest of agriculture, but if however, it is found that the grain does not return a higher price, I am in hopes that after the work you have undertaken and the knowledge you possess, what you do on behalf of this grain and everything in general for our farmers, will be to their advantage. As for the emigration of our Canadians to the United States, it is a deplorable affliction; even this spring, in spite of the prosperity here, I think, somewhat more than ordinary are going. Returning at the end of one or two years, they can no longer work on their lands, they are half dead, and notwithstanding, they go there again, and sometimes in order to die there. We require still many more factories to keep them here.

J. O. B. LAFREINÈRE,  
Miller, St. Cuthbert, Co. Berthier.

1. I do not consider that it would be in the interest of Canadian agriculturalists to admit free all kinds of American produce.
2. The imposition of a duty, more especially upon maize, forces our farmers to cultivate it for fattening purposes. This duty is also good so far as pease are concerned; but as for oats, I think that by removing this duty our farmers would reap much more profit.
3. In view of our Canadian granary (the North-West) on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we will be able to put more duty upon wheat and flour; but now, in this locality, we ought to lessen the duty on wheat, for the encouragement of flour mills. There is no difference, so far as we are concerned, between spring and fall wheat.
4. One could not desire a better effect than these duties have produced upon live hogs, ham, pork and lard, in their average prices on our Canadian markets.
5. Yes, and we believe we have the monopoly of the market in this country, without, however, reckoning Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

6. We consider that it is profitable to raise horses. As far as profits go, we think that horned cattle are in nowise inferior. Our principal market is the United States, although this year a great number were sold to be sent to Manitoba.
7. The farmer can raise to advantage the grain required for fattening his cattle.
8. The present Tariff has much improved the market. 9. A Reciprocity Treaty with the United States would not now be profitable for us. We are, however, in a better position to negotiate such a Treaty under the present Tariff than we were when American produce was admitted free, or with only a slight duty imposed.
10. The price of wool always remains firm. 11. As for tobacco the new Tariff acts well; as for flax it is not much grown, and the sugar beet is new and the price is not sufficiently high.
12. The prices have diminished owing to the present Tariff; the quality is better, and this applies to all the implements.
13. Woollens and cottons have diminished, but articles of hardware are increased, though I cannot say to what extent.
14. Yes, by the establishment of new factories since this Tariff.
15. Employment for our various classes of workmen has greatly increased, but emigration to the United States has not been checked.
16. Farming property has much increased in value since 1878, because under the present Tariff we can easily dispose of our produce and that at reasonably high prices. 17. Their condition has greatly improved since 1878.
18. A model farm for each county would be very useful to give new information to our farmers and encourage them to get out of their old groove and follow the new and progressive method adopted by our more skilful farmers year by year.

*General Remarks:*—We think that the greatest evil which exists amongst us is the emigration, and that the Government can never do too much to prevent our countrymen from becoming the slaves of a foreign people, while there still remains good land to clear not too far from our great centres. I trust you will take these few remarks into consideration.

PROSPÈRE ALLARD, Jun.,  
Farmer, St. Cuthbert, Co. Berthier.

1. No. Nevertheless, by admitting wheat free of duty, we cannot but benefit by it, seeing that here we do not raise enough for consumption.
2. The imposition of a duty upon American cereals cannot but be favourable for us. There is here a remarkable superabundance of pease, barley and oats. There is sufficient of maize. We do not cultivate rye.
3. Not cultivating in this part of the country wheat in quantities sufficient for the consumption, we should necessarily pay less dear for wheat and flour if these two articles were admitted free of duty. We do not raise autumn wheat.
4. We cannot but congratulate ourselves upon the effect of the Tariff upon these articles. We sold pork in 1878-79, for \$4 and \$5 per 100 pounds; last year we sold it at from \$8 to \$9; this year we sold it at from \$9 to \$10.
5. The duties upon horses and other live stock cannot but be beneficial for us. We raise numbers of them. As to horses we think there is nothing to dread. The Americans cannot supply their own wants.
6. Here one must raise both. The two yield good profit. Our principal market has been the United States; at present we have them both.
7. In this part of the country we have even a surplus.
8. As for these articles, I think we should be well off if exchange was free. We export enormous quantities of them. We are, however, satisfied with the prices obtained during the past two or three years.
9. As for us farmers, I think we would find ourselves well off under a Reciprocity Treaty, seeing that all the produce we have to sell is in great request in the American markets.

10. For several years past the prices have remained the same—from 30 to 35 cents per lb. I do not know whether the Tariff has effected any change. We are satisfied that it (wool) should be entered free of duty. 11. No effect here.
12. The price has not increased. The quality is the same. We have always made use of implements of Canadian manufacture.
13. The merchants round me reply that the Tariff has in no wise affected the prices of these various articles. Perhaps it does cotton momentarily.
14. Yes, inasmuch as our markets are so crowded with American produce. Among other things meats, which form for the Canadian farmers a great source of revenue. This article is not perhaps sufficiently protected. 15. Yes, yes, yes.
16. Farming property has increased at least 20 per cent. since 1878. It has so increased for the reason that money has become more common. This is what gives value to property. The high prices which we obtain for our farm produce, which respond to the abundance of money, are also a consequence of the high prices of property.
17. The man who will assert that the condition of farmers has not improved since 1878, will deny that there is light during the day time.
18. One certain means of making agriculture a more lucrative occupation, would be to negotiate a Treaty, so as to allow the Canadian farmer to cross the line of 45 with the following articles without paying duty, to wit: Horses, butter, poultry, eggs, vegetables, pease, barley and oats, and to impose a still higher duty on American pork. To admit free American wheat would be also to give us Protection, the Province of Quebec being essentially agricultural. One thing displeases greatly the people here, and they pointedly remark upon it. It is the duty on tobacco. The late changes do not favour us at all, inasmuch as we always sell rolled tobacco for immediate consumption. It would be a much more popular policy to allow tobacco to be sold freely.

B. BEAUCHAMP,

Secretary-Treasurer of the Agricultural Society,  
St. Hermas, Co. Two Mountains.

1 to 18. No answers.

*General Remarks* :—I have heard murmurings only against the present duty on tobacco. This duty injures the cultivation of this plant. The present system, respecting the duty on tobacco, is a very vicious one. This is the only complaint that is made, and it has a foundation of justice. It is evident that the Protective Tariff we enjoy has caused immense benefit. It is the duty of the Government, if it has at heart the welfare of the country, to protect its produce against the competition of strangers. The farmers sell their produce better. There is more money and more work. Manufactures open everywhere. Emigration has declined to a considerable extent. Every one is content and satisfied.

N. E. RICARD, Priest,  
St. Zéphirin de Courval, Co. Yamaska.

1. I see no advantage in it. 2. The effect of the imposition of these duties has been to cause the price of these grains to advance in our district. Many stock-raisers of Upper Canada, who formerly imported their grains from the United States, now have them sent from Montreal.
3. I am hardly in a position to answer this question. Fall wheat is not raised to advantage in Lower Canada. 4. The price of these articles has perceptibly increased since the coming into force of the present Tariff.
5. The price of cattle in general has increased during the past two years.
6. At the present time the horse raisers reap handsome profits. I would not presume to assert that the raising of horses returns as great profits as speculation in other kinds of live stock. The United States carry off the greater part of our disposable horse flesh.

7. I do not see but that the Canadian farmer, in our district at least, can raise to advantage all that he requires for the fattening of his cattle. At the instant I only see the advantage of importing a single article, that is oil-cake, the residue of the manufacture of the various kinds of oil. The sugar beet industry is about to add considerably to the resources for fattening.
8. Certainly, in the sense that the working class, in much easier circumstances now than before the establishment of the present Tariff, pays more for luxuries of the table, and all the profit on these articles goes on the fields.
9. Probably. Now that duties are put on American produce, we could show ourselves more exacting as respects the Americans. The abolition of the duties would demand an equivalent advantage from the Americans.
10. I am not in a position to answer this question.
11. The Tariff is of a character to encourage and develop the cultivation of these plants so useful in manufactures, and everywhere to increase considerably the resources of the agricultural class. The sugar beet, especially, is destined to exercise a most favourable influence upon modes of cultivation adopted in the country.
12. We have now excellent agricultural implements, and if their price is increased it is only slightly, and not to such a point as to counterbalance the advantages derived by the agricultural class from the Tariff.
13. The prices have not changed.
14. Without any doubt. In general our produce finds a market much more easily and more remunerative than two or three years ago. I attribute in a great measure this state of things to the fact that the working class, obtaining more work than in the past, consumes more of produce and pays better for it. The prosperity of cities and manufacturing centres always induces prosperity in the country.
15. Certainly. A glance over the country at the present time is sufficient to convince one of the fact. Everywhere old factories are reopened or new ones started. It has now produced an opposing stream of emigration from the United States towards Canada, which promises soon to attain considerable proportions.
16. Yes. A remarkable fact in our district is the tendency manifested by the professional classes and those in easy circumstances in the cities to betake themselves to agriculture, and to devote to it their capital and their intelligence. The value of lands has decidedly increased since 1878, owing to the favour with which agricultural work is regarded.
17. Considerably. No better proof of this can be given than the ease with which we dispose of our eatable produce in the markets of the city, and the independence with which workmen now offer their services.
17. In the condition of affairs established by the Federal Government, there is wanting but little more than the initiative on the part of our Local Legislature, and enterprise on the part of our farmers, to make agriculture in this Province a source of greater profit. The formation of an agricultural council for the whole Dominion would be perhaps a thing to be recommended. Every farmer of sound sense must applaud the patriotic sentiment which has brought the Tariff to its present state.

J. B. LECOURE,

St. Laurent, Co. Jacques Cartier.

1. No. 2. Since the imposition of the present duties, the market for cereals in this county is very high and quite to the advantage of the farmers.
3. Wheat is only raised here for local consumption. The Tariff has produced no effect here upon flour and wheat. 4. A favourable one.
5. The price of horses has increased 40 per cent, and of other stock, 25 per cent.

- 
6. It is very profitable to raise horses. Many sales are made to Western Canadians. A certain number of consignments are also sent to the United States.
  7. They can, and do, raise here, very profitably, all the grain required to fatten their stock. 8. Yes.
  9. This part of the country is not prepared for a Reciprocity Treaty. We are better off under the present Tariff. 10 and 11. A favourable effect.
  12. Farming implements are cheaper than before the Tariff.
  13. No remarkable change. 14. The agricultural market is more profitable than before the Tariff.
  15. The Tariff has had the effect of increasing our industries three-fold. Not only do the people not emigrate from here, but many Canadians are returning from the United States.
  16. The value of property has increased considerably during the past three years.
  17. Yes, greatly. 18. I know of no change necessary. To disseminate knowledge and to produce an agricultural literature within the reach of the purses of all, would be excellent measures.

**JULES BRUNET,**  
Farmer, St. Timothé, Co. Beauharnois.

---

1. No. 2. The present Tariff has had the effect of enabling us to sell our grain dearer, which is to our advantage.
3. No effect that can be found fault with. 4. Very favourable effect.
5. The price of horses has increased, and this is to our advantage.
6. Yes, it is profitable to raise them here. The best market is in the United States.
7. We can cultivate and harvest to our advantage all that is necessary for fattening our stock. 8. Yes. 9. No, we want no American produce admitted free. This would be injurious to us. 10. Excellent. 11. Favourable.
12. They are made no dearer than formerly and they are of a good quality.
13. Excellent. 14. It has caused the price of our grain to rise, which is an advantage.
15. The present Tariff has had the effect of increasing the number of factories, and of giving work to thousands of persons who would have left the country if it had not been for that.
16. Property has increased under the existing Tariff, and we are bringing back our exiled compatriots. 17. Yes. 18. None so far as I know.

**JOSEPH DORÉ CARDINAL,**  
Farmer, St. Timothé, Co. Beauharnois.

---

1. No answer. 2. To cause the price of pease and oats to advance considerably.
- 3 to 8. No answer. 9. Yes, more to our advantage now. 10. No answer.
11. The duties on Canadian tobacco should be removed, then Canadians would cultivate it in greater quantities. 12 to 17. No answer.
18. Model farms in various places would be a great benefit to our farmers.

**ANTOINE GAREAU,**  
Farmer, Secretary of the Municipal Council,  
Pointe du Lac, Co. St. Maurice,

---

---



---

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OPERATION OF THE TARIFF ON THE  
AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THE DOMINION.

OTTAWA, 25th April 1882.

SIR,—Will you kindly reply to the accompanying questions without delay, and forward immediately to Dr. Orton, M.P., Chairman of the above Committee, House of Commons P.O., Ottawa.

Yours, &c.,

W. S. DINGMAN,  
*Clerk to Committee.*

1. What wages do you pay per week ?
2. How many hands do you employ ?
3. Does the present Tariff benefit your industry ?
4. Do you supply the Canadian consumer of your product as cheaply as they were supplied before the present Tariff ?
5. Has the price of your raw material been increased or otherwise ?
6. Is your industry beneficial to the Canadian farmer ? If so, why ?
7. Were you a supporter of the National Policy at the last election ?
8. Are you favourable to its continuance ?
9. Was your industry established previous to the present Tariff ?
10. Have you increased your production ?
11. To what extent have you increased your production since the present Tariff came into operation ?

---

ANSWERS TO PRECEDING QUESTIONS.

1. Average for men \$1.50 ; girls, 75 cents. 2. 160 in all. Weekly pay list \$800 to \$1,000. 3. Yes, by giving us a largely increased market we now can make lines of goods we could not touch before.
4. Nearly all our lines of goods are lower in price than in 1878. 5. Some raw materials are less and others higher than in 1878.
6. By means of our industry the farmer has a larger home market, and our goods cheaper to him than before. 7. Yes. 8. Most assuredly I am. 9. Yes.
10. In 1878 we had in our establishment 3 sets of woollen machinery, now we have 8 sets. 11. No answer:

W. E. ADAMS,  
of the firm of ADAMS, HOCKLAND & Co., Paris.

- 
1. \$2,000. 2. 250. 3. Yes. 4. Yes, cheaper. 5. Slightly increased.
  6. A larger number to consume produce. 7. No, but I was in favour of readjustment. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. 10. Yes. 11. About doubled.

CHAS. RAYMOND, Guelph.

- 
1. We pay out about \$220 per week to miners, millers, teamsters, &c.
  2. The number of hands varies with the requirements of the business, at present we have twenty hands employed.
  3. The present Tariff is a decided advantage to this business, although rock gypsum is admitted free of duty from the States and ground in Ontario mills. Still we do not object to that, as we ship gypsum rock to points on the south shore of Lake Erie where it is admitted free also.

4. The price of land plaster has been lowered fully 20 per cent. on an average by manufacturers since the National Policy came in force. 5. As our raw material is the rock from our own mines it has not increased in value.
6. The use of land plaster is a benefit to the Canadian farmer by the increase which it causes in clover and leguminous crops. In our section the increase from its use was considered fully 50 per cent.
7. We are all Reformers and did not vote for the National Policy last election.
8. We are favourable to the continuance of the National Policy.
9. The land plaster trade has been established in Paris for more than fifty years; at Cayuga for a shorter period.
10. The production and sale of the mines and mills owned by us has more than doubled since we came into possession of them. 11. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—We own land plaster mines and mills, at Paris and Cayuga, doing business under the name of the "Canada Land Plaster Company." We purchased the properties two years ago, when the land plaster business was at the lowest condition known since gypsum mines were first opened in Ontario. One of the chief causes of depression in this trade was the facility with which surplus stock of land plaster could be thrown into this country from Michigan and New York States, regardless of price or quality. As an example: In consequence of a dispute some years ago between the grangers of Michigan and the land plaster manufacturers, the former purchased a gypsum mine and mill and supplied the members of the organization. As all mining and grinding in this business must be carried on for many months to meet the demand, when the season comes on the land plaster manufacturers found themselves loaded up with large stocks which they were obliged to carry over. Next year they canvassed all Western Ontario offering land plaster at the cost of the barrels with the freight to point of delivery, and the result was, in turn, all but complete demoralization in the Ontario land plaster trade. They were enabled to do this with greater facility because the late Government had abolished the duty formerly placed upon this article and it was admitted free. Since the present Tariff came into force there is greater security to those who have invested money in the business, and there is also a very considerable increase in the output. We believe the quantity disposed of in 1881 was fully double that of the season of 1879, and the demand is increasing. We refer to the companies and private individuals engaged in this trade between Paris and Cayuga on the Grand River.

GILL ALLAN & Co.

1. From \$3.50 to 50 cents per day. 2. About 150. 3. Yes. 4. Cheaper. 5. Not affected. 6. Yes. 7. Always. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. 10. No. 11. None. Added 15 per cent. new improved machinery.

BARBER BROTHERS.

1. We pay \$1400 per week. 2. 180 workmen, which do not include clerks or agents. Cannot see that it has benefited us any. Our industry was one of those that had control of the home market under the old Tariff, and increased Protection was not necessary. Our greatest evil was over-production; too many in the business.
4. So far we have been able to supply the consumer as cheaply as ever.
5. Price of raw material has advanced this past year, but not very much. During the years 1876, '77, '78, '79 and '80, iron and steel ruled very low in England; and coal the same in the United States—much lower than for many years preceding. For instance, in 1874, pig iron ruled from \$30 to \$35 per ton; in 1878, from \$15.50 to \$17. This, with improved methods of manufacturing, made a great difference in price to consumers.

6. It must be beneficial to farmers, as it supplies them with all the latest improved implements, and which they could not get along without in saving their crops.
7. No. 8. Regarding the continuance of the present policy, I would say that it is immaterial—so far as we are concerned. If prices of raw material go up very high, and wages also, we will only have to endeavour to get a corresponding price for our manufactured product. If they go down, prices will no doubt drop accordingly. We are governed a good deal by the foreign price of iron, steel and coal. The duties, of course, on the iron and coal increase the price some; but when the prices of these articles rule low, as they have done since 1878, the consumer does not feel it, as the extra duties come out of the manufacturer—at least they have done so, so far. Personally, I would prefer to see the duties taken off of coal and flour; and then as the revenue would admit, make such further reductions on the actual necessities of life as will reduce the burdens of poor people. It is admitted by almost every one that we should have a Tariff high enough to collect sufficient revenue for the requirements of the Government; and there is now no prospect that any Tariff can prevail again in this country as low as it was in 1878, or at least for a very considerable time to come. 9. Our industry was started on a small scale, in 1839, and has continued under the same firm's name since 1845. 10. Since then we have steadily increased our production until 1875, when it began to diminish.
11. By 1880 there had been a general reduction of about 25 per cent. in the volume of business done, compared with 1873, '74 and '75. In 1-81 we regained the 25 per cent., and are now producing for the present year, about 20 per cent. additional.

FRANCIS T. FROST, of Frost & Wood, Smith's Falls

1 to 11. No answer.

*General Remarks*:—The Armstrong & Patton Stave Mills were established in 1855, and up to the year that the Honourable Mr. Mackenzie's Government came into power the firm paid out thousands upon thousands of dollars to farmers, labouring men and mechanics. The "fly-on-the-wheel" policy of that Government necessitated the closing of the mills, consequent upon the shutting down of the sugar refineries. What was the result? Farmers who from year to year had disposed of their otherwise worthless elm and ash timbers, could no longer depend upon earning during the idle winter months hundreds of dollars, and operatives who had reared families of children and built for themselves comfortable houses were compelled to sell at a sacrifice and leave Iroquois for other fields. One man who, when the mills were closed, was worth upwards of \$3,000, sold his property at a much less price than what it cost him and moved to the West, where he engaged in farming pursuits. His venture was not a success, and he returned a short time ago (with only his furniture and a span of horses left out of the wreck) to work at the Iroquois Stave Mills. Since the inauguration of good old Sir John's policy the mills are "booming" again, the farmers rejoice, and the veriest Grit believes in his heart (as some have had occasion to know) that the National Policy is benefiting the country. I may say here, *en parenthèse*, that, as an outcome of Protection, another stave factory has been established here by a Grit of the deepest dye.

W. HENRY PATTON, Iroquois, Co. Dundas.

1. We pay \$400 to \$500 weekly. 2. We employ 105 persons.
3. But for the present Tariff we would not have invested a dollar in the woollen industry, and were it reduced would quit quick.
4. We supply our goods at 30 cents a pound under the present Tariff, and under the former Tariff we charged 35 cents for the same goods.

5. Our raw material has increased in price during the operation of this Tariff.  
 6. Our industry benefits the Canadian farmer as we give him 50 per cent. better value in blankets than he got before by buying imported goods.  
 7. We did support the National Policy at last election. 8. We are most anxious for its continuance.  
 9. Before the present Tariff I was a partner with Oliver Wilby at Weston; on the change of Tariff I withdrew, and purchased my present premises, which had been some years idle and all in ruins. I am now producing 1,000 pairs of blankets a week, and carding from 4,000 to 5,000 pounds of prepared wool a week; an investment of \$65,000, and a probability of doubling our capacity if the present Tariff is maintained. 10 and 11. No answer.

GEO. SMITH, Lambton Mills.

1. \$77 per week. 2. Seventeen hands employed (men and boys.) 3. Yes. 4. No.  
 5. Increases. 6. Yes; using material that was formerly burnt. 7. No.  
 8 and 9. Yes. 10. About the same. 11. No increase.

*General Remarks:*—Before the present Tariff I had great difficulty in selling my products, but now I could sell a greater quantity than I can manufacture.

ALEX. MITCHELL, Mitchell.

1. We pay \$750 per week. 2. We employ 130 hands. 3. Yes. 4. Yes.  
 5. The price of our raw material is not increased. 6. Our industry benefits Canadian farmers by employing people that consume his products. 7. Yes.  
 8. Yes. 9. Yes. 10. Yes. 11. We have increased our production to double the quantity.

W. W. CLAY, Paris.

From 1 to 11. No answer.

*General Remarks:*—Owing to recent illness and death of my brother William, and who was buried on Monday last, your summons and after communication, did not receive that prompt attention I otherwise would have given them. Besides this, a previous engagement made by me to go to St. Paul, Minn., for the purpose of closing a bargain regarding a self-binding reaper which we intend to make this season, and which must be attended to by me personally at once.

The reasons stated above I sincerely hope will induce you to dispense with my presence, at least for the present at Ottawa. If the following statements of my convictions regarding the benefits derived by both farmers and manufacturers are of any service to your Committee it will certainly please me very much.

The undoubted success of the N.P. is beyond question, but it should not be expected that either the farmers or manufacturers are able to give in detail all the gains acquired by the N.P. But we observe old factories doubling their productions, numerous new ones in active operation, and many others nearly completed, giving employment to thousands, who would otherwise have been compelled to seek employment in the United States, the farmer losing thereby his home market to a large extent, and the manufacturer obliged to give up his own market to a foreign country, who practically closed their market on him. We make agricultural steam engines, threshers, mowers, rakes, &c., the production of which has been largely increased since the protective Tariff came in force, and since we took advantage of the North-West market, which the National Policy has now opened to us.

By the enlargement of our market we, by the making and purchasing of special tools, can make better and cheaper implements than before, independent of the present duty of 50 cents per ton on coal, and \$2 per ton on pig iron, which has only

added 10½ cents per 100 lbs. to the cost of castings, provided that the iron founder used pig-iron alone, but which is well-known to be largely mixed with scrap to give it the proper hardness.

JOHN HAGGERT, Brampton.

1 to 11. No answer.

*General Remarks* :—The report of my evidence, given before your Committee, appearing in the *Toronto Globe* of the 26th inst., would lead people to suppose that I had 200 men all the time, which is not the case.

I here give you a statement of the number of men employed from 1877 to 1881 :—

1877.	Men in shops,	100.	Making with outside agents,	say	150.
1878.	do	100.	do	do	150.
1879.	do	115.	do	do	150.
1880.	do	115.	do	do	150.
1881.	do	120.	do	do	150.

Now with agents included, the number is rather above 200. The question put by yourself was :—“How many hands have you now ?” The answer I gave was, “All told—200, which of course included the outside agents.

JOHN ABELL, Woodbridge.

1. The weekly wages of this mill are about \$350. 2. There are 65 hands employed in the mill.
3. Without the present Tariff, or one better, there could not be any carpet factory here.
4. My time in Canada (nine months) does not qualify me to give an answer to this question ; but I would say that if carpet manufacturers could get the machinery necessary to their trade—which cannot be made in Canada—in free of duty, they could supply the market with better and cheaper goods than is imported.
5. More demand for the trade has somewhat increased the price of raw material.
6. The wages paid, and wool bought, goes either directly or indirectly to the farmer, and must be a benefit to that part of the county.
- 7 and 8. The protection of home industry has always had my support ; at the same time I am in favor of a very liberal policy toward those things which it is impossible to produce at home. 9. A carpet factory had been here before the present Tariff went into force, but had to be abandoned.
- 10 and 11. This place was only started last August, so the whole factory may owe its existence to the Tariff.

ROBERT HEPBURN,  
Manager, Ontario Worsted and Carpet Mills, Elora.

1. \$35 per week. 2. We employ 17. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. The price has not been increased.
6. We believe so ; by furnishing a market at home for their wool. 7. Yes. 8. Yes.
9. Yes. 10. Yes. 11. Increased our production 100 per cent.

McINTOSH & TAYLOR, Woodbridge.

*General Remarks* :—As you hold the proud position of champion of the agricultural industries of this Dominion in the House of Commons, I take the liberty of explaining Liverpool grain quotations, as our opponents are always pointing to the

Liverpool market as our guide. Wheat is sold and quoted by the cental (or 100 lbs.) and the freight which varies here according to supply by 25 cents per bushel, is as low as I ever remember it, to say nothing of the commissions and other extravagant charges there; and the quotations were yesterday as follows, viz:—Spring wheat 10s. per 100 lbs. equal to \$1.44 per bushel; red wheat, 10s. 3d. per 100 lbs., equal to \$1.47½ per bushel; white wheat, 9s. 9d. per 100 lbs., equal to \$1.42 per bushel; club wheat, 10s. 2d. per 100 lbs., equal to \$1.46 per bushel. Wheat in Chicago quoted at \$1.35 per bushel. In Liverpool same wheat quoted \$1.44 per bushel. Difference 9 cents per bushel.

THOMAS DIGHT, Lucan.

*General Remarks:*—We continue our custom of addressing a monthly letter to the capitalists and business men generally of the United States and Canada, endeavouring to set before them a review of our markets, giving such facts as are in our possession, and briefly stating our views of the probable course of future markets.

We have for several months, after carefully surveying the whole ground, taken something like the following view of matters:

1st. We have looked upon wheat as too high.

2nd. We have expressed our opinion that corn and oats were too high.

3rd. We have, ever since pork was selling at \$17 to \$17.50, given it as our view that pork was worth the money and that a purchase would prove a good investment.

In regard to wheat we admit that the price to-day is higher than we expected it would be, but this has been brought about by manipulation. At this time a corner exists in this grain, the present high price is not based upon supply and demand, but is forced up by heavy operators who own about all the No. 2 spring wheat, and day after day are in the market bidding for wheat in order to keep the price to the high figure it is now ruling at. We still contend that were our markets only governed by legitimate demand, prices of wheat would rule 10 cents to 20 cents lower.

One year ago our No. 2 wheat was selling at about \$1 per bushel. Now allowing for a large shortage, we ask, adding say 15 cents to 20 cents per bushel to the price of last year, if it would not more than cover any deficiency in the crops. Yet to-day our No. 2 spring wheat is selling at \$1.36 per bushel. The question now comes up, how long will this state of things continue? Of course no one can tell, but we predict that before the crop of 1882 is ready for market, the same wheat now selling at the above fabulous price will sell 20 cents per bushel lower.

One year ago No. 2 corn was selling in our market at say 40 cents to 40½ cents per bushel, and in April, 1881, it sold at 41 cents; now it is selling at 66 cents. We cannot believe that the present price will be sustained, although very much has been said and written about a short crop.

Oats to-day are selling nearly 10 cents per bushel higher than last year at this time, notwithstanding the oat crop of 1881 is reported almost universally good. We cannot look upon oats as good property to hold at present price.

We have and still do take the stand that pork or lard are worth the present price and that either would prove a good investment. Our packing season ended March 1st, and it was generally supposed that after the close the price of hogs would materially decline; such has not been the fact. Hogs to-day are bringing fully more than at the close of the packing season. The price of pork to-day is say \$6.10 per hundred, at this price it would cost over \$18 per barrel to pack, yet to-day pork is selling at \$17 per barrel. Founded on these facts we are firm believers in higher priced pork.

Probably no business interest in this country has increased with the same rapidity as has the business of buying and selling grain and provisions for future delivery upon the Chicago Board of Trade. Undoubtedly the reason for this wonderful increase arises from the fact that a large amount of property can be handled with comparatively a small amount of money. For instance, 10,000 bushels of wheat that

would cost \$13,000, can be bought upon a margin of say \$500 or \$1,000, the same with pork or lard, the party for whom we buy only being required to put up say 5 per cent. of the value of the property bought or sold, the same to be kept good.

Probably many do not fully understand how this business is conducted. To all such we say write us and we will fully explain.

D. H. DENTON & Co., Chicago.

1. \$900. 2. We employ 210. 3. Yes. 4. Yes; cheaper. 5. Yes; dearer.
6. Canadian wool is higher; our goods are cheaper. Besides finding a home market for produce, the reason we can sell cheaper, is that we have a ready market for our goods, and all the incidental expenses of carrying stock is saved, which was a very serious item.
7. Have been a Grit all my life, but was compelled to support the National Policy last election, or shut up my factory.
8. Our existence depends on its continuance. 9. Yes. 10. Yes. 11. We have doubled our capacity in our cloth department.

O. WILBY & CO., Woollen Manufacturers, Weston.

1. \$800. 2. We employ 110. 3. It does not. 4. I do; competition is so keen, prices cannot be increased, but I insist on shorter credits.
5. It has been increased very much. 6. My industry is beneficial to the Canadian farmer, because agricultural implements cannot be dispensed with.
7. I was not. 8. I am not. 9. Established and run continuously since 1847.
10. Not in the aggregate. 11. To no extent as regards the aggregate of business done.

JOHN WATSON, Agricultural Works, Ayr.

1. We pay \$1,200 per week for productive labour within our works, which does not include office salaries. 2. We employ 175 men and boys.
3. The present Tariff is an injury to our business, for the reason that it has increased the cost of our raw material, with no compensating advantage in return.
4. We supply the Canadian consumer of our products at as low prices as before the present Tariff, but with a lighter, more cheaply made (as regards labour) and less durable class of goods. 5. The cost of raw material has been increased to the extent of the additional duties under the present Tariff.
6. Our industry is beneficial to the Canadian farmer, for the reason that we manufacture the implements used on the farm. 7. Did not support the National Policy at last election. 8. I am not favourable to its continuance.
9. Our industry was established in 1856. 10. There has been a yearly increase in our production since 1860.
11. The ratio of increase is no greater since the National Policy than before.

JAMES NOXON, Ingersoll.

1. \$250. 2. We employ 30. 3. Yes. 4. Same. 5. Increased. 6. Because they cannot do without them. 7. No. 8 to 10. Yes. 11. Twelve times over.

*General Remarks:*—I am now engaged wholly in making waggons and ploughs for our North-West Territories, which is the only market we have for these articles; therefore, take notice that our only market is wholly dependent on a prohibitory Tariff. Were the present Tariff lowered in the least, one American waggon factory

---

could supply Manitoba with more and cheaper waggons than all our Canadian wagon factories put together, by reason of the little or no freight, while ours are very heavy. As waggons in the North-West are a necessity to the Canadian settler, and many extensive factories are now springing up. A still higher Tariff would be better for both producer and consumer, as a better article could then be made and readily purchased.

PETER ADAMS.

---

---



---

**This Letter has reference to Tables of Quotations on Pages 452 to 455**

BOARD OF TRADE, SECRETARY'S OFFICE, CHICAGO, 18th April, 1882.

Yours of the 29th ultimo was duly received, requesting quotations of various articles semi-monthly in the years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881. I have had these quotations made out as far as the articles are dealt in in this market. We do not have any trade in pease worth speaking of. I enclose statements herewith as requested. The items reported on are the *standard* grades dealt in, viz.: No. 2 spring wheat, No. 2 corn, No. 2 oats, No. 2 rye, and No. 2 barley, per bushel; mess pork, per barrel; short ribbed middles (bacon), sweet pickled hams, prime steam lard and live hogs, each per 100 lbs., all of which, I trust, will be satisfactory.

The preparation of these statements has involved considerable examination and taken a good deal of time, for which I have agreed to pay \$10, which please remit, and oblige.

Yours truly,

CHAS. RANDOLPH, Secretary.

---

**This Letter has reference to Tables of Quotations on Pages 456 to 461**

NEW YORK PRODUCE EXCHANGE, NEW YORK, 21st April, 1882.

Enclosed please find statement of certain markets as requested by you in your communication of 13th April, as also bill for \$30 for compiling the same.

The request comes to us at a time when we are very much occupied with our own Annual Report, but we have not allowed this to interfere with a prompt attention to your wishes.

Very respectfully yours,

PAUL BABCOCK, Jun., Secretary.

---

**This Letter has reference to Tables of Quotations on Pages 462 to 465.**

OFFICE OF THE CORN EXCHANGE ASSOCIATION, MONTREAL, 5th April, 1881.

I have now the pleasure to hand you eight sheets of tables, being Montreal and Liverpool prices for years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881, complying, as near as possible, to your request under date 29th ultimo. In connection with them, I would point out to your notice that the prices of Liverpool are not for the same quantities throughout all the years, the cental having come into use. The heading shows quantities for which prices are quoted. In regard to corn, for which you ask quotations in Montreal for No. 1 and No. 2 Western and Canadian, business is almost entirely confined to No. 2, which is the grade quoted throughout. Canadian corn is not an article of commerce. Rye, no quotations for 1877 and 1878. Shipments of this grain have only been made the last two years, before which it was hardly quotable. Bacon—have no records for 1877 and 1878. Wheat business here before navigation is limited; shipments that are made are bought at western points and shipped through to Portland, &c. Live hogs is practically only a butcher's trade, of which I have no quotations. Pork packing is almost entirely dressed hogs in winter, of which I give quotations. I enclose a voucher for \$10, being remuneration paid me for furnishing these tables.

I am, Sir, Yours obediently,

ALF. W. HADRILL.

---

This letter has reference to Tables of Quotations on Pages 466 to 469.

THE CORN EXCHANGE ASSOCIATION, TORONTO, 7th April, 1882.

Herewith please find official quotations as requested in yours of the 29th March, 1882.

I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

EDGAR A. WILLS, Secretary.

P.S.—The quotations for red winter wheat and corn are not official, as we keep no record of these grains, the transactions in them being very limited.

---

LIVERPOOL Prices, 1877-78.—Compiled from the

Date.	Flour, per bbl.	Red Wheat, Spring, per bush.	Red, Winter, per bush.	White, Winter, per bush.	Club, per bush.	Corn, per bush.
1877.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.
January 10.....	5.84 to 6.33	1.46 to 1.57	1.52 to 1.57	1.60 to 1.63	1.63 to 1.69	76 to —
do 25.....	5.81 " 6.33	1.46 " 1.59	1.57 " 1.61	1.59 " 1.61	1.63 " 1.67	76 1/2 " 77
February 10.....	5.35 " 5.98	1.46 " 1.57	1.57 " 1.61	1.59 " 1.54	1.54 " 1.61	72 " 73
do 25.....	5.84 " 6.08	1.45 " 1.57	1.57 " 1.60	1.57 " 1.59	1.58 " 1.64	72 1/2 " 73
March 10.....	5.84 " 6.08	1.42 " 1.56	1.54 " 1.59	1.50 " 1.57	1.57 " 1.61	68 " 68 1/2
do 25.....	5.84 " 6.08	1.42 " 1.56	1.54 " 1.59	1.50 " 1.57	1.57 " 1.61	69 1/2 " 70 1/2
April 10.....	6.08 " 6.57	1.46 " 1.65	1.57 " 1.64	1.61 " 1.68	1.64 " 1.71	69 " 70
do 25.....	7.06 " 7.79	1.65 " 1.86	1.79 " 1.82	1.77 " 1.86	1.82 " 1.89	77 " 78
May 10.....	7.30 " 8.03	1.79 " 2.04	1.89 " 1.94	1.82 " 1.87	1.92 " 2.02	76 1/2 " 78
do 25.....	7.30 " 8.03	1.79 " 1.89	1.89 " 1.94	1.89 " 1.94	1.92 " 1.94	69 1/2 " 73
June 10.....	7.06 " 7.91	1.76 " 1.94	1.89 " 1.94	1.82 " 1.87	1.89 " 1.93	68 " 69 1/2
do 25.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.61 " 1.87	1.89 " 1.94	1.74 " 1.77	1.77 " 1.85	68 " 69 1/2
July 10.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.62 " 1.82	1.89 " 1.94	1.75 " 1.81	1.80 " 1.89	69 1/2 " 70 1/2
do 25.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.60 " 1.85	1.89 " 1.94	1.82 " 1.87	1.87 " 1.94	75 " —
August 10.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.60 " 1.75	1.75 " 1.82	1.79 " 1.82	1.81 " 1.92	71 " 74
do 25.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.57 " 1.75	1.75 " 1.77	1.74 " 1.77	1.76 " 1.86	74 " 74 1/2
September 10.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.51 " 1.75	1.78 " 1.82	1.85 " 1.87	1.88 " 1.92	76 1/2 " 81 1/2
do 25.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.51 " 1.68	1.66 " 1.73	1.81 " 1.86	1.86 " 1.93	76 1/2 " 79 1/2
October 10.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.50 " 1.64	1.56 " 1.64	1.85 " 1.91	1.89 " 1.97	79 1/2 " 80
do 25.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.51 " 1.61	1.56 " 1.68	1.83 " 1.87	1.87 " 1.92	84 " 80
November 10.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.52 " 1.61	1.58 " 1.68	1.83 " 1.88	1.87 " 1.93	82 1/2 " 83
do 25.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.50 " 1.61	1.58 " 1.68	1.83 " 1.87	1.87 " 1.93	82 1/2 " 83
December 10.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.52 " 1.61	1.61 " 1.68	1.83 " 1.88	1.87 " 1.92	84 " 85
do 24.....	6.45 " 7.79	1.52 " 1.61	1.61 " 1.68	1.83 " 1.88	1.87 " 1.92	84 " 85
Average, 1st Quarter...	5.77 1/2 to 6.14 1/2	1.44 1/2 to 1.57	1.55 to 1.59 1/2	1.54 1/2 to 1.59 1/2	1.58 1/2 to 1.64	72 1/2 to 74 1/2
do 2nd do ...	6.87 1/2 " 7.68 1/2	1.67 1/2 " 1.71	1.82 " 1.87	1.78 " 1.83 1/2	1.83 1/2 " 1.89	71 1/2 " 73
do 3rd do ...	6.45 " 6.50 1/2	1.79 1/2 " 1.84 1/2	1.79 1/2 " 1.84 1/2	1.79 " 1.83 1/2	1.83 " 1.91	73 1/2 " 74 1/2
do 4th do ...	6.45 " 6.50 1/2	1.51 " 1.32 1/2	1.59 " 1.68	1.83 " 1.88	1.87 " 1.92 1/2	73 1/2 " 74 1/2
1878.						
January 10.....	6 81	1 49	1 75	1 88	1 93	1 23
do 25.....	6 81	1 50 1/2	1 71 1/2	1 86	1 93	1 30
February 10.....	6 81	1 63	1 70	1 85	1 89 1/2	77 1/2
do 25.....	6 57	1 58	1 68	1 79	1 86	76
March 10.....	6 33	1 56	1 68	1 73	1 80	75
do 25.....	6 33	1 54	1 68 1/2	1 67	1 79	73
April 10.....	6 45	1 57	1 68	1 67	1 78	74
do 25.....	6 39	1 56	1 68	1 67	1 78	75
May 10.....	6 57	1 53	1 65 1/2	1 69	1 78	73
do 25.....	6 20	1 49	1 65 1/2	1 62	1 70	71
June 10.....	6 08	1 38 1/2	1 61	1 57	1 63	67
do 25.....	5 84	1 36	1 49	1 53	1 53	65 1/2
July 10.....	5 84	1 31	1 43	1 48	1 56	64 1/2
do 25.....	5 84	1 35	1 41	1 49	1 53	64 1/2
August 10.....	5 84	1 38 1/2	1 46	1 52	1 53	64 1/2
do 25.....	5 84	1 41	1 38	1 53	1 57	67 1/2
September 10.....	5 30	1 41	1 29	1 49	1 53	67 1/2
do 25.....	5 60	1 41	1 26 1/2	1 43	1 50 1/2	67 1/2
October 10.....	5 60	1 38 1/2	1 30	1 46	1 49	64 1/2
do 25.....	5 35	1 38 1/2	1 29	1 41	1 47	66
November 10.....	5 35	1 36 1/2	1 34	1 44 1/2	1 48	68
do 25.....	5 60	1 37	1 30	1 43	1 48	67 1/2
December 10.....	5 35	1 36	1 31	1 41	1 46	67
do 24.....	5 35	1 36	1 31	1 38 1/2	1 42	66
Average, 1st Quarter...	6 61	1 55 1/2	1 69 1/2	1 80	1 86 1/2	84
do 2nd do ...	6 25 1/2	1 48 1/2	1 63 1/2	1 62 1/2	1 70	71
do 3rd do ...	5 76	1 38	1 37	1 49	1 54 1/2	65 1/2
do 4th do ...	5 43 1/2	1 34	1 31	1 41	1 46 1/2	66 1/2

Records of the Montreal Corn Exchange.

Barley, per bush.	Oats, per bush.	Peas, per bush.	Pork, per bbl.	Lard, per lb.	Beef, per tierce of 304 lbs.	Bacon, per lb.	Tallow, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.
cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	cents.
Record incomplete.			17.28 to 17.52	11 1/2 to 11 1/2	Record incomplete.			
68	52 to 65	1.03	14.60	10 1/2	18.25	8 1/2	8 1/2	14 1/2
68	52	1.03	14.36	10	18.25	8 1/2	8 1/2	15 1/2
68	52	1.18 1/2	15.82	10 1/2	22.51	8 1/2	9 1/2	15
68	52 " 65	1.17 to 1.18 1/2	16.06	10 1/2	23.12	8 1/2 to 8 1/2	9 1/2	15 1/2
68	52 " 65	1.15 1/2	15.21	10	21.17	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	9 1/2	15 1/2
68	52 " 65	1.13	13.87	9 1/2 " 10	20.20 to 20.68	8 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	14
68	52	1.08 1/2	12.77	10	19.47	7 1/2	8 1/2	12 1/2
62	52	1.08 1/2	12.17	9 1/2	19.47	7 1/2	8 1/2	11
68	52	1.08 1/2	12.77	9 1/2	20.32	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	11 1/2
68	52 " 65	1.07	13.14	9 1/2	21.53	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	11
68	52	1.08 1/2	12.17	9 1/2	23.12	8 1/2	9 1/2	11 1/2
68	52	1.11 1/2	12.17	10 " 10	23.36	9 1/2	8 1/2	13
68	52 " 65	1.18 1/2	11.92	10 " 10 1/2	22.51	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	13 1/2
68	52 " 65	1.15 1/2	11.66	10 1/2	22.51	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	13 1/2
68	52 " 65	1.13	11.66	10 " 10 1/2	22.51	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	14
68	52	1.07	14.36	9 1/2 " 9 1/2	22.87	9 " 9	8 1/2	13 1/2
68	52	1.07	14.11	9 1/2	22.51	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	13 1/2
68	52	1.07	13.87	9 1/2	21.05	7 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	14
68	52	1.06 1/2	13.63	9	20.93	7 1/2 " 7 1/2	8 1/2	14
68	52	1.03	16.02 to 17.52	11 to 10	18.25	8 1/2	8 1/2	15 1/2
68	52	1.12 1/2 to 1.18 1/2	14.68	10 " 10	20.78 1/2 to 20.68	8 1/2 to 8 1/2	9	14 1/2
68	52	1.10 1/2	12.99	9 1/2 " 10	21.72	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	9	12
68	52	1.09 1/2	13.20	9 1/2 " 10	22.06 1/2	8 1/2 " 8 1/2	8 1/2	14
76	52	1 07	13 63	10 1/2	20 44	6 1/2	10 1/2	13 1/2
76	52	1 05 1/2	13 63	10 1/2	20 44	7	10	13 1/2
76	52	1 05 1/2	13 38	8 1/2	22 20	6 1/2	10	14 1/2
76	52	1 05 1/2	13 14	8 1/2	20 68	6 1/2	10	14 1/2
73	52	1 05 1/2	12 41	8	20 20	6	9 1/2	15
73	52	1 04	12 41	8	19 95	6	8 1/2	14 1/2
71	52	1 07	11 92	8	19 71	6	8 1/2	13 1/2
			11 66	8				13 1/2
71	56	1 04	11 19	8	19 47	5 1/2	8 1/2	14
			10 34	7 1/2				11 1/2
65	54 1/2	1 01 1/2	10 34	7 1/2	18 74	6	8	10 1/2
62	47 1/2	1 01 1/2	10 46	7 1/2	17 52	6 1/2	8	9 1/2
58 1/2	46	0 98 1/2	11 80	7 1/2	17 52	6 1/2	8	9 1/2
58 1/2	46	1 05 1/2	11 92	8	17 64	7	8	9
58 1/2	46	0 97 1/2	11 92	8 1/2	17 88	7 1/2	8	9 1/2
58 1/2	46	0 98 1/2	11 92	8 1/2	18 01	7 1/2	8	9 1/2
58 1/2	44 1/2	0 97	11 68	8	16 42	7	8	9 1/2
58 1/2	43	0 97	11 66	8	16 42	6 1/2	8 1/2	9
60	43	0 95 1/2	11 19	7 1/2	16 42	7	8 1/2	10
60	43	0 94	10 85	7 1/2	16 42	7	8	10 1/2
62	43	0 95 1/2	10 34	7 1/2	16 42	7	8	10 1/2
62	43	0 94 1/2	10 22	7	16 42	6 1/2	8	10 1/2
62	43	0 92 1/2	9 73	7	(new) 19 47	5 1/2	8	10
62	43	0 92	9 73	6 1/2	19 47	5 1/2	8	9 1/2
76	52	1 05 1/2	13 10	9 1/2	20 65	9 1/2	9 1/2	14 1/2
67	52	1 03 1/2	10 97	8	18 86	6	8 1/2	12
68 1/2	46 1/2	0 99	11 60	8	17 31 1/2	7 1/2	8	9 1/2
61 1/2	43	0 94	10 36	7 1/2	17 43 1/2	6 1/2	8	10

LIVERPOOL Prices, 1880-81.—Compiled from the

Date.	Flour, per bbl.	Red Wheat, Spring, per bush.	Red, Winter, per bush.	White, Winter, per bush.	Club, per bush.	Corn, per bush.
1880.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.
January 10.....	5 95	1 61	1 68	1 68	1 73	76
do 25.....	5 72½	1 57	1 63	1 63	1 67	73
February 10.....	7 84	1 58	1 65½	1 57	1 65½	70½
do 25.....	6 19½	1 64	1 73	1 68	1 73	79½
March 10.....	6 19½	1 61	1 69	1 63	1 69	78½
do 25.....	6 19½	1 63	1 73	1 63	1 71½	80
April 10.....	5 95	1 57	1 64	1 57	1 64	78½
do 25.....	5 95	1 49	.....	1 49	1 54	70½
May 10.....	5 95	1 46	1 53	1 47	1 48	70½
do 25.....	5 95	1 46	1 54	1 49	1 48	66
June 10.....	5 72½	1 42	1 49	1 49	1 53	69½
do 25.....	5 72½	1 36	1 43½	1 41	1 46	68
July 10.....	5 72½	1 38½	1 46	1 42	1 46	68½
do 25.....	5 72½	1 36	1 50½	1 46	1 46	66
August 10.....	5 72½	1 36	1 43½	1 43½	1 50½	70½
do 25.....	5 49	1 31½	1 31½	1 43½	1 49	69½
September 10.....	5 25½	1 29	1 19½	1 36	1 42	69
do 25.....	5 25½	1 29	1 25½	1 36	1 42	66
October 10.....	5 49	1 34	1 32½	1 38½	1 47	67
do 25.....	5 60½	1 35	1 35	1 41	1 48	68½
November 10.....	5 60½	1 36	1 41	1 41	1 50½	71½
do 25.....	5 72½	1 46	1 49	1 46	1 56	78½
December 10.....	5 72½	1 43½	1 46	1 44½	1 53	79½
do 24.....	5 72½	1 42	1 43½	1 46	1 53	77
Average, 1st Quarter ...	6 35	1 60½	1 68½	1 63½	1 70	76½
do 2nd do ...	5 08	1 46	1 52½	1 48	1 53	70
do 3rd do ...	5 52½	1 33½	1 36	1 41	1 46	68
do 4th do ...	5 64½	1 39½	1 41	1 43	1 51	76
1881.						
January 10.....	5 72½	1 42	1 43½	1 43½	1 50½	74
do 25.....	5 49	1 39½	1 41	1 41	1 48	73½
February 10.....	5 49	1 36	1 38½	1 38½	1 43½	72½
do 25.....	5 25½	1 36	1 38½	1 37	1 42	74
March 10.....	5 25½	1 35	1 42	1 38	1 44½	75
do 25.....	5 25½	1 34	1 43	1 41	1 46	74½
April 10.....	5 25½	1 35	1 43	1 42	1 46	74½
do 25.....	5 25½	1 34	1 42	1 41	1 46	73
May 10.....	5 25½	1 31½	1 38½	1 38	1 42	69½
do 25.....	5 25½	1 31½	1 38½	1 38	1 42	69
June 10.....	5 25½	1 34	1 40	1 37	1 41	66½
do 25.....	5 49	1 37	1 43	1 38	1 42	65½
July 10.....	5 49	1 36	1 43	1 42	1 44½	70½
do 25.....	5 49	1 37	1 43	1 40	1 44½	68½
August 10.....	5 72½	1 42	1 45	1 41	1 47	68
do 25.....	6 19½	1 53	1 61	1 47	1 50½	74
September 10.....	6 19½	1 49½	1 61	1 61	1 65½	73
do 25.....	6 19½	1 49½	1 61	1 62	1 65½	68
October 10.....	6 43	1 53	1 65½	1 61	1 67	83½
do 25.....	6 19½	1 53	1 62	1 61	1 69	80½
November 10.....	6 19½	1 52	1 62	1 61	1 70½	80½
do 25.....	6 19½	1 52	1 61	1 61	1 67	79
December 10.....	6 19½	1 52	1 61	1 54	1 65½	80½
do 24.....	6 19½	1 53	1 59½	1 56	1 65½	80½
Average, 1st Quarter ...	5 57½	1 42	1 41	1 40	1 45½	74
do 2nd do ...	5 29	1 33½	1 41	1 39½	1 43½	70
do 3rd do ...	5 88	1 44½	1 53	1 51	1 56½	73½
do 4th do ...	6 22	1 63	1 53½	1 30	1 57	78½

Records of the Montreal Corn Exchange.

Barley, per bush.	Oats, per bush.	Peas, per bush.	Pork, per bbl.	Lard, per lb.	Beef, per tierce of 304 lbs.	Bacon, per lb.	Tallow, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.
cents.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	cents.
61½	48	1 02	14 60	10	19 95	8½	8	15
61½	48	0 98½	14 60	10	19 95	8½	8	15½
61½	46½	0 98½	14 36	8½	19 47	8	8	15
61½	50½	0 98½	13 99	8½	19 22	8½	7½	15
61½	50½	0 98½	14 48	8½	18 74	8½	7½	15½
61½	50½	1 02	13 99	8½	18 25	8	7½	15½
61½	50½	1 03	15 21	8½	18 25	8	7½	16½
61½	50½	1 05½	15 57	8½	18 25	7½	7½	15½
61½	48½	1 04½	16 06	8	17 64	7½	7	15½
61½	50½	1 04½	14 84	8	16 55	7½	7½	15
61½	48½	0 98½	14 36	7½	16 30	7½	7½	15
61½	48	1 01	14 60	8	15 57	8	7½	11
61½	48	1 02	14 81	8	14 60	8½	7½	11
61½	48	1 03	14 96	8	13 63	8½	7½	12½
61½	48	1 03	15 09	8½	13 99	9	7½	13
61½	48	1 04½	15 82	9½	15 09	9½	8	13½
61½	48	1 04½	16 79	9½	15 21	10	7½	13½
61½	48	1 03	17 52	9½	15 21	9½	7½	14
61½	48	1 03	17 76	9½	15 45	9½	7½	14
61½	48	1 01	17 52	9½	15 33	10	7½	14½
61½	48	1 02	19 79	10	14 36	10	8	14½
61½	48	1 02	16 55	10½	13 87	9½	8	14½
61½	48	1 02	16 55	10	13 87	9	7½	14½
61½	48	1 02	15 82	10	(new) 18 86	8½	8½	14½
61½	49	0 99½	14 33½	10½	19 26½	8½	8	15½
61½	49½	1 19½	15 10½	8	17 09½	8	7½	14½
61½	48	1 03½	15 83½	9	14 62	9	7½	13
61½	48	1 02	17 33	10	15 29	9½	8	14½
61½	48	0 99½	15 82	10½	(new) 17 76	8½	7½	14½
61½	48	0 98½	16 30	10½	18 01	8½	7½	14½
61½	48	0 98½	16 30	11	18 01	9	8	14½
61½	48	0 99½	16 55	11½	18 25	9½	8	14½
61½	48	0 99½	16 30	11½	18 25	9	7½	15
61½	48	0 99½	16 55	12	18 25	9	7½	15
61½	48	0 99½	16 55	12½	18 25	9½	7½	15
61½	48	0 99½	17 52	12	19 47	9½	7½	15
61½	48	0 99½	16 55	12	18 25	9½	7½	12
61½	48	0 96	17 61	12	21 29	10	7½	12
61½	48	0 96	17 64	11½	22 51	9½	7½	10½
61½	48	0 96	17 64	12	22 51	9½	7½	9½
61½	48	0 96	18 01	12½	22 51	10	7½	11½
61½	48	0 96	18 01	12½	22 51	10	7½	11½
61½	48	1 02	18 01	12½	22 51	10	7½	12½
61½	49½	1 05½	18 01	13½	22 51	10½	8	13
61½	49½	1 07	19 22	13½	22 51	11	9½	13½
61½	49½	1 05½	19 47	13½	22 51	11	9½	13
61½	49½	1 04½	19 47	13	22 51	10½	9	12½
61½	49½	1 03	18 25	12½	22 51	10½	9	11½
60½	49½	0 99½	18 25	12½	.....	10½	8½	12
60½	49½	0 99½	18 25	12	.....	10½	8½	12½
61½	48	0 99½	16 36½	11	18 12	9	7	15
61½	48	0 97½	17 25½	12	20 38	10½	7½	13
61½	49	1 02	18 21	13	22 51	10½	8	12
61	49½	1 02	18 63½	12½	22 51	10½	9	12½

SCHEDULE of Quotations, Liverpool, 1877-78.—From the Secretary of the Toronto Corn Exchange.

Date.	Wheat.					Corn.	Oats.	Barley.	Pens.	Pork.	Lard.	Bacon.	Cheese.
	Flour.	Spring.	Red, Winter.	White.	Club.								
1877.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
January	10 26 0	10 8	10 8	11 1	11 7	28 9	3 6	3 6	37 6	72 0	54 0	45 6	68 0
do	25 26 0	10 10	11 0	11 0	11 0	7 3	3 6	3 6	37 6	69 0	52 0	44 0	70 0
February	10 25 6	10 9	11 0	10 8	11 2	6 0	3 6	3 6	37 6	51 0	53 0	42 0	70 0
do	26 25 0	10 11	11 0	10 11	11 4	5 6	3 6	3 6	36 6	66 0	50 0	41 0	72 2
March	10 25 0	10 6	10 11	10 6	10 10	5 0	3 6	3 6	36 0	62 6	49 0	40 6	75 9
do	25 25 0	10 8	10 10	10 8	11 0	4 9	3 6	3 6	36 6	61 0	48 0	40 0	73 0
April	10 27 0	11 4	11 3	11 6	11 9	5 3	3 6	3 6	35 6	59 0	46 0	39 6	70 0
do	25 32 0	12 9	12 6	12 9	13 0	7 6	3 6	3 6	40 0	65 0	49 0	41 0	70 0
May	10 33 0	14 0	13 4	12 6	13 10	7 0	3 6	3 6	40 0	66 0	48 0	40 0	73 0
do	25 33 0	13 9	13 4	13 0	13 6	5 3	3 6	3 6	40 0	63 0	46 6	40 0	75 0
June	10 32 0	13 0	13 4	12 8	13 1	3 9	3 6	3 6	38 0	65 0	45 0	38 0	62 6
do	25 32 0	13 0	13 4	12 4	12 10	4 3	3 6	3 6	37 0	62 6	45 0	36 6	57 0
July	10 32 0	12 6	13 4	12 5	13 0	4 9	3 6	3 6	37 6	60 0	43 6	35 0	51 0
do	25 32 0	12 8	13 4	12 10	13 4	6 6	3 6	3 6	37 6	53 0	44 6	37 6	53 6
August	10 32 0	12 0	12 6	12 6	13 2	6 0	3 6	3 6	37 6	54 0	44 0	38 6	52 0
do	25 32 0	13 0	12 4	12 3	13 10	6 3	3 6	3 6	37 6	52 0	43 6	37 0	53 0
September	10 32 0	13 0	12 7	12 11	13 3	8 6	3 6	3 6	39 0	50 0	46 6	38 0	61 0
do	25 32 0	11 10	12 1	12 10	13 0	7 6	3 6	3 6	41 0	49 0	47 0	40 0	63 0
October	10 32 0	11 6	11 10	12 9	13 1	8 3	3 6	3 6	40 0	48 0	47 0	42 6	61 2
do	25 32 0	11 3	11 3	12 1	13 6	9 6	3 6	3 6	39 0	47 6	46 0	41 6	64 0
November	10 32 0	11 0	11 4	12 4	13 3	9 3	3 6	3 0	37 6	60 0	44 9	42 0	63 0
do	25 32 0	10 0	11 6	13 0	13 4	9 6	3 6	3 0	37 0	57 0	43 0	41 0	63 0
December	10 32 0	11 2	11 6	12 12	13 4	9 9	3 6	3 0	37 0	56 0	43 0	37 0	64 0
do	24 32 0	11 0	11 6	12 11	13 2	9 3	3 6	3 0	36 9	56 0	42 0	34 6	64 0
1878.													
January	10 28 0	11 3	12 0	12 11	13 3	29 0	3 11	3 0	37 0	56 0	33 6	41 0	64 0
do	25 28 0	11 2	11 9	12 9	12 1	8 3	3 11	3 0	36 6	56 0	32 0	40 6	64 0
February	10 28 0	10 10	11 6	12 6	12 11	7 3	3 11	3 0	36 6	55 0	30 0	39 9	66 0
do	25 27 0	10 10	11 6	12 2	12 8	6 9	3 11	3 0	36 6	54 0	19 6	39 6	69 0
March	10 26 0	11 6	11 4	11 8	12 3	6 3	3 9	3 0	36 6	51 0	27 0	37 3	68 0
do	25 26 0	10 7	11 4	11 6	12 3	5 6	3 9	3 0	36 0	51 0	18 6	37 6	65 0
April	10 26 6	10 9	11 6	11 5	12 2	6 0	3 8	3 0	37 0	49 0	28 3	37 0	63 0
do	25 26 3	10 8	11 6	11 6	12 3	6 3	3 8	3 2	36 6	47 6	27 6	36 9	63 0
May	10 27 0	10 6	11 4	11 7	12 2	6 0	3 8	3 3	36 0	46 0	26 3	36 9	63 0
do	25 25 6	10 4	11 4	11 3	11 9	5 0	3 8	3 2	35 6	44 0	25 0	35 0	57 6
June	10 25 0	9 6	11 0	10 10	11 3	3 3	3 4	3 2	35 0	42 6	26 6	35 0	49 0
do	25 24 0	9 2	10 0	10 5	10 8	2 9	2 9	3 2	35 0	43 0	30 0	36 0	45 0
July	10 24 0	9 0	9 10	10 2	10 8	2 9	2 8	3 0	34 3	49 0	30 6	35 9	45 0
do	25 24 0	9 3	9 8	10 3	10 6	2 9	2 8	3 0	34 6	49 0	32 6	37 0	44 0
August	10 24 0	9 6	10 0	10 5	10 8	3 0	2 8	3 0	33 6	49 0	31 1	39 3	43 0
do	25 24 0	9 8	9 6	10 6	10 9	3 9	2 10	3 0	33 0	49 0	36 0	38 9	44 0
September	10 24 0	9 8	9 2	10 5	10 3	3 9	2 8	3 0	33 6	49 0	34 6	37 6	44 0
do	25 23 6	9 8	9 8	10 2	10 2	3 3	2 6	3 0	33 6	47 6	38 3	37 0	42 0
October	10 23 0	9 6	8 11	10 0	10 0	2 9	2 6	3 1	33 6	46 0	32 6	35 9	45 6
do	25 22 0	9 6	9 0	9 9	9 9	3 3	2 6	3 0	32 6	45 0	31 6	35 0	48 0
November	10 22 0	9 6	9 0	9 11	9 11	4 0	2 6	3 1	32 6	44 0	32 0	33 9	47 0
do	25 22 0	9 6	9 1	9 10	9 10	4 0	2 6	3 2	32 9	42 0	28 6	33 0	49 0
December	10 22 0	9 4	9 0	9 9	9 9	3 6	2 6	3 2	32 0	40 0	26 6	32 0	46 0
do	24 22 0	9 4	9 1	9 6	9 6	3 3	2 6	3 2	31 9	40 0	24 9	31 3	44 9

SCHEDULE of Quotations, Liverpool, 1880-81.—From the Secretary of the Toronto Corn Exchange.

Date.	Wheat.																									
	Flour.		Spring.		Red, Winter.		White.		Club.		Corn.		Oats.		Barley.		Peas.		Pork.		Lard.		Bacon.		Cheese.	
1880.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
January 10	12	6	11	1	11	6	11	7	11	10	5	7	6	2	5	3	7	0	60	0	39	3	37	6	68	0
do 25	12	0	11	10	11	4	11	3	11	7	5	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	0	5	3	6	10	60	0	40	9	38	0	72	0
February 10	12	3	10	10	11	6	10	9	11	4	5	3	6	0	5	3	6	9	59	0	38	6	37	0	73	0
do 25	13	0	11	3	11	4	11	6	11	10	5	10	6	8	5	3	6	9	57	6	40	0	38	6	73	0
March 10	13	0	11	0	11	7	11	2	11	7	5	9	6	6	5	3	6	9	57	6	39	6	38	0	70	0
do 25	13	0	11	2	11	10	11	2	11	9	5	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	5	3	7	0	57	6	39	6	36	6	71	6
April 10	13	0	10	11	11	6	10	10	11	4	5	8	6	6	5	3	7	0	69	0	39	0	36	9	71	6
do 25	12	6	10	3	10	9	10	3	10	6	5	5	6	6	5	3	7	4	62	6	37	6	36	0	75	0
May 10	12	6	10	0	10	6	10	2	10	4	4	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	3	5	3	7	2	65	0	37	3	35	6	68	0
do 25	12	6	10	0	10	7	10	3	10	6	4	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	5	3	7	2	62	6	37	6	35	6	68	0
June 10	12	0	9	11	10	3	10	0	10	6	4	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	3	5	3	6	9	58	6	36	0	35	6	69	0
do 25	12	0	9	11	9	11	9	9	10	7	5	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	11	60	0	38	0	36	6	58	0
July 10	12	0	10	0	10	0	9	6	10	0	4	11	6	2	5	3	6	11	60	0	38	0	36	9	53	6
do 25	12	0	10	5	10	5	10	0	10	4	5	0	6	2	5	3	7	0	61	6	38	3	37	6	56	0
August 10	12	0	9	10	9	10	9	10	10	3	5	1	6	2	5	3	7	1	62	0	40	6	41	6	60	0
do 25	11	6	9	0	9	9	9	7	10	0	5	1	6	2	5	3	7	2	65	0	43	6	45	0	62	0
September 10	11	0	8	10	8	2	9	4	9	9	4	11	6	2	5	3	7	2	68	0	45	6	43	6	63	0
do 25	11	0	8	10	8	8	9	4	9	9	4	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	7	1	71	0	45	0	42	0	63	0
October 10	11	0	9	1	9	0	9	6	10	0	5	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	7	2	73	0	45	0	42	6	64	6
do 25	11	9	9	4	9	5	9	8	10	2	5	4	6	2	5	3	6	10	72	6	46	6	45	6	67	0
November 10	11	9	9	4	9	8	9	8	10	4	5	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	7	0	69	0	46	0	46	0	67	0
do 25	12	0	10	0	10	3	10	0	10	8	5	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	7	0	67	6	47	6	43	6	67	0
December 10	12	0	9	10	10	1	9	11	10	6	5	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	7	0	67	6	45	6	42	0	66	0
do 24	12	0	9	9	9	10	10	0	10	6	5	7	6	2	5	3	7	0	65	0	46	6	40	6	65	0

  

1881.																											
January 10	12	0	9	9	9	10	9	10	10	4	5	6	6	2	5	3	6	10	66	0	48	6	40	0	66	0	
do 25	11	6	9	6	9	8	9	8	10	2	5	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	9	67	0	49	0	40	6	68	0	
February 10	12	0	9	4	9	6	9	6	9	10	5	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	9	67	0	50	6	41	6	68	0	
do 25	11	6	9	3	9	5	9	5	9	9	5	4	6	2	5	3	6	8	68	0	52	9	42	6	68	0	
March 10	11	0	9	3	9	9	9	6	9	11	5	6	6	2	5	3	6	10	68	0	52	0	41	0	68	6	
do 25	11	0	9	3	9	10	9	8	10	0	5	5	6	2	5	3	6	10	68	0	54	9	41	6	69	0	
April 10	11	0	9	3	9	10	9	9	10	0	5	4	6	2	5	3	6	10	68	0	53	6	45	0	69	0	
do 25	11	0	9	2	9	8	9	7	9	11	5	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	10	68	0	57	3	44	6	70	0	
May 10	11	0	9	0	9	6	9	6	9	9	5	1	6	2	5	3	6	10	72	0	56	0	45	6	69	6	
do 25	11	0	9	0	9	6	9	5	9	8	4	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	7	72	6	55	9	45	6	55	0	
June 10	11	0	9	2	9	7	9	6	9	9	4	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	7	72	6	55	3	44	6	55	0	
do 25	11	0	9	4	9	8	9	7	9	9	5	2	6	2	5	3	6	7	72	6	55	0	44	6	54	9	
July 10	11	6	9	4	9	10	9	7	9	11	5	0	6	2	5	3	6	7	74	0	58	0	44	6	56	6	
do 25	11	6	9	6	9	10	0	8	10	1	4	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	5	3	6	7	74	0	59	0	45	6	55	0	
August 10	12	0	9	9	10	2	10	2	10	4	5	5	6	4	5	3	7	3	74	0	57	0	45	6	52	0	
do 25	12	9	10	3	10	10	10	9	11	2	6	2	6	4	5	3	7	3	74	0	57	9	47	0	56	6	
September 10	13	0	10	4	11	0	11	0	11	6	5	11	6	4	5	3	7	4	74	0	60	0	48	9	61	0	
do 25	13	0	10	6	11	0	11	0	11	5	6	0	6	4	5	3	7	3	79	0	61	0	51	0	61	0	
October 10	13	6	10	4	11	3	11	3	11	7	6	1	6	4	5	3	7	2	80	0	60	0	51	0	58	6	
do 25	13	0	10	5	11	1	11	3	11	8	5	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	4	5	3	7	1	80	0	59	0	50	0	58	0	
November 10	13	0	10	5	11	1	11	0	11	5	8	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	4	5	3	6	10	76	0	58	0	48	6	58	0	
do 25	13	0	10	5	11	1	10	11	11	5	6	0	6	4	5	2	6	10	76	0	57	6	49	6	54	0	
December 10	13	0	10	6	11	0	10	11	11	4	5	11	6	4	5	2	6	10	75	0	57	0	49	0	57	0	
do 24	13	0	10	6	10	11	10	8	11	3	5	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	4	5	2	6	10	75	0	56	0	48	0	65	0	

SEMI-MONTHLY Quotations of various Articles of Produce, for the Years 1877-78.

Date	Wheat, No. 2, Spring.		Corn, No. 2.		Oats, No. 2.		Rye, No. 2.		Barley, No. 2.		Mess Pork.		Short Ribs.		Sweet Pickled Hams.		Lard.		Live Hogs.	
	Per Bush.	\$ cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per 100 Lbs.	\$ cts.	Per 100 Lbs.	\$ cts.	Per Lb.	Cts.	Per 100 Lbs.	\$ cts.	Per 100 Lbs.	\$ cts.
1877.																				
January 10.	1 28	to 1 28 1/2	43 1/2	to 41	35 1/2	to 35 1/2	72	to 72 1/2	66	to 67	17 87 1/2	to 17 90	9 00	to	10 1/2	to 10 1/2	11 30	to 11 32 1/2	6 10	to 7 20
do 25.	1 27 1/2	to 1 31	42 1/2	to 43	35 1/2	to 35 1/2	71	to 70	61 1/2	to 63	16 80	to 16 85	8 45	to	9 1/2	to 9 1/2	10 75	to 10 80	5 75	to 6 75
February 10.	1 30 1/2	to 1 31	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	35 1/2	to 35 1/2	69 1/2	to 65 1/2	61 1/2	to 61 1/2	15 75	to 15 90	8 45	to	9 1/2	to 9 1/2	10 85 1/2	to 10 90	5 90	to 6 70
do 24.	1 26 1/2	to 1 27	41	to 41	33 1/2	to 33 1/2	65	to 63	48	to 48	14 25	to 14 37 1/2	8 07	to	9	to 9	9 85 1/2	to 9 87 1/2	5 40	to 6 00
March 10.	1 25 1/2	to 1 25 1/2	39 1/2	to 40 1/2	31 1/2	to 31 1/2	62 1/2	to 63	51 1/2	to 51 1/2	14 00	to 14 00	7 15	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	9 17 1/2	to 9 25	5 25	to 5 75
do 24.	1 26	to 1 26 1/2	39 1/2	to 40 1/2	32 1/2	to 32 1/2	62 1/2	to 66 1/2	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	13 90	to 14 00	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	9 40	to 9 40	5 20	to 5 40
April 10.	1 35 1/2	to 1 33	40 1/2	to 41	33 1/2	to 33 1/2	68 1/2	to 69	78	to 78	16 50	to 16 75	8 1/2	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	10 20	to 10 25	5 15	to 5 90
do 25.	1 65	to 1 67	51 1/2	to 53 1/2	41	to 41 1/2	88	to 90	77	to 77	14 75	to 14 87 1/2	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	9 47 1/2	to 9 52 1/2	5 20	to 5 60
May 10.	1 47 1/2	to 1 50	47	to 46 1/2	38 1/2	to 37 1/2	70	to 70	65	to 65	13 62 1/2	to 13 75	8 1/2	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	9 25	to 9 25	4 85	to 5 05
do 25.	1 49 1/2	to 1 47	47 1/2	to 47 1/2	36 1/2	to 36 1/2	68 1/2	to 63	63	to 63	13 35	to 13 40	7 45	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	8 62 1/2	to 8 65	4 40	to 4 65
June 9.	1 46	to 1 45	47 1/2	to 48 1/2	33 1/2	to 33 1/2	63	to 62	50	to 50	13 00	to 13 12 1/2	8 1/2	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	8 75	to 9 00	4 60	to 4 75
do 25.	1 47	to 1 33	48 1/2	to 47 1/2	28 1/2	to 28 1/2	60	to 60	40	to 40	13 15	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	9 00	to 9 10	4 80	to 5 10
July 10.	1 29	to 1 33	48 1/2	to 47 1/2	28 1/2	to 28 1/2	60	to 60	40	to 40	13 15	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	9 00	to 9 10	4 80	to 5 10
do 25.	1 17 1/2	to 1 19	45 1/2	to 45 1/2	25	to 24 1/2	56	to 55 1/2	30	to 30	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
August 10.	1 08	to 1 08 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	23	to 23	52	to 52	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
do 25.	1 08 1/2	to 1 13	41 1/2	to 42 1/2	24	to 24	52	to 52	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
September 10.	1 17 1/2	to 1 14 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	23	to 23	52	to 52	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
do 25.	1 17 1/2	to 1 12 1/2	42 1/2	to 42 1/2	22 1/2	to 22 1/2	53	to 53	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
October 10.	1 17 1/2	to 1 12 1/2	42 1/2	to 42 1/2	22 1/2	to 22 1/2	53	to 53	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
do 25.	1 08 1/2	to 1 08 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	54	to 54	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
November 10.	1 06 1/2	to 1 06 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	54	to 54	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
do 25.	1 08 1/2	to 1 09 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	54	to 54	23	to 23	13 20	to 13 20	7 45	to	8 1/2	to 8 1/2	8 85	to 8 87 1/2	4 75	to 5 00
December 10.	1 10 1/2	to 1 10 1/2	43 1/2	to 43 1/2	25 1/2	to 25 1/2	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	25 1/2	to 25 1/2	12 00	to 12 05	6 1/2	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	7 90	to 7 95	4 10	to 4 45
do 24.	1 09 1/2	to 1 08 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	24 1/2	to 24 1/2	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	25 1/2	to 25 1/2	11 75	to 11 75	6 1/2	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	7 70	to 7 70	4 00	to 4 25
1878.																				
January 10.	1 05 1/2	to 1 08 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	21 1/2	to 21 1/2	53	to 53	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	10 95	to 11 00	5 1/2	to	7	to 7	7 25	to 7 25	4 00	to 4 20
do 25.	1 05 1/2	to 1 04 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	21 1/2	to 21 1/2	53	to 53	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	10 95	to 10 85	5 1/2	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	7 25	to 7 25	4 00	to 4 20
February 9.	1 05 1/2	to 1 04 1/2	39 1/2	to 39 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	51	to 51	46	to 46	10 20	to 10 25	5 1/2	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	7 30	to 7 30	4 15	to 4 35
do 25.	1 03 1/2	to 1 10 1/2	42 1/2	to 42 1/2	25 1/2	to 25 1/2	55	to 55	45	to 45	10 52 1/2	to 10 25	5 1/2	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	7 30	to 7 30	4 30	to 4 50

March 9.	1 04 1/2	to 1 04 1/2	41 1/2	to 41 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	55	to 55	45	to 45	9 35	to 9 35	4 00	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 80	to 6 80	3 80	to 3 80
do 15.	1 08 1/2	to 1 08 1/2	40 1/2	to 40 1/2	22 1/2	to 22 1/2	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	45 1/2	to 45 1/2	10 95	to 10 85	5 1/2	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	7 15	to 7 15	3 40	to 3 40
do 25.	1 11	to 1 10 1/2	40 1/2	to 40 1/2	26 1/2	to 26 1/2	56 1/2	to 56 1/2	45 1/2	to 45 1/2	8 90	to 8 75	4 75	to	7 1/2	to 7 1/2	7 00	to 7 00	3 35	to 3 35
April 10.	1 09 1/2	to 1 05 1/2	39 1/2	to 39 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	55	to 55	45	to 45	8 60	to 8 50	4 60	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 85	to 6 85	3 30	to 3 30
do 25.	1 09 1/2	to 1 05 1/2	39 1/2	to 39 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	55	to 55	45	to 45	8 60	to 8 50	4 60	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 85	to 6 85	3 30	to 3 30
May 10.	1 09 1/2	to 1 05 1/2	39 1/2	to 39 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	55	to 55	45	to 45	8 60	to 8 50	4 60	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 85	to 6 85	3 30	to 3 30
do 25.	0 98 1/2	to 0 98 1/2	36 1/2	to 36 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	52 1/2	to 52 1/2	43	to 43	8 85	to 8 90	4 77 1/2	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 45	to 6 45	3 35	to 3 35
June 10.	0 98 1/2	to 0 93 1/2	36 1/2	to 36 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	52 1/2	to 52 1/2	43	to 43	8 85	to 8 90	4 77 1/2	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 45	to 6 45	3 35	to 3 35
do 25.	0 94	to 0 96	38 1/2	to 39 1/2	24 1/2	to 24 1/2	48 1/2	to 48 1/2	43	to 43	9 40	to 9 35	5 40	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 95	to 6 95	4 00	to 4 20
July 10.	0 95 1/2	to 0 95 1/2	38 1/2	to 39 1/2	24 1/2	to 24 1/2	48 1/2	to 48 1/2	43	to 43	9 40	to 9 35	5 40	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 95	to 6 95	4 00	to 4 20
do 25.	1 04	to 1 05 1/2	41	to 40 1/2	26 1/2	to 26 1/2	53 1/2	to 53 1/2	43	to 43	9 25	to 9 57 1/2	5 40	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 85	to 6 85	4 10	to 4 60
August 10.	0 97 1/2	to 1 07 1/2	39 1/2	to 39 1/2	23 1/2	to 23 1/2	53	to 53	43	to 43	9 47 1/2	to 9 57 1/2	5 40	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	7 05	to 7 07 1/2	4 10	to 4 60
do 25.	0 96 1/2	to 0 92 1/2	37 1/2	to 37 1/2	21 1/2	to 21 1/2	52	to 52	43	to 43	10 55	to 10 65	5 85	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	7 10	to 7 22 1/2	4 40	to 4 65
September 10.	0 85 1/2	to 0 87 1/2	36 1/2	to 36 1/2	19 1/2	to 19 1/2	48	to 48	43	to 43	9 55	to 8 15	5 30	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 70	to 6 70	3 60	to 4 25
do 25.	0 87 1/2	to 0 87 1/2	35 1/2	to 35 1/2	19 1/2	to 19 1/2	48	to 48	43	to 43	8 35 1/2	to 8 15	5 30	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 32 1/2	to 6 35	3 60	to 4 00
October 10.	0 81 1/2	to 0 87 1/2	34 1/2	to 34 1/2	18 1/2	to 18 1/2	43	to 43	43	to 43	7 85	to 7 50	5 05	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 25	to 6 25	3 40	to 3 75
do 25.	0 79 1/2	to 0 79 1/2	33 1/2	to 33 1/2	19 1/2	to 19 1/2	43	to 43	43	to 43	7 85	to 7 50	5 05	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	6 00	to 6 00	3 00	to 3 25
November 9.	0 81	to 0 81 1/2	31 1/2	to 31 1/2	18 1/2	to 18 1/2	45	to 45	43	to 43	8 6	to 8 65	4 70	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	5 75	to 5 75	3 10	to 3 10
do 25.	0 83 1/2	to 0 85 1/2	31	to 31 1/2	18 1/2	to 18 1/2	45	to 45	43	to 43	8 00	to 8 00	3 80	to	6 1/2	to 6 1/2	5 50	to 5 50	2 80	to 2

SEMI-MONTHLY QUOTATIONS OF THE VARIOUS ARTICLES OF PRODUCE, FOR THE YEARS 1880-81.

Date.	Wheat, No. 2 Spring.		Corn, No. 2.		Oats, No. 2.		Rye, No. 2.		Barley, No. 2.		Meas Pork.		Short Ribs.		Sweet Pickled Hams.		Lard.		Live Hogs.	
	Per Bush.	\$ cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per Bush.	Cts.	Per 100 lbs.	\$ cts.	Per 100 lbs.	\$ cts.	Per lb.	Cts.	Per 100 lbs.	\$ cts.	Per 100 lbs.	\$ cts.
1880.																				
January 10.	1 25	1 28	40	34	35	34	78	81	12 25	13 40	6 67	6 70	7 80	7 62	8 1	7 62	7 05	4 45	4 85	
do 24.	1 16	1 14	36	35	32	33	76	80	11 50	12 65	6 42	6 46	7 50	7 50	8	7 50	7 37	4 40	4 75	
February 10.	1 22	1 23	35	34	31	33	75	78	11 40	12 65	6 45	6 05	7 75	7 50	8	7 50	7 02	4 15	4 55	
do 25.	1 23	1 24	37	37	31	33	75	77	11 35	11 40	6 35	6 47	8	7 15	8	7 15	7 20	4 30	4 65	
March 10.	1 20	1 20	37	37	31	33	71	73	11 35	11 40	6 35	6 47	8	7 05	8	7 05	7 20	4 30	4 65	
do 25.	1 16	1 17	35	35	28	30	69	71	10 47	10 37	6 32	6 35	7 4	7 02	8	7 02	7 05	4 20	4 60	
April 10.	1 17	1 17	36	36	29	30	71	73	10 20	10 37	6 16	6 17	8	6 97	8	6 97	7 00	4 35	4 75	
do 24.	1 17	1 17	36	36	30	30	72	74	9 65	9 80	6 07	6 05	8	6 85	8	6 85	6 92	4 45	4 75	
do 25.	1 12	1 13	37	37	31	31	72	74	10 10	10 12	6 07	6 10	8	6 87	8	6 87	6 90	4 30	4 65	
May 10.	0 99	0 97	36	35	30	31	75	76	10 25	10 05	6 27	6 30	7 4	6 55	8	6 55	6 65	4 09	4 35	
do 25.	0 88	0 89	34	35	25	25	63	63	11 77	12 10	6 35	6 60	7 4	6 55	8	6 55	6 70	4 15	4 50	
June 10.	0 92	0 93	36	35	25	25	63	63	13 80	14 09	6 90	6 95	8	6 75	8	6 75	6 77	4 25	4 75	
do 24.	0 89	0 87	34	34	26	26	66	66	15 90	15 00	7 07	7 15	9	6 90	9	6 90	6 92	4 30	4 75	
do 25.	0 89	0 91	34	34	25	25	66	66	15 90	15 00	7 07	7 15	9	6 90	9	6 90	6 92	4 30	4 75	
August 10.	0 92	0 91	34	34	25	25	66	66	15 90	15 00	7 07	7 15	9	6 90	9	6 90	6 92	4 30	4 75	
do 24.	0 89	0 87	34	34	26	26	66	66	15 90	15 00	7 07	7 15	9	6 90	9	6 90	6 92	4 30	4 75	
do 25.	0 89	0 91	34	34	25	25	66	66	15 90	15 00	7 07	7 15	9	6 90	9	6 90	6 92	4 30	4 75	
September 10.	0 93	0 91	40	39	29	29	77	75	17 00	17 85	8 00	8 05	9	7 65	9	7 65	7 82	4 70	5 25	
do 25.	0 94	0 90	39	39	29	29	81	82	18 00	18 30	8 35	8 37	9	7 87	9	7 87	7 90	4 70	5 25	
October 10.	0 94	0 99	39	39	30	30	82	82	19 00	19 30	8 35	8 37	9	7 87	9	7 87	7 90	4 70	5 25	
do 25.	0 99	0 99	39	39	30	30	82	82	19 00	19 30	8 35	8 37	9	7 87	9	7 87	7 90	4 70	5 25	
November 10.	1 04	1 04	42	42	30	31	82	83	19 00	19 30	8 35	8 37	9	7 87	9	7 87	7 90	4 70	5 25	
do 24.	1 11	1 12	43	43	32	32	87	87	14 25	14 00	7 00	7 20	8	7 95	8	7 95	8 32	4 15	4 60	
do 25.	1 02	1 01	39	39	32	32	87	87	14 25	14 00	7 00	7 20	8	7 95	8	7 95	8 32	4 15	4 60	
December 10.	0 92	0 91	36	36	29	29	82	82	11 80	13 00	6 65	6 70	7	8 30	7	8 30	8 32	4 40	5 10	
do 24.	0 92	0 91	36	36	29	29	82	82	10 70	12 30	6 30	6 35	7	8 20	7	8 20	8 32	4 30	4 90	
1881.																				
January 10.	0 98	0 99	37	37	31	31	89	89	11 25	13 10	6 75	6 80	7	8 70	7	8 70	8 70	4 55	5 30	
do 25.	0 97	0 98	36	36	31	31	88	88	12 25	13 30	6 80	6 85	7	8 60	7	8 60	8 70	4 50	5 30	
February 10.	0 97	0 97	36	36	31	31	88	88	12 25	13 30	6 80	6 85	7	8 60	7	8 60	8 70	4 50	5 30	
do 25.	0 98	0 97	38	38	29	31	89	89	11 50	14 00	7 35	7 40	8	9 02	8	9 02	9 12	4 80	5 50	

March 10.	0 90	0 90	39	39	31	31	98	98	15 20	15 47	7 80	7 85	8	10 30	8	10 30	10 40	5 25	6 70
do 25.	1 02	1 02	41	41	29	31	98	98	14 85	17 25	7 65	7 60	8	10 25	8	10 25	10 37	5 30	6 40
April 10.	1 03	1 03	43	43	30	31	1 05	94	16 65	17 35	7 65	7 60	8	10 25	8	10 25	10 37	5 30	6 40
do 25.	1 07	1 07	42	42	30	31	1 20	94	16 90	17 20	8 33	8 35	9	10 67	9	10 67	11 15	5 75	6 50
May 10.	1 08	1 08	43	43	30	31	1 16	94	16 65	17 00	8 40	8 42	9	10 50	9	10 50	10 80	5 60	6 25
do 25.	1 08	1 08	43	43	30	31	1 18	94	16 65	17 00	8 40	8 42	9	10 50	9	10 50	10 80	5 60	6 25
June 10.	1 13	1 13	46	46	30	31	1 05	94	16 20	16 20	8 10	8 15	8	10 67	8	10 67	10 70	5 60	6 40
do 25.	1 08	1 08	46	46	30	31	1 05	94	16 20	16 20	8 10	8 15	8	10 67	8	10 67	10 70	5 60	6 40
July 10.	1 08	1 09	46	46	30	31	1 05	94	16 20	16 20	8 10	8 15	8	10 67	8	10 67	10 70	5 60	6 40
do 25.	1 20	1 21	49	49	30	31	1 00	98	17 05	17 10	8 25	8 30	9	11 60	9	11 60	11 65	5 90	6 65
August 10.	1 31	1 31	53	53	33	34	1 04	94	18 22	18 35	8 97	9 00	10	12 30	10	12 30	12 30	6 25	6 95
do 25.	1 25	1 25	63	63	37	37	1 04	94	17 75	17 87	9 15	9 15	11	11 25	11	11 25	11 45	6 10	6 90
September 10.	1 31	1 31	62	62	39	39	1 03	94	19 25	19 40	10 20	10 25	11	11 35	11	11 35	12 10	6 10	7 15
do 24.	1 31	1 31	68	68	41	41	1 03	94	19 25	19 40	10 20	10 25	11	11 35	11	11 35	12 10	6 10	7 15
do 25.	1 36	1 37	63	63	41	41	1 03	94	19 25	19 40	10 20	10 25	11	11 35	11	11 35	12 10	6 10	7 15
October 10.	1 33	1 34	61	61	43	43	1 03	94	18 15	18 10	9 45	9 50	12	12 10	12	12 10	12 20	6 25	7 40
do 25.	1 28	1 29	58	58	44	44	1 03	94	18 15	18 10	9 45	9 50	12	12 10	12	12 10	12 20	6 25	7 40
November 10.	1 24	1 24	58	58	44	44	1 03	94	18 15	18 10	9 45	9 50	12	12 10	12	12 10	12 20	6 25	7 40
do 25.	1 28	1 28	61	61	46	46	1 03	94	18 15	18 10	9 45	9 50	12	12 10	12	12 10	12 20	6 25	7 40
December 10.	1 28	1 28	61	61	46	46	1 03	94	18 15	18 10	9 45	9 50	12	12 10	12	12 10	12 20	6 25	7 40
do 23.	1 25	1 25	61	61	44	44	1 03	94	18 15	18 10	9 45	9 50	12	12 10	12	12 10	12 20	6 25	7 40

\* New.  
† Old.

SEMI-MONTHLY Prices of Grain and

Date.	Wheat.				Corn.	Oats.	Rye.	Barley.
	No. 2 Red, per bush.	No. 1 White, per bush.	No. 1 Spring, per bush.	No. 2 Spring, per bush.				
1877.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Jan. 10...	1 45 -	1 50 -	1 40 -1 44	58 -	43 -	0 90 -0 93	1 11 -	
do 25...	1 45 -	1 52 -	1 40 -1 44	60 -62	41 -45	0 92 -0 93	1 12 -	
Feb. 10...			1 43 -1 45	59 -61	39 -45	0 91 -0 93		
do 24...	1 52 -1 55	1 65 -	1 45 -1 48	58 1/2 -60 1/2	41 -46	0 85 -0 91		
M'ch 10...	1 45 -1 50		1 42 -1 43	58 1/2 -57	38 -44	0 88 -0 90	1 15 -	
do 24...			1 44 -1 46	57 1/2 -	44 -	0 85 1/2 -0 90 1/2		
Ap'l 10...		1 80 -	1 55 -	58 1/2 -	47 -48	0 86 -0 90	0 62 -	
do 25...			1 70 -1 90	58 -	44 1/2 -56	1 05 -1 10		
May 10...			1 95 -1 98	70 -71	55 -	1 05 -1 10		
do 25...			1 75 -	60 -	52 -	0 98 -1 00		
June 9...			1 70 -1 75	57 1/2 -58	48 -	0 97 -0 98		
do 25...			1 61 -1 62	58 1/2 -67	47 -	0 93 -0 95		
July 10...		1 80 -	1 60 -1 62 1/2	60 -	44 1/2 -	0 90 -0 92		
do 25...	1 47 1/2 -1 48		1 60 -	63 -67	40 -41 1/2			
Aug. 10...	1 36 1/2 -1 36 3/4		1 26 -	60 -	35 -	0 86 -		
do 25...	1 37 -		1 35 -	54 1/2 -55	34 -34 1/2	0 80 -		
Sept. 10...	1 41 -1 43		1 37 -1 37 1/2	59 -	34 -35 1/2			
do 25...	1 49 -1 57		1 36 1/2 -1 38	56 -57	34 -	0 81 -0 83	0 95 -1 00	
Oct. 10...	1 50 -1 51		1 37 -	60 -60 1/2	34 1/2 -35	0 81 -0 82	0 87 -0 93	
do 25...	1 40 -1 46		1 31 -1 32	62 -63	36 1/2 -37	0 75 -0 78		
Nov. 10...	1 40 -1 45		1 27 1/2 -1 29 1/2	62 1/2 -	38 1/2 -	0 78 -0 90	0 75 -	
do 24...	1 44 -1 48		1 31 -1 31 1/2	63 1/2 -	40 -	0 75 -0 78	0 77 -	
Dec. 10...	1 44 -1 47		1 34 1/2 -1 34 1/2	64 1/2 -65 1/2	39 1/2 -	0 77 1/2 -	0 73 -1 00	
do 24...	1 45 -		1 33 -1 34 1/2	64 1/2 -	39 -	0 77 -0 78		
1878.								
Jan. 10...	1 37 -		1 29 1/2 -	61 1/2 -62 1/2	39 -	0 76 -	0 83 -	
do 25...	1 26 -1 40	1 46 -1 47	1 26 -1 29	61 -64	36 -	0 72 -0 75	0 63 -0 80	
Feb. 9...	1 32 1/2 -1 34 1/2	1 37 1/2 -1 42 1/2	1 25 -1 26 1/2	69 -60	36 -	0 71 -0 75		
do 25...	1 35 -	1 38 1/2 -1 43	1 25 -1 27 1/2	66 -58 1/2	34 1/2 -		0 65 -	
M'ch 9...	1 29 -1 31	1 38 -	1 21 -1 21 1/2	53 -55	35 -	0 75 -0 76	0 65 -	
do 25...	1 31 -1 40		1 24 -1 25	55 1/2 -56	33 1/2 -34	0 76 -0 77	0 71 -	
Ap'l 10...	1 34 -	1 40 -	1 31 -1 32	52 1/2 -53 1/2	35 1/2 -33 1/2	0 75 -	0 70 -0 80	
do 25...	1 36 -1 39	1 45 -1 46	1 31 -1 35	55 1/2 -55 1/2	35 1/2 -	0 74 -0 75 1/2		
May 10...	1 30 -	1 38 -1 39	1 24 -1 27	50 -51 1/2	34 -	0 74 1/2 -0 75 1/2		
do 25...	1 21 1/2 -	1 28 -1 30	1 20 -	49 1/2 -50	30 -	0 72 -0 73		
June 10...	1 15 -	1 27 -1 29	1 14 -	45 1/2 -46 1/2	29 1/2 -	0 67 -0 68		
do 25...	1 10 -	1 20 -	1 04 -1 05	44 -41 1/2	30 1/2 -31	0 64 -0 66		
July 10...	1 10 -1 20	1 21 -	1 03 -1 04	47 -43	32 -	0 64 -0 66		
do 25...	1 11 -1 13	1 28 -	1 06 -1 15	49 -	34 -	0 65 -0 67		
Aug. 10...	1 09 -1 09 1/2		1 04 -1 09 1/2	49 1/2 -49 1/2	32 1/2 -32 1/2	0 69 -		
do 24...	1 09 -1 10	1 18 -1 18 1/2		49 -49 1/2	31 -	0 66 -0 67		
Sept. 10...	1 05 1/2 -1 06	1 13 -1 13 1/2		49 1/2 -49 1/2	30 -	0 64 -		
do 25...	1 07 1/2 -1 07 3/4	1 12 -1 13		49 1/2 -49 1/2	30 -	0 64 -		
Oct. 10...	1 04 -1 04 1/2	1 07 1/2 -1 07 3/4		50 -50 1/2	29 -	0 64 -		
do 25...	1 01 -1 01 1/2	1 03 1/2 -1 04 1/2		47 1/2 -	29 -	0 61 -		
Nov. 9...	1 06 1/2 -1 07	1 08 1/2 -		46 1/2 -46 1/2	28 1/2 -28 1/2	0 60 -		
do 25...	1 10 -	1 10 1/2 -		46 1/2 -47	31 -	0 62 -0 64	1 00 -1 20	
Dec. 10...	1 06 1/2 -1 08	1 07 1/2 -1 08 1/2		46 1/2 -	30 -30 1/2	0 61 -		
do 24...	1 09 -1 11	1 09 -1 09 1/2		46 1/2 -	30 1/2 -	0 60 1/2 -		

Provisions for the Years 1877-78.

Date.	Pens.	Pork.	Bacon.	Hams.	Lard.	Butter.	Cheese.	Hogs.
1877.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ - cts.	cents.	cents.	cents.
Jan. 10...	0 90 -	18 50 -	9 1/2 - 10	11 1/2 - 12	11 40 -11 50			8 1/2 - 8 1/2
do 25...	0 90 -	17 50 -17 75	9 - 9 1/2	10 - 11 1/2	11 25 -11 30			8 1/2 - 8 1/2
Feb. 10...	0 92 -	16 75 -16 80	8 1/2 - 9 1/2	10 - 11 1/2	11 20 -			8 1/2 - 8 1/2
do 24...		16 00 -	8 1/2 - 8 1/2	10 - 10 1/2	10 12 1/2 -10 17 1/2			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
M'ch 10...	0 99 -0 92	14 75 -15 50	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	9 - 10 1/2	9 50 - 9 70			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
do 24...	0 99 -0 91	14 90 -	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	9 - 10 1/2	9 85 -			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
Ap'l 10...	0 99 -	15 00 -15 50	8 - 8 1/2	9 - 10 1/2	9 75 - 9 80			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
do 25...	1 00 -	16 90 -17 00	8 1/2 - 8 1/2	9 - 10 1/2	10 32 1/2 -10 40			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
May 10...	1 10 -1 15	15 50 -	8 1/2 - 8 1/2	9 1/2 - 10	9 80 - 9 87 1/2			6 1/2 - 6 1/2
do 25...	1 10 -1 15	14 65 -	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	9 1/2 - 10	9 55 -			6 1/2 - 6 1/2
June 9...	1 00 -	14 15 -	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	9 1/2 - 10	8 20 - 9 00			6 1/2 - 6 1/2
do 25...	0 95 -	14 25 -14 50	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	9 1/2 - 10	9 20 - 9 25			6 1/2 - 6 1/2
July 10...	0 95 -1 00	14 30 -14 35	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	11 - 11 1/2	9 15 -			8 1/2 - 8 1/2
do 25...	0 93 -	14 30 -14 35	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	11 - 11 1/2	9 50 - 9 60			8 1/2 - 8 1/2
Aug. 10...	0 83 -	14 00 -	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	12 1/2 - 12 1/2	9 10 -			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
do 25...	0 89 -	13 00 -	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	12 1/2 - 12 1/2	8 50 - 8 60			7 1/2 - 7 1/2
Sept. 10...	0 80 -	13 35 -	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	12 1/2 - 12 1/2	9 15 - 9 17 1/2			7 - 7 1/2
do 25...	0 80 -	13 90 -14 00	7 1/2 - 8	12 1/2 - 12 1/2	9 27 1/2 -			7 - 7 1/2
Oct. 10...	0 85 -	14 35 -	8 1/2 - 8 1/2	12 -	9 15 - 9 25			
do 25...	0 81 -0 86	14 30 -14 40	8 1/2 - 8 1/2	12 -	8 95 -			
Nov. 10...	0 84 -	11 25 -	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	11 1/2 - 12	8 50 - 8 57			
do 24...	0 85 -	13 50 -	7 1/2 - 7 1/2	10 - 11	8 37 1/2 - 8 40			
Dec. 10...	0 77 -0 73	13 12 1/2 -13 50	6 1/2 - 7 1/2	10 - 11	8 50 - 8 52 1/2			
do 24...	0 85 -	13 25 -	6 1/2 - 6 1/2	10 - 11	8 12 1/2 - 8 15			
1878.								
Jan. 10...	0 86 -	12 00 -12 40	6 1/2 - 6 1/2	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	7 75 - 7 80			5 - 5 1/2
do 25...	0 81 -0 83	12 12 1/2 -12 25	6 1/2 - 6 1/2	8 - 9	7 75 - 7 77 1/2			
Feb. 9...		11 25 -11 40	5 1/2 - 6	8 - 9	7 60 - 7 65			
do 25...		11 00 -11 20	5 1/2 - 6	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	7 75 -			
M'ch 9...		9 87 1/2 -10 40	5 1/2 - 5 1/2	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	7 15 - 7 17 1/2			
do 25...		10 20 -10 50	5 1/2 - 5 1/2	6 - 8	7 47 1/2 - 7 50			
Ap'l 10...		9 87 1/2 -10 00	5 1/2 - 5 1/2	6 - 7 1/2	7 27 1/2 - 7 30			
do 25...	0 84 -0 85	9 65 -10 00	5 1/2 - 5 1/2	6 - 7 1/2	7 22 1/2 - 7 25			
May 10...	0 83 -	9 40 -9 75	5 - 5 1/2	6 - 7 1/2	7 17 1/2 -			
June 10...		8 65 - 8 75	4 90 - 5 1/2	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	6 75 - 6 77 1/2			
do 25...		10 00 -10 25	5 - 5 1/2	9 - 9 1/2	7 05 - 7 15			
July 10...		10 50 -10 70	5 1/2 - 6	9 1/2 - 11	7 25 -			
do 25...		10 25 -10 50	6 - 6 1/2	10 - 11 1/2	7 20 -			
Aug. 10...		10 25 -10 50	6 - 6 1/2	11 - 11 1/2	7 30 -			
do 24...		10 75 -11 00	6 1/2 - 6 1/2	11 1/2 - 12	7 80 - 7 85			
Sept. 10...		10 25 -10 50	6 1/2 - 7	11 1/2 - 12	7 50 -			
do 25...		9 00 - 9 45	6 1/2 - 6 1/2	9 1/2 - 10 1/2	7 02 1/2 - 7 05			
Oct. 10...		8 90 -10 00	6 - 6 1/2	9 1/2 - 10 1/2	6 75 - 6 85			
do 25...		8 80 - 9 75	6 - 6 1/2	9 1/2 - 10	6 67 1/2 - 6 70			
Nov. 9...		8 30 - 8 75	5 1/2 - 6	9 1/2 - 10	6 47 1/2 - 6 50			
do 25...		7 50 - 7 60	4 1/2 - 5 1/2	7 1/2 - 8 1/2	6 17 1/2 - 6 20			
Dec. 10...		7 40 - 7 70	4 1/2 - 4 1/2	7 - 7 1/2	6 07 1/2 - 6 10			
do 24...	0 73 -	7 35 - 7 60	4 1/2 - 4 1/2	6 1/2 - 7	5 95 - 5 97 1/2			
	0 80 -	7 15 - 7 50	4 - 4 1/2	5 1/2 - 6 1/2	5 77 1/2 -			

SEMI-MONTHLY Prices of Grain and

Date.	Wheat.				Corn.	Oats.	Rye.	Barley.
	No. 2 Red, per bush.	No. 1 White, per bush.	No. 1 Spring, per bush.	No. 2 Spring, per bush.				
1879.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Jan. 10...	1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 10 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	1 10 -1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 00 -	47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 55-0 60	1 00-1 03
do 25...	1 09 -1 09 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 10 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.....	0 98 -1 00	46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -48	31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	0 60-0 60 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....
Feb. 10...	1 09 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 09 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 09	1 07 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	1 03 -1 04 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 60-0 62 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....
do 25...	1 13 -	1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	.....	46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -47	34 -	0 61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -0 63	0 68 -
M'ch 10...	1 16 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17	1 15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	.....	45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	34 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	0 61-0 63 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 95-1 05
do 25...	1 15 -	1 13 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	.....	45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -32	0 61 -	.....
Ap'l 10...	1 13 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 14	1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	.....	45 -45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	0 59-0 60	0 60-0 61
do 25...	1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 13	1 11 -1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	45 -45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 58-0 61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....
May 10...	1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 17 -	.....	.....	43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	34 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -35 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 63 -	0 88 -
do 24...	1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 13 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	.....	40 -40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	35 -35 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 63 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -0 64	.....
June 10...	1 18 -1 18 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 17 -	.....	.....	44 -44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	40 -40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 65-0 65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....
do 25...	1 20 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	1 14 -1 14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	43 -43 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	38 -38 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 65-0 65 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....
July 10...	1 20 -1 22	1 18 -	.....	.....	45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 64 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -0 65	.....
do 25...	1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 15 -	.....	.....	44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -37	0 67 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....
Aug. 9...	1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 09 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 11 -1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -46	34 -34 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 68 -	.....
do 25...	1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	30 -30 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 67 -	.....
Sept 10...	1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	47 -47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	34 -	0 67 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....
do 25...	1 23 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 24 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 23 -1 23 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	53 -	37 -	0 80 -	.....
Oct. 10...	1 37 -1 37 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 37	.....	.....	55 -	39 -39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 83 -	0 90-0 98
do 25...	1 47 -1 47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 46 -1 47	.....	.....	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -62	41 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -42	0 90-0 92	0 95-1 03
Nov. 10...	1 40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 40 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 39 -1 39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	58 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -60	44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 90 -	0 90 -
do 25...	1 47 -1 48	1 45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	.....	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -61	46 -46 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 91-0 92	.....
Dec. 10...	1 58 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 59	1 55 -1 57	.....	.....	66 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -67	51 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -51 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 95-0 97	0 72 -
do 24...	1 59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 55 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 56	.....	.....	64 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	50 -	0 97 -	.....
1880.								
Jan. 10...	1 53 -1 53 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 51	.....	1 45 -1 46	59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -49	0 95-0 96	.....
do 24...	1 39 -1 42 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 40	.....	1 30 -1 31	61 -61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	47 -47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 90-0 91	0 95
Feb. 10...	1 49 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 50	1 48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	.....	1 36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	60 -61	47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	0 95	.....
do 25...	1 51 -1 52	1 48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 49	.....	1 45 -1 47	60 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -60 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 -48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 97	.....
Mar. 10...	1 44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 46	1 42 -1 42 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	61 -61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 -48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 97	.....
do 25...	1 45 -1 47	1 38 -1 39	.....	1 33 -1 40	56 -56 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	42 -42 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 94	0 91-1 06 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Aprill 10...	1 36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 37 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 32 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 28 -1 30	53 -54	41 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -42	0 88-0 90	.....
do 24...	1 31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 32	1 28 -1 28 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	.....	52 -52 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	41 -42	0 88-0 89	.....
May 10...	1 30 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 31 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 24 -1 24 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 24	50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -51	41 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -42	0 91	.....
do 25...	1 34 -1 35	1 27 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 27 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 19 -1 22	53 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -54	44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -45	0 95	.....
June 10...	1 29 -1 30	1 26 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 27	.....	1 17 -1 20	51 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -52	38 -39	0 98	.....
do 25...	1 20 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 21 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 09 -1 11	50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -51	35 -36	0 96	.....
July 10...	1 24 -1 26	1 16 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 11 -1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	48 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -49	36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 90	.....
do 24...	1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	1 07 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 07 -1 08	47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	35 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -36 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 82	.....
Aug. 10...	1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 09	1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 06 -1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	49 -49 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -40	0 80-0 81	.....
do 25...	1 08 -1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 08 -1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 04 -1 06	51 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	38 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 92	.....
Sept. 10...	1 06 -1 06	1 04 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 04 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 02 -1 05	50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> 51	42 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -43	0 89-0 90	.....
do 25...	1 06 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 07	1 08 -1 08 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 05	50 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	43 -44	0 95	.....
Oct. 10...	1 15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17	1 15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17	.....	1 06	54 -54 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -39 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 98-1 00	.....
do 25...	1 16 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 17	1 14 -1 15	.....	.....	55 -55 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	38 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -38 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 03-1 05	.....
Nov. 10...	1 20 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 20 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 18 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 18 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.....	1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	59 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -60	42 -42 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 04	0 78-1 11
do 25...	1 25 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 27	1 22 -1 24	.....	1 20	61 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -45 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 07	1 00-1 05
Dec. 10...	1 17 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 20 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 16 -1 18	.....	1 16	58 -58 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -44 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	0 98-1 00	0 97-1 08
do 24...	1 13 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -1 13	.....	1 13 -1 15	57 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -55 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	42	0 98	1 10-1 35

Provisions for the Years 1879-80.

Date.	Peas.	Pork.	Bacon.	Ham.	Lard.	Butter.	Cheesc.	Hogs.
1879.	cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	cents.
Jan. 10...	75 -	7 50 - 9 00	37 - 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 05 - 6 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	16 - 20	8 - 9	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	73 -	8 75 - 10 00	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 - 7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 45 - 6 50	17 - 21	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Feb. 10...	73-75	9 00 - 10 75	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 07 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	17 - 20	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	73-74	9 70 - 11 00	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 05 - 7 10	15 - 19	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
M'ch 10...	72-73	9 25 - 10 25	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 50 -	15 - 20	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	72-73	9 25 - 10 50	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 - 8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 40 - 6 47 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	13 - 16	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Ap'l 10...	72-73	9 40 - 10 50	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 - 8	6 50 - 6 60	10 - 14	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	76-78	9 40 - 10 50	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 - 8	6 20 - 6 25	14 - 17	6 - 7	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
May 10...	75 -	9 00 - 10 25	5 - 5	7 - 8	6 27 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6 32 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12 - 15	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 8	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 24...	75-78	9 00 - 10 00	5 - 5	7 - 8	6 32 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6 35	14 - 16	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 8	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
June 10...	76-77	9 00 - 10 25	5 - 5	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9	6 37 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6 40	12 - 14	6 - 7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	71-75	9 25 - 10 20	5 - 5	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 37 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6 40	12 - 14	5 - 6	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6
July 10...	75 -	9 50 - 10 25	5 10 -	8 - 10	6 37 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6 40	12 - 13 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 - 6	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6
do 25...	70 -	10 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 10 25	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	9 - 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 05 -	13 - 14 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Aug. 9...	70 -	9 12 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 25	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 80 -	14 - 15 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	70 -	8 75 -	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5	9 - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 00 -	14 - 15	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Sept 10...	70 -	8 80 - 8 90	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9	6 07 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 6 15	15 - 17	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 7	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	70 -	8 80 - 9 25	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 45 - 6 50	20 - 23	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 11	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Oct. 10...	.....	9 20 - 9 50	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> -	8 - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6 50 - 6 52 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	18 - 23	9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> - 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
do 25...	75 -	10 10 - 10 65	6 -	8 - 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 10 - 7 15	23 - 28		

SEMI-MONTHLY Prices of Grain and

Date.	Wheat.				Corn. No. 2 Mixed, per bush.	Oats. No. 2 Mixed, per bush.	Rye States and Canada, per bush.	Barley. States and Canada, per bush.
	No. 2 Red, per bush.	No. 1 White, per bush.	No. 1 Spring, per bush.	No. 2 Spring, per bush.				
1881.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Jan. 10	1 18-1 19	1 13-1 17	.....	1 13	57 1/2-58	44 1/2-44 3/4	1 00	.....
do 25	1 18-1 18 1/2	1 15 1/2-1 16	.....	1 13 1/2-1 17	55-57	41 1/2-42 1/2	0 97-1 00	.....
Feb. 10	1 16 1/2-1 17 1/2	1 15-1 15 1/2	.....	1 14	56 1/2-58	45	0 97-0 98	1 27 1/2-1 30
do 25	1 17 1/2-1 18 1/2	1 15 1/2-1 16 1/2	.....	1 17	57-58 1/2	44-44 1/2	1 03	1 20-1 30
March 10	1 20 1/2-1 22	1 18 1/2-1 18 3/4	.....	.....	58 1/2-59	44	1 03-1 03 1/2	.....
do 25	1 23-1 24	1 20 1/2-1 21 1/2	.....	.....	58-59 1/2	44-44 1/2	1 06 1/2	.....
April 10	1 22 1/2-1 24	1 21-1 21 1/2	.....	.....	58-59 1/2	46 1/2-47	1 09 1/2	1 10-1 18
do 25	1 26 1/2-1 27 1/2	1 23-1 24	.....	1 26 1/2	60 1/2-60 1/2	46-46 1/2	1 16	.....
May 10	1 26-1 27	1 25-1 27	.....	1 21-1 22	62-62 1/2	46	1 13	0 93-1 00
do 25	1 27-1 28	1 25-1 28	.....	1 22	58-58 1/2	45 1/2-46	1 13-1 15	.....
June 10	1 25 1/2-1 26 1/2	1 19 1/2-1 19 3/4	.....	1 19 1/2-1 19 3/4	56 1/2-56 1/2	47 1/2-48	1 10	.....
do 20	1 29 1/2-1 30 1/2	1 28 1/2-1 28 3/4	.....	1 25 1/2-1 25 1/2	57 1/2-58 1/2	43	1 09	.....
July 9	1 26-1 27 1/2	1 24 1/2-1 25 1/2	.....	1 20 1/2	55-55 1/2	42 1/2-43 1/2	1 00-1 03	.....
do 25	1 26-1 26 1/2	1 23	.....	1 16-1 16 1/2	57-57 1/2	44 1/2-45	0 83-0 89	.....
Aug. 10	1 31-1 31 1/2	1 28 1/2-1 29	.....	1 23	59 1/2-59 3/4	45 1/2-46	0 90-0 91	.....
do 25	1 44 1/2-1 45 1/2	1 43-1 43 1/2	.....	1 36-1 39	71 1/2-73	41-42 1/2	1 06-1 08	.....
Sept. 10	1 44 1/2-1 45 1/2	1 41 1/2-1 45	.....	1 35-1 37 1/2	71 1/2-71 1/2	51	1 05	.....
do 24	1 49 1/2-1 49 1/2	1 47 1/2-1 48 1/2	.....	1 41 1/2-1 42	74 1/2-74 1/2	43 1/2-44	1 08	.....
Oct. 10	1 50 1/2-1 51 1/2	1 48-1 48 1/2	.....	1 38-1 40	71-72	47 1/2-48 1/2	1 11 1/2	1 20
do 25	1 49-1 51 1/2	1 45 1/2-1 46 1/2	.....	1 42 1/2-1 43	70-72	46-47 1/2	1 05 1/2-1 06	1 16-1 21
Nov. 10	1 40 1/2-1 42 1/2	1 38 1/2-1 40 1/2	.....	1 38-1 40	67 1/2-68 1/2	47 1/2-48	1 03	.....
do 25	1 39 1/2-1 41 1/2	1 36 1/2-1 39	.....	1 36 1/2-1 38	65-65 1/2	48 1/2-50 1/2	1 03-1 03 1/2	1 11-1 16
Dec. 10	1 42 1/2-1 44	1 38 1/2-1 38 1/2	.....	.....	70 1/2-71	50 1/2-52	0 97-1 00	1 20
do 23	1 39 1/2-1 41 1/2	1 38 1/2-1 38 1/2	.....	1 28-1 28 1/2	68 1/2-72	48 1/2-49 1/2	0 96	1 10
1882.								
Jan. 10	1 43 1/2-1 44	1 40 1/2-1 42	.....	.....	69-69 1/2	51 1/2-53	0 96 1/2	1 05-1 29
do 25	1 47 1/2-1 49 1/2	1 43 1/2-1 45	.....	.....	70-72	49 1/2-50	0 96 1/2	1 05
Feb. 10	1 39 1/2-1 40 1/2	1 35 1/2-1 36 1/2	.....	1 37-1 28	67 1/2-68 1/2	47 1/2-49 1/2	0 96-0 97	0 90-1 17
do 25	1 31 1/2-1 32 1/2	1 28	.....	1 30-1 32	67-69	49 1/2-49 1/2	0 90 1/2	0 93-1 14
March 10	1 31 1/2-1 32 1/2	1 31	.....	1 25-1 30	71-72	51-52 1/2	0 89-0 90	0 90-1 12
do 25	1 43-1 45 1/2	1 39	.....	1 36	75-78	53 1/2-53 1/2	0 93	1 15-1 17 1/2
April 10	1 40-1 42	1 38	.....	1 33	82 1/2-83	59-60	0 93-0 94	1 00-1 25

Provisions for the Years 1881-82.

Peas.	Pork.	Bacon.	Ham.	Lard.	Butter.	Cheese.	Hogs.
Canada in bond, per bush.	Mess. per bri.	per lb.	per lb.	Western prime, per 100 lbs.	State Dairy, good to choice, per lb.	State Factory, good to choice, per lb.	Dressed, per lb.
cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	cents.
87-88	12 75	7 1/2	7 1/2-8	9-17 1/2-9 20	23-25	12-13 1/2	6 1/2-6 3/4
87-88	13 50-13 75	7 1/2-8	8 1/2-9	9 60	24-26	12 1/2-13 1/2	6 1/2-6 3/4
86-87	14 25-14 50	8 1/2-8 1/2	8 1/2-9 1/2	10 00	24-26	12 1/2-13 1/2	7 1/2-7 3/4
86	15 25-16 25	8 1/2-8 1/2	9 1/2-9 1/2	10 52 1/2	23-25	12-13 1/2	7 1/2-8
85-86	15 25-16 25	8 55-8 95	9 1/2-9 1/2	10 75-10 77 1/2	23-24	12 1/2-13 1/2	7 1/2-7 3/4
85-87	15 00-15 50	8 1/2-8 1/2	9 1/2-9 1/2	10 77 1/2-10 85	25-30	12 1/2-13 1/2	7 1/2-8
85-87	16 00-18 00	8 1/2-8 1/2	9 1/2-9 1/2	11 10	24-29	12 1/2-13 1/2	7 1/2-8
89-90	16 25-18 00	9-9 1/2	9 1/2-10 1/2	11 55-11 65	21-24	12 1/2-14	8 1/2-8 3/4
85-88	16 00-17 30	8 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-10 1/2	11 20	19-22	11 1/2-13 1/2	7 1/2-8
85	16 00-17 00	8 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-10 1/2	11 05-11 10	21-24	12 1/2-14	7 1/2-8
.....	15 75-16 75	8 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-10 1/2	11 05-11 10	19-21	11 1/2-12 1/2	7 1/2-7 3/4
85	16 50-17 00	8 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-11	11 32 1/2-11 35	20-22	12 1/2-13 1/2	8
85	17 25-17 50	8 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-11 1/2	12 00-12 02 1/2	20-22	12 1/2-13 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4
85-86	18 25-18 50	9 1/2-10	11-11 1/2	12 10	19-21	10 1/2-11	8 1/2-8 3/4
85-86	17 85-18 00	9 1/2-10	11-11 1/2	11 45	21-23	9 1/2-10 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4
85-86	18 50	9 1/2-9 1/2	11 1/2-12	11 45-11 47 1/2	23-25 1/2	10 1/2-11 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4
85-87	19 75-20 00	11	12 1/2-12 1/2	12 40	28-31	11 1/2-12 1/2	8-8 1/2
.....	20 00	11 1/2-11 1/2	12 1/2-12 1/2	12 40	28-30	12-13	8 1/2-9
.....	19 75	10 1/2-11 1/2	12 1/2-12 1/2	12 00-12 15	27-31	12-12	8 1/2-8 3/4
.....	18 00	10-10 1/2	12 1/2-12 1/2	11 72 1/2-11 87 1/2	28-33	12-13	8-8 1/2
95	17 50	9 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-10 1/2	11 27 1/2-11 32 1/2	28-33	12-12 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4
91	17 50	9 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-10 1/2	11 30	31-35	11 1/2-12 1/2	7 1/2-8 1/2
95	17 50	9 1/2-9 1/2	10 1/2-10 1/2	11 25-11 27 1/2	32-35	11 1/2-12 1/2	7 1/2-8 1/2
95	17 75	9-9 1/2	9 1/2-10	11 15-11 20	32-35	11 1/2-12 1/2	7 1/2-8
95	16 87 1/2-18 00	9 1/2-9 1/2	9 1/2-10 1/2	11 30	30-31	11-13	8-8 1/2
90	17 00-18 00	9 1/2-9 1/2	9 1/2-10	11 47 1/2-11 50	32-37	11 1/2-13 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4
90	17 00-18 25	9 1/2-9 1/2	9 1/2-10 1/2	11 27 1/2-11 35	33-42	11 1/2-13 1/2	8 1/2-9
99	16 75-18 00	9 1/2-9 1/2	10-10 1/2	10 55	41-41	11 1/2-13	8 1/2-8 1/2
.....	16 25-17 50	9 1/2-9 1/2	10-10 1/2	10 65-10 70	37-41	10 1/2-12 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4
90	16 50-17 50	9 1/2-10	10 1/2-11	11 00	39-43	10 1/2-13	8 1/2-9
92 1/2-95	16 75-18 00	9 1/2-10 1/2	11 1/2-12	11 45-11 47 1/2	38-40	10 1/2-13 1/2	8 1/2-9

MONTREAL PRICES, 1877-78.—Compiled from

Date.	Wheat, White, Winter, per bush.	Wheat, Red, Winter, per bush.	Wheat, Spring, per bush.	Corn, per bush of 56 lbs.	Rye, per bush of 56 lbs.	Barley, per bush. of 48 lbs.	Oats, per bush. of 32 lbs.	Peas, per bush. of 60 lbs.
1877.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Jan. 10	.....	.....	.....	60 to 62½	.....	55 to 60	37 to 38	78 to 79
do 25	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	37 " 38	78 " 79
Feb. 10	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	82 " 84
do 25	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
March 10	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
do 25	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
April 10	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
do 25	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
May 10	.....	.....	.....	65 " 70	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
do 25	.....	.....	.....	67½ " 70	.....	57 " 62½	40 " 45	80 " 82
June 10	.....	1 55 to 1 57	.....	53 " 54	.....	65 " 75	46 " 48	97 " 99
do 25	.....	1 54 " 1 57	.....	56	.....	60 " 65	38 " 40	85 " 87½
July 10	.....	1 52½ " 1 57	56½ " 57	57 " 58	.....	60 " 65	39 " 41	87 " 89
do 25	.....	1 52½ " 1 57½	56½ " 57	57 " 58	.....	60 " 65	39 " 41	85 " 87½
Aug. 10	.....	1 35 " 1 37½	56½ " 57	56½ " 57	.....	60 " 65	38 " 40	82½ " 85
do 25	.....	.....	55 " 56	55 " 56	.....	60 " 65	35 " 37	80 " 82
Sept. 10	1 35 to 1 40	.....	1 30 to 1 32	56	.....	60 " 65	34 " 35	85 " 87½
do 25	1 40 " 1 45	1 35 to 1 40	1 30 " 1 35	56½ " 57	.....	55 " 65	32 " 33	80 " 81
Oct. 10	1 31 " 1 40	1 30 " 1 33	1 24 " 1 30	56 " 57	.....	55 " 65	31 " 32	74 " 75½
do 25	1 33 " 1 40	1 30 " 1 33	1 20 " 1 28	57 " 58	.....	55 " 62½	27 " 29	71 " 73
Nov. 10	1 29 " 1 36	.....	1 16 " 1 22	57 " 58	.....	55 " 62½	27 " 29	71 " 73
do 25	1 29 " 1 36	.....	1 18 " 1 22	62½ " 65	.....	55 " 62½	27 " 29	71 " 73
Dec. 10	1 29 " 1 36	.....	1 18 " 1 22	62½ " 65	.....	55 " 62½	28 " 30	71 " 73
do 24	1 29 " 1 36	.....	1 18 " 1 22	62½ " 65	.....	55 " 62½	28 " 30	71 " 73

1st Q'rter	.....	.....	.....	62½	.....	62½	43	81
2nd do	.....	.....	.....	62	.....	71	45½	96½
3rd do	.....	.....	1 51	57	.....	65	39	85½
4th do	1 37½	1 33	1 24½	60½	.....	63	30½	74

1878.	Wheat, White, Winter, per bush.	Wheat, Red, Winter, per bush.	Wheat, Spring, per bush.	Corn, per bush of 56 lbs.	Rye, per bush of 56 lbs.	Barley, per bush. of 48 lbs.	Oats, per bush. of 32 lbs.	Peas, per bush. of 60 lbs.
Jan. 10	1 29 to 1 36	.....	1 18 to 1 22	62½ to 65	.....	55 to 65	28 to 30	71 to 73
do 25	.....	.....	.....	62½ " 65	.....	55 " 65	28 " 30	71 " 73
Feb. 10	.....	.....	.....	62½ " 65	.....	55 " 65	27 " 29	71 " 73
do 25	.....	.....	.....	62½ " 65	.....	55 " 65	27 " 29	71 " 73
March 10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
do 25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
April 10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
do 25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
May 10	.....	1 30 " 1 35	1 18 " 1 21	53	.....	55 " 65	34	81 " 82
do 25	1 30 " 1 35	1 30 " 1 32	1 13 " 1 16	50	.....	55 " 60	31	77 " 80
June 10	.....	.....	1 02 " 1 10	45 " 46	.....	50 " 55	28 " 30	73 " 75
do 25	.....	.....	0 96 " 1 00	44 " 45	.....	47½ " 52	26 " 28	72 " 73
July 10	.....	.....	0 98 " 1 01½	48 " 49	.....	50 " 55	25 " 27	73 " 74
do 25	.....	.....	1 02 " 1 06	50	.....	50 " 55	28 " 30	75 " 75½
Aug. 10	.....	.....	1 06 " 1 10	48 " 49	.....	50 " 55	29 " 30	75 " 76½
do 25	.....	.....	1 14 " 1 16	49 " 50	.....	.....	29 " 30	76 " 77
Sept. 10	1 00 " 1 12½	1 03 " 1 04	1 05 " 1 06	48 " 49	.....	.....	29	75 " 76
do 25	.....	1 01 " 1 02	1 00 " 1 01	48	.....	85 " 90	29 " 30	71 " 72
Oct. 10	.....	0 96 " 0 97	0 90 " 0 92	45	.....	85 " 90	28	69 " 70
do 25	.....	0 94 " 0 95	0 86	45	.....	75 " 85	28	68 " 69
Nov. 10	.....	0 99	0 86 " 0 87	45	.....	75 " 85	27	66 " 67
do 25	.....	0 98	.....	.....	.....	75 " 85	28	66 " 67
Dec. 10	.....	.....	.....	46 " 47½	.....	70 " 80	28	66 " 67
do 24	.....	.....	.....	46 " 47½	.....	70 " 80	28 " 29	66 " 67

1st Q'rter	.....	.....	1 22	65	.....	65	29½	73
2nd do	.....	1 32	1 11½	51	.....	58½	31½	77½
3rd do	.....	1 04½	1 06½	49	.....	66½	29½	75
4th do	.....	0 97	0 88	46	.....	84	28	68

the Records of the Montreal Corn Exchange.

Flour, Superfine Extra, per brl.	Flour, S. Bakers, per brl.	Lard, per lb.	Butter, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.	Hams, per lb.	Bacon, per lb.	Pork, per brl. of 200 lbs.	Dressed Hogs, per 100 lbs.
\$ cts.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	cents.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
7 00 to 7 10	6 50 to 6 60	12 to 13	16 to 24	12½ to 13½	13 to 14	.....	20 00 to 20 50	7 10 to 7 20
7 00 " 7 10	6 55 " 6 70	11 " 13	16 " 24	12½ " 13½	13 " 14	.....	20 00 " 20 50	6 75 " 6 90
7 05 " 7 20	6 60 " 6 75	11 " 12	16 " 25	14 " 15	13 " 14	.....	19 00 " 19 50	6 50 " 6 75
7 10 " 7 20	6 60 " 6 75	10 " 12	15 " 22	14 " 15	12½ " 13	.....	18 50 " 19 00	6 00
7 15 " 7 25	6 60 " 6 75	10 " 12	15 " 22	13½ " 15	12½ " 13	.....	17 50 " 18 00	.....
9 15 " 9 25	8 50 " 8 65	11 " 12½	22 " 24	14 " 15	12½ " 13	.....	18 00 " 18 50	.....
9 15 " 9 30	8 50 " 8 75	11 " 12½	21 " 22	12 " 13	12½ " 13	.....	17 75 " 18 25	.....
8 70 " 8 85	7 90 " 8 15	11 " 12	19 " 22	12½ " 13	12½ " 13	.....	17 75 " 18 25	.....
8 25 " 8 50	7 50 " 7 75	11 " 12	19 " 22	12½ " 13	12½ " 13	.....	17 00 " 17 50	.....
7 90 " 8 10	7 15 " 7 40	11 " 12	14 " 19	8 " 9	12 " 13	.....	16 75 " 17 00	.....
8 10 " 8 25	7 40 " 7 60	11 " 11½	14 " 19	8 " 9	12 " 13	.....	16 50 " 17 00	.....
7 60 " 7 75	6 80 " 7 05	11 " 11½	15 " 19	9 " 10	11 " 12	.....	16 50 " 17 00	.....
7 35 " 7 50	6 80 " 7 05	11 " 11½	16 " 22	9 " 10	12 " 13	.....	16 25 " 16 50	.....
6 20 " 6 40	6 00 " 6 25	10 " 11	16 " 21	10 " 11	10 " 11	.....	16 00 " 16 50	.....
6 45 " 6 55	6 10 " 6 30	10 " 11	16 " 21	11 " 12	12 " 13	.....	16 00 " 16 50	.....
6 40 " 6 55	6 20 " 6 40	10 " 11	16 " 21	11 " 12	12 " 13	.....	17 75 " 18 00	.....
6 20 " 6 25	5 80 " 6 00	11 " 11½	15 " 22	12 " 13	12 " 13	.....	17 75 " 18 00	.....
6 05 " 6 15	5 60 " 5 80	11 " 11½	13 " 21	12 " 13	12 " 13	.....	17 75 " 18 00	.....
5 85 " 5 95	5 45 " 5 60	11 " 11½	13 " 21	11 " 12	12 " 13	.....	16 87½ " 17 50	.....
6 05 " 6 10	5 55 " 5 75	11 " 11½	13 " 21	11 " 12	12 " 13	.....	16 50 " 17 25	.....
5 95 " 6 00	5 40 " 5 65	10 " 11	11 " 20	11 " 12	12 " 13	.....	15 50 " 16 25	.....
5 99 " 6 00	5 40 " 5 60	10 " 11	10 " 20	12 " 12	12 " 13	.....	15 50 " 16 25	5 50 " 5 75

7 15	6 71	12½	24	14½	13½	.....	19 40	6 71½
8 54	7 91	12½	21	12½	13	.....	17 91½	.....
7 22½	6 48	11½	21	10½	13	.....	16 66½	.....
6 67½	5 73½	11½	21	12½	13	.....	17 21	5 75

5 91	5 35	10	20	14½	10½	.....	14 37½	5 21
4 88½	5 20	9½	17	11	10	.....	12 92½	.....
4 83½	5 18½	10	16	8½	12½	.....	13 46	.....
4 43	4 45	9	17	9	12	.....	12 21	3 87½

\* New.

Record incomplete.

Winter trade only.

MONTREAL PRICES, 1880-81.—Compiled from

Date.	Wheat, White, Winter, per bushel.	Wheat, Red, Winter, per bushel.	Wheat, Spring, per bushel.	Corn, per bushel of 56 lbs. — In Bond.	Rye, per bushel of 56 lbs.	Barley, per bushel of 48 lbs.	Oats, per bushel of 32 lbs.	Peas, per bushel of 60 lbs.
1880.	\$ cts	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
Jan. 10	1 40 to 1 43	1 36 " 1 38	1 40 to 1 43	60 to 62	82 to 83	55 to 65	31 " 33	72 " 73
do 25	1 36 " 1 38	1 36 " 1 38	1 36 " 1 38	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 33	72 " 74
Feb. 10	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	70 " 71
do 25	1 39 " 1 40	1 39 " 1 40	1 39 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	30 " 32	70 " 72
Mar. 10	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	71 " 72
do 25	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	71 " 72
April 10	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	71 " 72
do 25	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	46 " 47	83 " 84	60 " 65	31 " 33	76 " 78
May 10	1 29 " 1 30	1 29 " 1 30	1 29 " 1 30	47 " 48	83 " 84	60 " 65	32 " 33	76 " 78
do 25	1 33 to 1 35	1 30 " 1 32	1 30 " 1 32	50 " 51	88 " 89	60 " 65	33 " 34	78 " 80
June 10	1 20 to 1 22	1 20 " 1 22	1 20 " 1 22	49 " 50	91 " 92	60 " 65	35 " 35½	81 " 82
do 25	1 12½ " 1 14	1 15 " 1 20	1 24 " 1 25	49 " 50	91 " 92	60 " 65	34 " 34½	82 " 83
July 10	1 14 " 1 15	1 15 " 1 16	1 17 " 1 20	48 " 49	91 " 92	60 " 65	34 " 34½	84 " 85
do 25	1 18 " 1 19	1 20 " 1 25	1 20 " 1 25	48 " 49	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Aug. 10	1 16 " 1 17	1 20 " 1 25	1 20 " 1 25	50 " 51	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 10 " 1 11	1 09 " 1 10	1 10 " 1 11	53 " 54	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Sept 10	1 09 " 1 10	1 08 " 1 09	1 10 " 1 11	52 " 53	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 09 " 1 10	1 08 " 1 09	1 10 " 1 11	52 " 53	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Oct 10	1 10 " 1 11	1 10 " 1 11	1 16 " 1 18	52 " 53	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 12 " 1 14	1 12 " 1 14	1 16 " 1 18	53 " 54	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Nov. 10	1 14 " 1 15	1 11 " 1 16	1 18 " 1 23	56 " 57	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 20 " 1 22	1 23 " 1 24	1 25 " 1 30	60 " 62	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Dec. 10	1 25 " 1 28	1 19 " 1 21	1 21 " 22	60 " 61	87 " 89	65 " 75	34 " 35	73 " 75
do 24	1 25 " 1 28	1 19 " 1 21	1 21 " 22	60 " 61	87 " 89	65 " 75	34 " 35	73 " 75
1st Q'rter	1 18	1 27½	1 39½	62	83	65	32½	72½
2nd do	1 13½	1 11	1 22	61½	89	65	33½	79
3rd do	1 13½	1 11	1 22	51	82	65½	33	74
4th do	1 15½	1 18½	1 23	57	93½	72	33	76
1881.								
Jan. 10	1 40 to 1 43	1 36 " 1 38	1 40 to 1 43	60 to 62	82 to 83	55 to 65	31 " 33	72 " 73
do 25	1 36 " 1 38	1 36 " 1 38	1 36 " 1 38	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 33	72 " 74
Feb. 10	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	70 " 71
do 25	1 39 " 1 40	1 39 " 1 40	1 39 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	30 " 32	70 " 72
March 10	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	71 " 72
do 25	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	71 " 72
April 10	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	1 38 " 1 40	60 " 62	82 " 83	55 " 65	31 " 32	71 " 72
do 25	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	1 35 " 1 36	46 " 47	83 " 84	60 " 65	31 " 33	76 " 78
May 10	1 29 " 1 30	1 29 " 1 30	1 29 " 1 30	47 " 48	83 " 84	60 " 65	32 " 33	76 " 78
do 25	1 33 to 1 35	1 30 " 1 32	1 30 " 1 32	50 " 51	88 " 89	60 " 65	33 " 34	78 " 80
June 10	1 20 to 1 22	1 20 " 1 22	1 20 " 1 22	49 " 50	91 " 92	60 " 65	35 " 35½	81 " 82
do 25	1 12½ " 1 14	1 15 " 1 20	1 24 " 1 25	49 " 50	91 " 92	60 " 65	34 " 34½	82 " 83
July 10	1 14 " 1 15	1 15 " 1 16	1 17 " 1 20	48 " 49	91 " 92	60 " 65	34 " 34½	84 " 85
do 25	1 18 " 1 19	1 20 " 1 25	1 20 " 1 25	48 " 49	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Aug. 10	1 16 " 1 17	1 20 " 1 25	1 20 " 1 25	50 " 51	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 10 " 1 11	1 09 " 1 10	1 10 " 1 11	53 " 54	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Sept 10	1 09 " 1 10	1 08 " 1 09	1 10 " 1 11	52 " 53	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 09 " 1 10	1 08 " 1 09	1 10 " 1 11	52 " 53	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Oct 10	1 10 " 1 11	1 10 " 1 11	1 16 " 1 18	52 " 53	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 12 " 1 14	1 12 " 1 14	1 16 " 1 18	53 " 54	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Nov. 10	1 14 " 1 15	1 11 " 1 16	1 18 " 1 23	56 " 57	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
do 25	1 20 " 1 22	1 23 " 1 24	1 25 " 1 30	60 " 62	91 " 92	60 " 65	33½ " 34	84 " 85
Dec. 10	1 25 " 1 28	1 19 " 1 21	1 21 " 22	60 " 61	87 " 89	65 " 75	34 " 35	73 " 75
do 24	1 25 " 1 28	1 19 " 1 21	1 21 " 22	60 " 61	87 " 89	65 " 75	34 " 35	73 " 75
1st Q'rter	1 18	1 27½	1 39½	62	83	65	32½	72½
2nd do	1 13½	1 11	1 22	61½	89	65	33½	79
3rd do	1 13½	1 11	1 22	51	82	65½	33	74
4th do	1 15½	1 18½	1 23	57	93½	72	33	76

the Records of the Montreal Corn Exchange.

Flour, Superfine Extra, per barrel.	Flour, S. Bakers, per brl.	Lard, per lb.	Butter, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.	Hams, per lb.	Bacon, per lb.	Pork, per brl. of 200 lbs.	Dressed Hogs, per 100 lbs.
\$ cts	\$ cts.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	\$ cts	\$ cts.
6 30 to 6 35	6 25 to 6 50	10 to 11½	15 to 28	12 to 13½	11 to 12½	8½ to 10	17 00 to 18 00	6 50 to 6 80
6 20 " 6 25	6 10 " 6 50	10 " 11½	15 " 28	13 " 14	11 " 12½	8½ " 10	17 00 " 18 00	6 35 " 6 50
6 07½ " 6 10	6 05 " 6 40	10½ " 11	15 " 28	14 " 15½	11 " 12½	9 " 10½	16 50 " 17 50	5 60 " 5 75
6 15	6 10 " 6 50	10 " 11	15 " 23	14 " 15½	11 " 12½	9 " 10½	16 50 " 17 00	5 25 " 5 50
6 15	6 10 " 6 50	10 " 11	15 " 22	14 " 15½	11 " 12½	9 " 11	16 00 " 17 00	5 00 " 5 25
6 15	6 50 " 6 75	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 11	15 75 " 16 25	5 25 " 5 50
6 10	6 50 " 6 75	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10½	15 00 " 16 00	6 25 " 5 50
6 00	6 10 " 6 40	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10½	14 50 " 15 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 90	6 10 " 6 40	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	14 50 " 15 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 80	5 90 " 6 20	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	14 25 " 15 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 50	5 55 " 5 90	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	14 75 " 15 25	5 25 " 5 50
5 30	5 35 " 6 00	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10½	15 00 " 16 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 60	5 60 " 6 40	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	15 50 " 17 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 85	5 90 " 6 10	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	16 00 " 17 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 40	5 45 " 5 90	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	16 50 " 17 50	5 25 " 5 50
5 30	5 35 " 6 00	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	17 00 " 18 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 15	5 20 " 5 70	10 " 10½	14 " 22	14 " 16	10½ " 11½	9 " 10	18 00 " 19 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 25	5 50 " 6 25	12 " 12½	18 " 26	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	18 00 " 19 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 20	5 25 " 5 50	12 " 12½	17 " 26	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	18 00 " 19 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 20	5 25 " 5 75	12 " 12½	17 " 27	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	17 50 " 18 50	5 25 " 5 50
5 20	5 30 " 5 75	12 " 12½	19 " 27	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	17 00 " 18 00	5 25 " 5 50
5 15	5 75 " 6 50	12 " 12½	18 " 27	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	16 50 " 17 00	6 25 " 6 50
5 60	5 65 " 6 00	12 " 12½	18 " 27	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	16 50 " 17 50	6 25 " 6 50
5 40	5 45 " 6 25	12 " 12½	16 " 27	12 " 12½	12 " 12½	10 " 11	16 00 " 17 00	6 30 " 6 50
6 18	6 52½	11	25	15	12½	10½	17 29	5 88½
5 80	6 55	11	22	13	11	10½	15 37½	.....
5 45½	6 74	11½	24	11½	12½	10½	17 92½	.....
5 38½	6 42½	12½	27	13	13	11	16 58½	6 50
5 30 to 5 35	5 75 to 6 25	12 to 12½	16 to 27	12 to 13	12½ to 13	10 " 11	16 00 to 17 00	6 50 to 6 65
5 30 " 5 35	5 75 " 6 25	12 " 12½	17 " 28	12 " 14	12½ " 13	10 " 11	16 50 " 17 50	6 75 " 6 90
5 30 " 5 35	5 75 " 6 20	12 " 12½	16 " 29	13 " 14	12½ " 13	10 " 11	17 50 " 18 50	7 75 " 8 00
5 25 " 5 30	5 75 " 6 20	12½ " 13	16 " 27	13 " 14	12½ " 13	11 " 12	18 50 " 19 00	8 25 " 8 50
5 25 " 5 30	5 65 " 6 20	13 " 14	16 " 24	13 " 14	12½ " 13	11½ " 12	18 50 " 19 50	8 25 " 8 50
5 35 " 5 40	5 65 " 6 20	14 " 14½	12 " 22	13 " 14	12½ " 13	11 " 12	19 50 " 20 00	8 25 " 8 50
5 35	5 55 " 6 20	14 " 14½	12 " 21	13 " 14	12½ " 13	10½ " 11	18 50 " 19 50	8 25 " 8 50
5 40	5 45 " 6 20	15 " 15½	15 " 21	13½ " 14	13 " 14	11 " 12	20 50 " 21 50	8 25 " 8 50
5 35	5 50 " 6 15	15 " 15½	15 " 21	12 " 12½	13 " 14	11 " 12	19 50 " 20 50	8 25 " 8 50
5 50	5 50 " 6 15	14½ " 14	14 " 20	9 " 9	13 " 13	11 " 12	19 50 " 20 50	8 25 " 8 50
5 45	5 50 " 6 15	14½ " 14	14 " 20	9 " 9	13 " 13	11 " 12	19 50 " 20 50	8 25 " 8 50
6 00	5 75 " 6 25	14½ " 14	15 " 21	9½ " 9½	13 " 14	11 " 12	19 50 " 20 50	8 25 " 8 50
5 90	5 85 " 6 50	14½ " 14	15 " 22	9½ " 9½	13 " 14	11 " 12	19 50 " 20 50	8 25 " 8 50
6 00	6 00 " 6 75	14½ " 14	15 " 24	10½ " 10½	13 " 14	11 " 12	20 00 " 21 00	8 25 " 8 50
6 10	6 00 " 6 75	15 " 15	15 " 23	9 " 9	13 " 14	11 " 12	21 00 " 22 00	8 25 " 8 50
6 35	6 00 " 6 75	15 " 15	15 " 18	24 " 24	11 " 11	12 " 13	21 00 " 22 00	8 25 " 8 50
6 35	6 00 " 6 75	15 " 15	15 " 18	24 " 24	11 " 11	12 " 13	21 50 " 22 50	8 25 " 8 50
6 55	6 60 " 7 25	15 " 15	15 " 18	25 " 25	12 " 12	13 " 14	22 50 " 23 50	8 25 " 8 50
6 75	6 80 " 7 75	15 " 15	15 " 17	25 " 25	11 " 11	13 " 14	23 00 " 24 00	8 25 " 8 50
6 35	6 40 " 7 00	15 " 15	15 " 17	25 " 25	11 " 11			

SCHEDULE of Quotations

Date.	Fall Wheat, Grade, per bush.			Spring Wheat, Grade, per bush.			Barley, Grade, per bush.	Rye, per bush.	Oats, per bush.	Flour, per brl.
	1	2	2	1	2	3				
1877.										
Jan. 10	1 38	1 33	1 25	1 24	1 23	.....	79	65	50	6 35-6 50
do 25	1 45	1 42	1 32	1 34	1 32	.....	74-76	65	50	6 75-7 00
Feb. 10	1 40	1 32	1 30	1 34	1 31	.....	74-76	75	60	6 75-7 00
do 25	1 50	1 48	1 38	1 40	1 39	.....	74-76	75	60	6 80-7 00
Mar. 10	1 50	1 46	1 33	1 38	1 36	.....	71-73	75	57	6 80-7 00
do 25	1 50	1 46	1 33	1 40	1 37	.....	70-72	70	53	6 80-7 00
Apr. 10	1 63	1 60	1 43	1 48	1 43	.....	72-76	76	55	7 10-7 25
do 25	2 00	1 90	1 65	1 84	1 81	.....	90-95	78	60	9 00-9 25
May 10	2 05	1 94	1 78	1 86	1 82	.....	93-96	78	64	8 75-9 00
do 25	1 95	1 86	1 67	1 63	1 59	.....	88-89	78	64	8 75-9 00
June 10	1 70	1 60	1 51	1 58	1 50	.....	80-83	78	63	7 80-8 25
do 25	1 65	1 58	1 46	1 51	1 48	.....	74-78	78	63	7 60-8 00
July 10	1 70	1 62	1 55	1 53	1 45	.....	80-82	75	65	8 00
do 25	1 65	1 60	1 50	1 60	1 57	1 45	75-80	78	65	7 80
Aug. 10	1 50	1 40	1 20	1 36	1 34	.....	72-76	78	65	7 00-7 25
do 25	1 17	1 14	1 08	1 16	1 14	.....	72-75	78	65	6 08-6 25
Sept. 10	1 30	1 27	1 16	1 22	1 19	.....	73-80	77	64	6 10-6 25
do 25	1 28	1 24	1 15	1 16	1 14	.....	73-78	65	57	6 00-6 15
Oct. 10	1 30	1 23	1 10	1 20	1 17	.....	73-78	63	53	5 90-6 00
do 25	1 30	1 22	1 13	1 16	1 14	.....	70	60	50	5 90-6 00
Nov. 10	1 28	1 24	1 15	1 10	1 08	1 04	65	63	53	5 70-5 80
do 25	1 29	1 26	1 15	1 12	1 09	1 03	65-67	68	59	5 70-5 80
Dec. 10	1 28	1 26	1 16	1 12	1 10	1 04	66-67	68	60	5 70-5 75
do 24	1 27	1 25	1 15	1 11	1 08	1 02	66	67	58	5 75-5 80
1st Q'tr	1 45	1 41	1 32	1 35	1 33	.....	71 1/2-75 1/2	75 1/2	46 1/2	6 65-6 91 1/2
2nd do	1 77	1 74	1 58	1 65	1 60	.....	83-86	77 1/2	61 1/2	8 21-8 43 1/2
3rd do	1 43	1 38	1 27	1 34	1 31	1 45	74-78 1/2	77 1/2	63 1/2	6 81 1/2-6 47 1/2
4th do	1 28 1/2	1 24 1/2	1 14	1 13 1/2	1 11	1 03 1/2	67 1/2-69 1/2	69	55 1/2	5 77 1/2-5 70
1878.										
Jan. 10	1 28	1 25	1 15	1 12	1 08	1 03	67-00	1 67	1 57	None
do 25	1 28	1 20	1 11	1 06	1 03	1 94	64-65	1 65	1 54	.....
Feb. 10	1 27	1 21	1 11	1 05	1 02	1 93	65-66	1 64	1 52	.....
do 25	1 24	1 20	1 10	1 05	1 02	1 93	65-66	1 62	1 52	.....
Mar. 10	1 23	1 18	1 08	1 04	1 01	1 93	65-66	1 62	1 51	.....
do 25	1 25	1 21	1 14	1 11	1 07	1 01	67-68	1 61	1 51	.....
Apr. 10	1 25	1 22	1 15	1 10	1 08	1 02	68-70	1 59	1 49	.....
do 25	1 25	1 22	1 15	1 14	1 10	1 03	73-75	1 58	1 49	.....
May 10	1 25	1 21	1 15	1 13	1 10	1 04	73-80	1 57	1 48	.....
do 25	1 18	1 12	1 08	1 07	1 05	1 01	70-71	1 57	1 48	.....
June 10	1 08	1 03	1 99	1 98	1 93	1 87	67-68	1 57	1 49	1 38
do 25	1 05	1 01	1 94	1 94	1 91	1 86	66-67	1 55	1 50	1 40
July 10	1 05	1 02	1 93	1 95	1 92	1 85	65-67	1 55	1 50	1 41
do 25	1 05	1 02	1 90	1 99	1 95	1 86	66-67	2 58	1 50	1 50
Aug. 10	1 07	1 03	1 96	1 03	1 99	1 87	66-67	1 85	1 75	None
do 25	1 03	1 04	1 98	1 08	1 05	1 94	68-70	1 00	1 85	.....
Sept. 10	1 06	1 03	1 99	1 05	1 02	1 94	68-70	1 00	1 80	.....
do 25	1 03	1 08	1 92	1 98	1 95	1 89	66-67	1 00	7 75	.....
Oct. 10	1 95	1 89	1 83	1 81	1 87	1 85	70-73	1 02	1 91	1 70
do 25	1 93	1 87	1 73	1 85	1 82	1 65	66-67	1 03	1 87	1 63
Nov. 10	1 92	1 85	1 76	1 85	1 83	1 62	None	1 98	1 84	1 55
do 25	1 93	1 90	1 83	1 86	1 84	1 75	.....	1 99	1 75	1 55
Dec. 10	1 90	1 90	1 84	1 86	1 84	1 76	.....	1 02	1 76	1 58
do 24	1 93	1 88	1 84	1 84	1 80	1 76	.....	1 09	1 75	1 55
1st Qr.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	65 1/2-66 1/2	1 63 1/2	1 53	.....
2nd do	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	69 1/2-70 1/2	1 57	1 49	1 39
3rd do	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	66-68	1 83	1 69	1 50
4th do	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	68-70	1 00 1/2	1 83	1 59 1/2

Toronto—Years, 1877-78.

Flour, per brl.	Butter, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.	Pork, per brl.	Lard, per lb.	Bacon, per lb.	Hams, per lb.	Hogs, per 100 lbs.	Red Winter, per bush.	Cora, per bush.
5 70-5 75	16-17	12 1/2-13 1/2	18 50-19 00	12 1/2-13	8 1/2	9 1/2-10	6 90-7 00	None.	54-55
6 00-6 10	17-19	13-13 1/2	18 50-19 00	12 1/2-13	8 1/2-8 3/4	11-12	6 80-7 00	do	54-55
6 15-6 25	16-17	13-13 1/2	18 00-18 50	11 1/2-12 1/2	8 1/2-8 3/4	11-11 1/2	6 50-6 62 1/2	do	52-54
6 25	16-18	12-14	18 50	12-12 1/2	9	11-12	6 50	do	52
6 10-6 15	16-18	12-13	17 50-18 00	10 1/2-11	8 1/2-9	11 1/2-12	6 25	do	49-50
6 10-6 15	16-18	15-16	17 00-17 50	11-11 1/2	9 1/2-10	11-12	5 75-6 00	do	49
6 60-6 70	18-19	16-16 1/2	17 00-17 50	11 1/2-12	9 1/2-10	11 1/2-12	5 75	do	51 1/2
8 00-8 10	17-19	15-15 1/2	17 50-18 00	11-11 1/2	8 1/2-9	12	6 00-7 25	do	56-57
8 00	19-21	14 1/2-15	17 50-18 00	11-11 1/2	8 1/2-9	12 1/2	7 00-7 50	do	60-61
7 50-7 75	18-20	13-13 1/2	17 25-17 00	11-11 1/2	8-8 1/2	11 1/2-12	6 75	do	59
7 20-7 25	15-16	12 1/2-13	17 00-17 50	11-11 1/2	8-8 1/2	12-12 1/2	6 50-7 00	do	56
6 90-7 00	11 1/2-12 1/2	11-12	16 50-17 00	10 1/2-11	8-8 1/2	11 1/2-12	6 50	do	56
7 15-7 25	15-16	10-10 1/2	16 50-17 00	10 1/2-11	7 1/2-7 3/4	11-11 1/2	6 50-7 00	do	53-59
7 25	15-16	10-11	16 00-16 50	10 1/2	7 1/2-8 1/2	11-11 1/2	6 50	do	53
6 40-6 60	16-17	10-11	16 50-17 00	10 1/2	7 1/2-8	10 1/2-11	6 50	do	54
5 50	15 1/2-16	11	16 50-17 00	10 1/2	7-7 1/2	10 1/2-11 1/2	6 50-7 00	do	54
5 75-5 8 1/2	15-16 1/2	11-12	16 00-17 00	10 1/2	7 1/2	10 1/2-11	5 00-6 00	do	54
5 70	16-18	12 1/2-13 1/2	16 00-17 00	10 1/2	8	11-11 1/2	6 00-6 50	do	54
5 50-5 60	17-17 1/2	12 1/2-13 1/2	16 50-17 00	10 1/2	7 1/2-8 1/2	10-10 1/2	5 50-6 50	do	54-55
5 35-5 40	17-18	13	17 00	10 1/2	7 1/2-8 1/2	10-10 1/2	5 50-6 50	do	54-55
5 25	13-15	12 1/2-13 1/2	16 75-17 00	10-10 1/2	7 1/2-8 1/2	10-10 1/2	5 00-5 25	do	54-55
5 15-5 20	13-14	12 1/2-13 1/2	16 00-16 50	10	7 1/2-8 1/2	10-10 1/2	5 15-5 25	do	54-55
5 10-5 15	12-14	12-13	15 50-16 00	9 1/2-9 1/2	7 1/2	10-10 1/2	4 50-4 75	do	54-85
5 10-5 15	11-12	12 1/2-13 1/2	15 50-16 00	9-9 1/2	7 1/2	10-10 1/2	4 50-4 75	do	54-85
6 05-6 08	16-18	13-14	18 75-18 40	11 1/2-12 1/2	8 1/2-9	11-11 1/2	6 45-6 56 1/2	None.	51 1/2-52 1/2
7 33-7 36	17-18 1/2	14-14 1/2	17 40-17 41 1/2	11 1/2-11 1/2	8 1/2-9	10 1/2-11 1/2	6 50-6 79	do	56 1/2-57
6 29-6 55	15 1/2-16 1/2	10 1/2-11 1/2	16 25-16 83 1/2	10 1/2	7 1/2-8	10 1/2-11 1/2	6 25-6 58 1/2	do	56-56 1/2
5 22 1/2-5 30	14-15	12 1/2-13 1/2	16 21-16 58 1/2	10	7 1/2-8	10 1/2-10 1/2	5 27 1/2-5 79	do	54-55
5 05-5 15	14-15	12 1/2-13 1/2	14 75-15 25	7 1/2	10-10 1/2	9-9 1/2	5 00-5 25	None.	Not quoted.
4 90-5 00	13 1/2-14 1/2	11 1/2-12	14 50-15 00	6 1/2-7	9-9 1/2	9-9 1/2	4 50-4 75	do	do
4 70-5 00	12 1/2-15	12 1/2-13 1/2	14 00-14 50	7-7 1/2	9 1/2-10	8 1/2-9	4 60-4 75	do	do
4 70-5 00	10-11	11-13 1/2	14 00-14 50	6 1/2-7	9 1/2-10	8 1/2-9	4 90-5 00	do	do
4 68-5 85	12-13	11-13 1/2	13 50-14 00	6 1/2-7 1/2	9 1/2-10	8-8 1/2	4 50-4 75	do	do
4 70-5 00	12 1/2-13 1/2	12 1/2-13 1/2	13 50-14 00	7	9 1/2-10	8 1/2-9	5 50-6 00	do	do
5 00	14-15	13-13 1/2	13 00-13 50	6 1/2-7	9-9 1/2	8 1/2	5 25-5 75	do	do
5 00-5 15	13-14	12 1/2-14	13 00-13 50	6 1/2-7	9-9 1/2	8 1/2	5 50-6 00	do	do
5 00	15-16	12-12 1/2	12 75-						

SCHEDULE of Quotations,

Date.	Fall Wheat, Grade, per bush.			Spring Wheat, Grade, per bush.			Oats, per bush.	Rye, per bush.	Peas, per bush.	Barley, Grade, per bush.			Flour, per brl. Superior Extra
	1	2	3	1	2	3				1	2	3	
1880.	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	cents.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts	\$ cts	Cts.	\$ cts.
Jan. 10	1 32	1 31	1 27	1 29	1 27	1 25	36-36½	75-76	68-69	77	68	48	5 80-5 85
do 25	1 28	1 25	1 24	1 25	1 23	1 20	36½-37	75-76	66-68	77	65	49	5 65-5 70
Feb. 10	1 32	1 30	1 27	1 28	1 25	1 22	36-36½	76-78	66-68	77	62	48	5 65-5 70
do 25	1 36	1 34	1 31	1 35	1 33	1 28	36-37	78-80	67-68	72	62	48	6 85-6 00
Mar. 10	1 31	1 27	1 24	1 27	1 25	1 22	36-37	78-80	70-71	73	63	50	6 65-5 75
do 25	1 32	1 30	1 27	1 31	1 23	1 23	36-37	80-82	72-73	73	62	50	5 70-5 75
April 10	1 29	1 27	1 22	1 29	1 27	1 22	36-37½	80-82	71-72	70	64	50	5 65-5 70
do 25	1 24	1 21	1 16	1 25	1 22	1 18	36-37½	80-82	71-72	73	65	52	5 60
May 10	1 25	1 22	1 18	1 26	1 24	1 21	36-37	78-80	72-73	72	66	52	5 60-6 00
do 25	1 22	1 19	1 17	1 26	1 24	1 19	36-37	78-80	72-73	72	68	52	5 55-6 00
June 10	1 16	1 14	1 12	1 23	1 20	1 17	36-37	78-80	72-73	70	60	50	5 30-6 35
do 25	1 09	1 07	1 04	1 13	1 10	1 06	36-37	78-80	70-71	70	60	50	4 90-5 00
July 10	1 07	1 05	1 01	1 09	1 06	1 00	36-37	78-80	70	70	60	50	4 90-5 00
do 25	1 13	1 11	1 05	1 19	1 16	1 09	35½-36½	78-80	70	70	60	50	5 30-5 40
Aug. 10	1 12	1 10	1 05	1 22	1 17	1 13	38-39	58-60	70	70	30	50	5 35-5 40
do 25	1 06	1 04	0 96	1 09	1 06	1 01	35-36	65-67	69-70	65	55	50	4 80-4 90
Sept. 10	1 97	1 90	1 08	1 05	0 98	0 93	35-36	65-67	69-70	67	62	50	4 65-4 70
do 25	1 92	1 00	1 10	1 08	1 00	0 92	32-33	70-72	69-70	70	65	59	4 60
Oct. 10	1 00	0 92	1 10	1 08	0 98	0 91	31-31½	78-80	65-66	70	64	.....	4 70-4 75
do 25	1 05	0 95	1 14	1 12	1 02	0 92	31-32	90	80-82	70	66	.....	4 80-4 85
Nov. 10	1 06	0 95	1 15	1 12	1 02	0 92	33-34	87-88	75	82	75	.....	4 80-4 85
do 25	1 14	1 10	1 23	1 21	1 16	1 10	34	87-88	70	1 00	1 00	85	5 10-5 25
Dec. 10	1 16	1 13	1 09	1 20	1 18	1 14	34	87-88	70	96	88	72	5 10
do 24	1 12	1 10	1 06	1 17	1 15	1 10	33-34	84-85	69	1 02	93	77	5 00

1st Q'tr.	36-37	77-78½	68-69½	75	63½	49	5 71½-5 80
2nd do.	36-37	78-80½	71½-72½	71	65½	51	5 43½-6 06
3rd do.	35-36½	69-71	69½-70	68½	60½	51½	4 96½-5 08
4th do.	33-33½	85½-85	69½-67	86½	81	78	4 91½-4 96

Date.	Fall Wheat, Grade, per bush.			Spring Wheat, Grade, per bush.			Oats, per bush.	Rye, per bush.	Peas, per bush.	Barley, Grade, per bush.			Flour, per brl. Superior Extra
	1	2	3	1	2	3				1	2	3	
1881.	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	\$ cts	cents.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts	\$ cts	Cts.	\$ cts.
Jan. 10	1 12	1 09	1 04	1 17	1 15	1 09	34	80-81	68	1 02	0 92	77	4 90
do 25	1 12	1 09	1 03	1 17	1 15	1 08	34	80-81	68	0 98	0 89	75	4 85-9 00
Feb. 10	1 11	1 09	1 05	1 17	1 15	1 09	34-35	83-84	68-69	0 98	0 88	75	4 80
do 25	1 12	1 08	1 03	1 18	1 16	1 08	36-37	84-85	69	1 00	0 95	84	4 70-4 80
Mar. 10	1 13	1 10	1 07	1 19	1 17	1 12	36½-37	84-85	70	0 95	0 93	72	4 85-5 00
do 25	1 14	1 11	1 09	1 20	1 18	1 13	38	86-87	72-73	0 98	0 89	71	4 90-5 00
Apr. 10	1 16	1 13	1 10	1 20	1 17	1 10	38	86-87	76	0 97	0 89	73	4 95-5 00
do 25	1 16	1 14	1 09	1 20	1 17	1 10	40	1 00-1 02	77	0 94	0 84	70	5 00
May 10	1 15	1 12	1 09	1 20	1 18	1 10	40	95-96	75-76	0 85	0 75	65	4 95-5 00
do 25	1 17	1 15	1 11	1 19	1 15	1 09	38-39	83-85	76	0 80	0 70	60	5 00
June 10	1 18	1 16	1 12	1 18	1 16	1 11	38	83-85	75	0 80	0 70	60	5 00-5 10
do 25	1 23	1 21	1 17	1 24	1 22	1 16	38-39	75-80	75	0 80	0 70	60	5 45-5 65
July 10	1 27	1 23	1 17	1 25	1 23	1 18	39	75-78	75	0 80	0 70	60	5 70
do 25	1 25	1 22	1 16	1 26	1 22	1 17	39	None.	70	0 81	0 70	65	5 75
Aug. 10	1 25	1 23	1 18	1 26	1 25	1 19	42	do.	72-73	0 80	0 70	60	5 75
do 25	1 31	1 29	1 23	1 30	1 29	1 24	42	do.	72	0 80	0 70	.....	5 87½
Sept. 10	1 31	1 30	1 24	1 31	1 30	1 25	40-41	95-97	73-75	0 82	0 72	.....	5 95
do 25	1 36	1 40	1 30	1 34	1 32	.....	40	95-96	73-75	0 90	0 84	.....	6 10-6 15
Oct. 10	1 34	1 31	1 29	1 36	1 34	.....	41-42	96-97	79	0 89	0 83	76	6 20-6 25
do 25	1 33	1 31	1 28	1 35	1 33	.....	42-42½	95-96	80	0 98	0 92	80	6 10-6 15
Nov. 10	1 29	1 27	1 23	1 34	1 32	.....	45	94-95	78	0 93	0 89	76	5 75-5 80
do 25	1 30	1 28	1 25	1 35	1 33	.....	42-43	90	78	0 92	0 87	78	5 70-5 75
Dec. 10	1 29	1 27	1 23	1 34	1 32	.....	41-43	85-88	79	0 89	0 85	78	5 60-5 65
do 24	1 28	1 26	1 23	1 34	1 32	.....	42-43	86-88	79	0 90	0 85	76	5 65-5 70

1st Q'r	1 12½	1 9½	1 05	1 18	1 16	1 10	36	83-84	69-70	0 99	0 91	75½	4 83½-5 95
2nd do.	1 17½	1 15	1 11½	1 20	1 17½	1 11	39	87-89	75½-76	0 86	0 76½	64½	5 06-5 15
3rd do.	1 29	1 28	1 21½	1 28½	1 27	1 20½	40½-41	88-90½	72½-73	0 87	0 72½	62½	5 85½-6 15
4th do.	1 30½	1 28½	1 25	1 34½	1 32½	.....	42-43	91-92½	79	0 92	0 87	78	5 83½-5 86½

Toronto—Years, 1880-81.

Flour, per brl.	Butter, per lb.	Cheese, per lb.	Pork, per brl.	Lard, per lb.	Bacon, per lb.	Ham, per lb.	Hogs, per 100 lbs.	Red Winter, per bush.	Corn, per bush.
\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	cents.	cents.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	None.
17-18	11-13	16 00-16 50	9-9½	7½-8	10½-11	6 15-6 25	None.	do	do
17-18	12-13	15 00	9	7½-7¾	10½-11	6 20-6 25	do	do	do
None.	12-13	15 00-16 00	9½	7-7½	10½-11	5 40	do	do	do
5 65-5 75	15-16	12-13	9-9½	7-7½	10½-11	5 00-5 20	do	do	do
5 15-5 80	14-15	12-14	9-9½	6½-7½	10½-11	5 05-5 15	do	do	do
5 70-5 80	15-17	14-15	9-9½	7-7½	10½-10½	5 00	do	do	do
5 70-5 75	17-19	14-15	9	7-7½	10½-11	6 00-6 50	do	do	do
5 65-5 75	17-19	14-15	9-9½	8-8½	10½-11	6 50-7 00	do	do	do
None.	15-18	14-15	9-9½	8-8½	10-10½	7 00-7 25	do	do	do
None.	12-13	13½-14	9	8-8½	10-11	6 50	do	do	do
5 80-5 85	13-14	12-13	9½	7-7½	10½	6 25-7 00	do	do	do
5 70-5 75	12½-14	12-13	9½	7-7½	10½-10	6 50-7 00	do	do	do
5 40-5 45	13-14	10½-11½	9-9½	7-7½	11-11½	7 00	do	do	do
5 09-5 10	13½-14	9-9½	9½	7-7½	10½-11	6 50-7 00	do	do	do
5 40-5 45	12½-13½	9-10	9	7-7½	11-11½	7 00	do	do	do
5 37-5 50	12½-13	9½-10½	9½	7-7½	11-11½	6 50-7 00	do	do	do
None.	14-16	10-11½	10-10½	7-7½	11-11½	6 50-7 00	97-98	do	do
do	16-17	12½-13	18 00-18 50	8-8½	11-11½	6 50-7 00	100-101	do	do
do	17-17½	12½-13	17 00	9-9½	11-11½	7 25-7 50	None.	do	do
do	18-29	13-13½	17 00	10½-11	11-11½	6 50-7 00	103-105	do	do
do	18½-19	13½-14	17 00	11½-12	11-11½	6 50-7 25	105-107	do	do
do	18	13½-14	18 50-19 00	9½-10	11-11½	5 50-6 50	None.	do	do
do	18-18½	13-14	19 00	11½-12	9-9½	6 00-6 50	do	do	do
5 25	17-18	13-14	16 75-17 00	10½-10½	10½-11	6 00-6 25	do	do	do
5 25-5 30	15-17	12½-13	16 00-16 50	10½-10½	7½-8½	10½-10½	do	do	do

5 70-5 79	16-17½	12½-14	15 33½-15 83½	9-9½	7½-7¾	10½-11	5 46½-5 96	.....	.....
5 61-5 70	13½-15½	12½-13½	14 08½-14 35	9½-9½	7-8	10-10½	6 46-7 00	.....	

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

SCHEDULE showing the Fluctuations in Prices between Chicago and Toronto.

Date.	Spring Wheat Higher.		Oats, Higher.		Rye, Higher.		Barley, Higher.		Pork, Higher.		Hams, Higher.		Lard, Higher, per 100 lbs.		Hogs, Higher, per 100 lbs.	
	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.
1877.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
Jan. 10...	5		6 1/4	7 1/4	1 1/4		0 82		1 43 3/4				1 43 3/4		0 30	
do 25...		3	13	6	1 1/2	2 1/2	1 92 1/2		1 97 1/2				1 97 1/2		0 75	
Feb. 9...	Even	Even	12 1/2	5	1 1/2		2 42 1/2		1 11 1/2				1 11 1/2		0 75	
do 25...		12	11	1 1/2		12	4 17		2 40				2 40		0 80	
March 9...		12	12	2 1/4		5 1/2	3 75		1 54 1/2				1 54 1/2		0 75	
do 25...		11	15	1 1/2		2 1/2	3 30		1 83 1/2				1 83 1/2		0 47 1/2	
April 10...		8	11	4	1 1/2		2 95		2 47 1/2				2 47 1/2		0 35	
do 25...		10	10	5 1/2	18		1 17 1/2		1 52 1/2				1 52 1/2		1 22 1/2	
May 10...		16	10	3	15 1/2		2 94		2 25				2 25		1 85	
do 25...		9	10 1/2	15	3 1/2		3 44 1/2		2 50				2 50		1 80	
June 10...	1		7 1/2	17	2		4 45		3 12 1/2				3 12 1/2		2 23 1/2	
do 25...		1	9 1/2	23	8		3 69		2 37 1/2				2 37 1/2		0 82 1/2	
July 10...		8	12 1/2	23			3 37		1 82 1/2				1 82 1/2		1 65	
do 25...		26	19	55	25		3 07 1/2		1 38 1/2				1 38 1/2		1 87 1/2	
Aug. 10...		16	19	9 1/2			3 50		1 87 1/2				1 87 1/2		1 40	
do 25...		5	12	12 1/2	5 1/2		4 60		2 30				2 30		1 57 1/2	
Sept. 10...		7	9	9 1/2	2 1/2		3 56 1/2		1 07 1/2				1 07 1/2		1 62 1/2	
do 25...	Even		10 1/2	11	30 1/2		3 16		1 55 1/2				1 55 1/2		0 62 1/2	
Oct. 10...		5	8	27	6 1/2		2 00		1 80				1 80		0 75	
do 25...		5	9	6 1/2	9 1/2		2 57		2 12 1/2				2 12 1/2		1 00	
Nov. 9...		1 1/2	8	7 1/2	5 1/2		4 25		2 48 1/2				2 48 1/2		1 25	
do 25...	Even		7	6	4 1/2		4 32 1/2		2 26 1/2				2 26 1/2		0 75	
Dec. 10...		10 1/2	8	4 1/2	1 1/2		3 72 1/2		1 45				1 45		0 90	
do 24...	Even	1 1/2	7 1/2	5			4 02 1/2		1 80				1 80		0 52 1/2	
1878.																
Jan. 10...		2 1/2	8 1/2	5	1		4 00		2 1/2				1 87 1/2		1 02 1/2	
do 25...		3	9 1/2	9 1/2	2 1/2		3 95		3				1 91 1/2		0 55	
Feb. 10...		3	7 1/2	9	5		4 03		2 1/2				1 48 1/2		0 75	
do 25...		8	7 1/2	4	6		3 97		2 1/2				1 45		1 10	
March 10...	3 1/2		10 1/2	5	4 1/2		4 40		3				1 23 1/2		0 97 1/2	
do 25...	2		10 1/2	3 1/2	5 1/2		4 47		2 1/2				1 58 1/2		2 05	
April 10...	1		12 1/2	3	6		4 80		3				1 75		1 95	
do 25...	1		12 1/2	1 1/2	1 1/2		4 55		2 1/2				1 53 1/2		2 30	
May 10...	Even		7 1/2	2	1 1/2		4 40		2 1/2				2 40		2 42 1/2	
do 25...		7	9	6			4 83		1 1/2				2 5 3/4		2 65	
June 10...	5 1/4		7 1/2	7 1/2			3 72		1				1 21 1/2		2 28 1/2	
do 25...	2		6 1/2	7 1/2	2		3 55		1				1 16 1/2		2 12 1/2	
July 10...	4		7 1/2	11 1/2	2		3 70		2				1 38 1/2		0 77 1/2	
do 25...	10		5 1/2	6 1/2	24 1/2		3 48		2 1/2				0 93 1/2		1 85	
Aug. 10...	10		10 1/2	8	27		3 15		2 1/2				0 66 1/2		0 97 1/2	
do 25...		9	10 1/2	12	12		3 40		2 1/2				1 15 1/2		4 42 1/2	
Sept. 10...		6 1/2	7 1/2	15	24		4 66		3 1/2				1 52 1/2		0 87 1/2	
do 25...		7 1/2	7 1/2	14 1/2	33		4 38		3				1 78 1/2		0 82 1/2	
Oct. 10...		5	9 1/2	12			3 63		3 1/2				1 10 1/2		1 55	
do 25...		2 1/2	7 1/2	9	8 1/2		4 32		3 1/2				1 75 1/2		2 37 1/2	
Nov. 10...		2	8	9	2 1/2		3 98		3 1/2				1 88 1/2		0 82 1/2	
do 25...		2 1/2	8	9	5		3 50		4 1/2				1 53 1/2		1 35	
Dec. 10...		2	8	5 1/2	19		3 60		3 1/2				1 73 1/2		0 97 1/2	
do 24...	2 1/4		8	6	23		4 36		3 1/2				1 81 1/2		0 85	

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS--Concluded.

SCHEDULE showing the Fluctuations in Prices between Chicago and Toronto.

Date.	Spring Wheat Higher.		Oats, Higher.		Rye, Higher.		Barley, Higher.		Pork, Higher.		Hams, Higher.		Lard, Higher, per 100 lbs.		Hogs, Higher, per 100 lbs.	
	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.
1880.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
Jan. 10...	1 1/2				1 1/2	2 1/2	18			3 43		2 1/2		1 61 1/2		1 55
do 25...		3			3 1/2	4 1/2	15			3 43		3		1 56 1/2		1 65
Feb. 10...		2			3 1/2	5	16			4 35		3 1/2		2 48 1/2		1 05
do 25...		9			4	2	15			3 12		3 1/2		1 95		0 65
March 10...		4 1/2			4 1/2	11	12			3 63		3 1/2		2 07 1/2		0 70
do 25...		12 1/2			7 1/2	11	13 1/2			4 18		3 1/2		2 21 1/2		0 45
April 10...		15 1/2			10 1/2	11	12 1/2			4 59		3 1/2		1 13 1/2		1 75
do 25...		10			7 1/2	9	15			4 53		3 1/2		2 36 1/2		2 17 1/2
May 10...		6 1/2			6 1/2	14	14			4 39		2 1/2		2 18 1/2		2 65
do 25...		10			5 1/2	11 1/2	15			3 84		2 1/2		2 63 1/2		2 37 1/2
June 10...		20 1/2			6 1/2	11 1/2	16			3 34		2 1/2		2 66 1/2		2 02 1/2
do 25...		10			5 1/2	4 1/2	11 1/2			2 31		1 1/2		2 70		2 42 1/2
July 10...		13			12	12 1/2	20			1 06		2 1/2		2 60 1/2		2 25
do 25...		2 1/2			11	9 1/2	17			0 97		2 1/2		2 56 1/2		2 15
Aug. 10...		28			14 1/2	7	20 1/2			0 05		2 1/2		2 06 1/2		1 60
do 25...		18			9	1	24 1/2			0 15		2 1/2		2 41 1/2		1 55
Sept. 10...		11 1/2			9	17 1/2	13 1/2			0 43		2 1/2		2 43 1/2		1 77 1/2
do 25...		17 1/2			5 1/2	11	10			1 15		2 1/2		3 06 1/2		1 65
Oct. 10...		11			3	4	12			1 25		2 1/2		3 20		1 50
do 25...		13			1	7	15			2 00		2 1/2		3 92 1/2		2 37 1/2
Nov. 10...		7 1/2			3	5	12			4 63		2 1/2		3 70		2 15
do 25...		9 1/2			1 1/2	2 1/2	5			5 75		2 1/2		3 03 1/2		1 20
Dec. 10...		16 1/2			1 1/2	1	18 1/2			4 47		2 1/2		2 05 1/2		1 50
do 24...		21			4	2 1/2	14			4 25		2 1/2		2 11 1/2		1 52 1/2
1881.																
Jan. 10...		16			3 1/2	8 1/2	21			4 17 1/2		3		1 42 1/2		1 27 1/2
do 25...		17			4 1/2	8	14 1/2			3 85		2 1/2		2 67 1/2		1 47 1/2
Feb. 10...		17 1/2			4 1/2	4 1/2	12			3 33		2 1/2		2 71 1/2		1 87 1/2
do 25...		18			6	5 1/2	6			3 38		3 1/2		2 67 1/2		2 10
March 10...		17 1/2			5 1/2	13	14			2 92		3 1/2		2 40		1 65
do 25...		15			7	12 1/2	16			3 30		3 1/2		3 44		1 73 1/2
April 10...		14 1/2			6 1/2	18 1/2	11			1 49		2 1/2				

AGRICULTURAL

SUMMARY showing results of Quotations taken on the same Day

CHICAGO AND

DATE.	SPRING WHEAT. Higher.				OATS. Higher.				Rye. Higher.				BARLEY. Higher.			
	Chicago.		Toronto.		Chicago.		Toronto.		Chicago.		Toronto.		Chicago.		Toronto.	
	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount	Times.	Average Amount
		Cts.		Cts.		Cts.		Cts.		Cts.		Cts.		Cts.		Cts.
1877.....	3	2.625	17	9.147	24	10.6354	8	4.063	16	14.813	15	7.25	7	8		
1878.....	14	2.93	9	4.16	24	8.3	24	7.25	12	17.583	12	2.5	24	3.145		
1880.....	1	1.75	23	13.49	24	6.0313	8	6.25	16	5.734	24	14.25				
1881.....	3	3.5	21	10.2143	6	2.125	17	3.72	20	12.8625		23	21.62			

SUMMARY showing result of Quotations taken on the same Day twice in each Month Markets, and giving Average

Date.	Spring Wheat.		Oats.		Rye.		Barley.		Pork.
	Chicago.	New York.	Chicago.	New York.	Chicago.	New York.	Chicago.	New York.	
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
1877.....	1 27.8	1 48.392	31.75	41.4	62.224	0 84.52	0 58.4	0 92.33	13 89.66
1878.....	0 96.875	1 15.4063	22.66	32.66	50.63	0 67.913	0 70.33	0 77.5	8 41.3178
1880.....	1 09.25	1 19.524	29.584	42.292	77.5	0 94.8	0 81.33	1 04.5	13 24.416
1881.....	1 14.875	1 26.78	37.83	45.83	91.75	1 04.0105	1 09.435	1 16.3	16 00

TORONTO AND

Date.	Toronto.	Montreal.	Toronto.	Montreal.	Toronto.	Montreal.	Toronto.	Montreal.	Toronto.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	\$ cts.	Cts.	Cts.	\$ cts.
1877.....	1 34	1 57.66	43	39.5	70	No sales.	73.75	63	17 31
1878.....	1 01	1 29	31.33	29.5	59.25	do	51	68.5	13 25
1880.....	1 18	1 29	36	33	79	0 89.25	75.33	67	16 08.75
1881.....	1 23.25	1 32	39.75	39	89	1 01	91	83	20 37.5

PRODUCTS.

twice in each Month, in the Years 1877-78 and 1880-81. TORONTO.

	PORK. Higher.		HAMS. Higher.		LARD. Higher.		HOGS. Higher.	
	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.	Toronto.
	Times.	Average Amount						
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.		Cts.		\$ cts.
.....	24	3 21.25	3	375.21	24	2.17	24	1 93.704
.....	24	4 03.46	24	2.5	24	1 55.48	24	1 06.425
.....	3	1 45.21	24	3 18.66	24	2.532	24	2 44.44
.....	24	3 73.78	24	3.13	24	3 06.35	24	1 81.25

in the Years 1877-78 and 1880-81, as above, comparing Chicago and New York Prices for each Year.

Pork.	Hams.		Lard.		Hogs.	
	New York.	Chicago.	New York.	Chicago.	New York.	Chicago.
	\$ cts.	Cts.	Cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
14 82.33	9.16	10.9	9 13.21	9 48.9	5 19.75	7.46
9 72.913	7.5	8.19	6 70.375	7 05.146	3 50.25	5.157
12 65.886	8.83	9.53	7 87.25	7 57.313	4 62.5	6.307
16 99.25	9.583	10.531	10 92.386	11 20.85	6 21.12	8.285

MONTREAL.

Montreal.	Toronto.	Montreal.	Toronto.	Montreal.	Toronto.	Montreal.
\$ cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
17 80	11.25	13	11	12	6 43.25	6 23
15 74.25	10.5	11.25	8.5	9.75	5 15	4 87.75
16 71.33	11	12.25	10	11.5	6 69.66	6 19
20 73.33	12.5	13.66	14	15	8 02.25	7 75.5

NEW YORK, 20th April, 1882.

W. L. DINGMAN, Esq., Clerk to Committee, Ottawa.

DEAR SIR,—Your favour of the 17th inst. has been received, and we are seeking to get the information your Committee desires. Our greatest difficulty is to get the freight quotations from Chicago to New York; but we have put a party to work on this who we think will succeed, and we hope to have this pleasure again in a few days.

We are, yours very truly,  
SCAMMELL BROTHERS.

NEW YORK, 21st April, 1882.

W. L. DINGMAN, Esq., Secretary to Committee, Ottawa.

DEAR SIR,—We had this pleasure last on the 20th inst., and now beg to hand you statement of rates of freight by rail from Chicago to New York, and by steamer from New York to Liverpool, for the months and years you ask for, which we hope will cover the information you desire.

We paid \$10 to get this compiled and enclose receipt for the amount. There was more labour than would seem on the face of the documents.

If at any time we can be of service, pray command us.

Yours truly,  
SCAMMELL BROTHERS.

N.B.—The National Line took four loads of grain yesterday, and paid  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel for the privilege.  
S. B.

NEW YORK, 21st April, 1882.

Messrs. Scammell Bros.—To GEO. MEAD, Dr.

Statement showing rates of freight on grain and flour from Chicago to New York; also from New York to Liverpool, during January, June and October, years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881..... \$10.00

Received payment. GEO. MEAD.

RATES of Freight from Chicago to New York by Rail, stated periods, during Years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881.

Dates.	Flour, per bbl.	Grain, per 100 lbs.
	cts.	cts.
1877—January 2nd to April 6th.....	70	35
June—May 28th to July 2nd.....	60	30
October 17th to November 9th.....	80	40
1878—January 1st to February 8th.....	80	40
June—May 21st to July 7th.....	40	20
October—August 31st to November 25th.....	60	30
1880—January 1st to February 29th.....	80	40
June 7th to September 6th.....	60	30
October—September 7th to October 31st.....	60	30
1881—January 1st to March 31st.....	70	35
June 8th to 14th.....	50	25
do 15th to 22nd.....	30 to 40	15 to 20
October—September 26th to October 31st.....	25 to 30	12½ to 20

RATES of Freight from New York to Liverpool, by Steam and Sail, stated periods, during Years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881.

Dates.	STEAM.						SAIL.			
	Grain, per bushel.		Flour, per bbl.		Flour, sacks, per ton.		Grain, per bushel.		Flour, per bbl.	
	d.	d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	d.	d.	s. d.	s. d.
1877—January 15th .....	6½	to 7	3 6				7		2 9	
June 15th .....	4		2 3				4		2 0	
October 15th .....	9½	" 10½	3 6	to 3 9			7½		2 9	
1878—January 15th .....	9½	" 9¾	4 0				8½		2 9	
June 15th .....	7½	" 8½	2 6	" 2 7½			7		2 3	
October 15th .....	6½	" 7	3 6				6	to 6½	2 5	to 2 6
1880—January 15th .....	3½	" 3½	1 9		17 6					
June 15th .....	5		2 0		17 6		3½			
October 15th .....	6	" 6½	3 0		22 6					
1881—January 15th .....	7	" 7½	2 9		22 6	to 25 0				
June 15th .....	3½		1 3		10 0					
October 15th .....	3	" 3½	1 6		7 6					

N.B.—The above rates are in English money.

NEW YORK, 22nd April, 1882.

W. L. DINGMAN, Esq., Clerk to Committee, House of Commons, Ottawa.

DEAR SIR,—Since writing you yesterday, we have received your favor of 20th inst., asking for further information.

We enclose sheet No. 1, showing the rate of freight from Chicago to New York by water, for the time required; also sheet No. 2, for 1880 and 1881, for through rates from Chicago to Liverpool, by rail and steam. It has been impossible to get the information for the years 1877 and 1878, for the reason that it will take a great deal of time to work it up—but if necessary, it can be had.

We have not paid anything for these two sheets, though the compiler thinks he ought to have \$5.

Yours truly,

SCAMMELL BROTHERS.

RATES of Freight, Lake and Canal, from Chicago to New York, via Buffalo and Oswego, during stated periods, through 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881.

Dates.	BUFFALO.		OSWEGO.	
	Wheat, per 60 lbs.	Corn, per 56 lbs.	Wheat, per 60 lbs.	Corn per 56 lbs.
	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
1877—June .....	8·0·5	7·1·7	10·2·5	8·9·0
October .....	15·9·7	13·5·9	18·0·0	15·9·4
1878—June .....	6·5·6	6·0·2	6·5·8	6·0·6
October .....	11·6·0	10·4·8	11·6·2	10·5·2
1880—June .....	14·1·87	13·1·56	15·7·50	14·3·22
October .....	12·5·50	11·9·30	14·5·61	12·9·0
1881—June .....	8·9·1	8·1·9	11·6·00	10·6·1
October .....	7·7·2	6·9·5	9·5·8	9·1·2

N.B.—The above rates are in cents, mills, and fractions of mills.

FREIGHT Rates from Chicago to Liverpool, Rail and Steamer, during 1880 and 1881.

Dates.	Grain, per 100 lbs.	Flour, sacks per 100 lbs.
	cts.	cts.
1880—January.....	51½	53 to 55
June.....	45½	49½ " 53
October.....	51½	52 " 58
1881—January.....	50·66 to 58·50	55·50 " 59·00
June.....	27·95 " 30·75	28·00 " 36·25
October.....	21·25 " 28·00	22·25 " 24·75

Rates in cents and fractions.

The ruling rates of freight on grain from New York to Liverpool, were for the years you ask, as below:—

1877. January, for wheat,	6d. to	7d.;	for corn,	6½d. to	6¾d. per bushel.
June,	4	to	6¾	4	to 6¾
October,	8½	to	10¼	8½	to 10¼
1878. January,	9½	to	10	9	to 9½
June,	7¾	to	8¼	7¾	to 8¼
October,	6½	to	7½	6½	to 7½
1879. January,	3	to	6¼	5¼	to 6
June,	4¼	to	5¼	4¼	to 5¼
October,	6½	to	9	6½	to 9
1880. January,	3	to	4	3	to 4
June,	4	to	6	4	to 6
October,	5½	to	6	5½	to 6½
1881. January,	5½	to	7	5½	to 7
June,	3	to	3½	3	to 3½
October,	2¼	to	3¼	2¼	to 3¼

The present rate is only from one-eighth to one-half a penny per bushel:

F. W. J. HURST,  
Manager National Line of Steamships, New York.

In reply to yours of the 26th inst., *re* freight rates by water on grains from Chicago to Toronto, from Chicago to Montreal, and from Chicago to Liverpool, during the months of January, June and October, in the years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881, there is no grain carried by water in January from Chicago, as during that and other winter months navigation is closed. Mostly corn comes from Chicago to Toronto, and usually during the month of November for distilling, and the rates by water, per 56 lbs., year 1877, 6½c.; 1878, 7c.; 1880, 8c.; and 1881, 5 to 5½c. The rates from

	1877.	1878.	1880.	1881.
Chicago to Montreal—On corn (per 56 lbs.),	8½c.	8¾c.	13c.	9¼c.
" " On wheat (60 lbs.),	" 9	9½	13½	9½
" " On corn, October...	11¼	8½	9½	7
" " On wheat,	" 12¼	9½	10¼	7½

The rates from Chicago to Liverpool will be sent to you in a day or two.

A. GUNN.

The rates of freight from Chicago to Liverpool *via* Montreal, by rail to Portland, thence by steamer to Liverpool :—

January, 1878.....	62½c. to 70c. per 100 lbs.
“ 1879.....	48 “ 50½ “
“ 1880.....	55 “ “
“ 1881.....	53½ “ 57 “
“ 1882.....	32½ “ “

A. GUNN.

I am in receipt of yours of 26th, note remarks, and in reply would say that it is impossible for me to furnish you with rate of freight from Chicago to Toronto in months and years mentioned. If you would address Messrs. Gooderham & Worts, of Toronto, no doubt they would be in a position, and gladly supply particulars, being large consumers of corn. As to the rate from Chicago to Liverpool, you would have to procure from Messrs. D. Torrance & Co., or Messrs. H. & A. Allan, of Montreal, ocean freights from Montreal during specified periods, and add to rate from Chicago to Montreal, and thus arrive at it. The best which I can furnish is the rate from Chicago to Montreal during the years stated, of which find memorandum enclosed herewith.

MEMORANDUM of Freights, Chicago to Kingston and Kingston to Montreal, per schooners and steamers in first instance, and by barges in latter, during years and months mentioned below.

	1877.	1878.	1880.	1881.
Chicago to Kingston—On Wheat, in June.....	6¼c.	5·37½c.	9·25c.	8·37c.
“ “ Corn “ .....	5·29	4·30	8·54	7·75
“ “ Wheat, in October.....	8·72	6·75	8·06	5·87
“ “ Corn “ .....	7	6·33	7·35	5
Kingston to Montreal—On Wheat, in June, with Tolls... 3¼	2½	3¼	2½	2½
“ “ Corn “ “ ... 3	2¼	3	2¼	2¼
“ “ Wheat, in October, “ ... 3¼	2½	3	2½	2½
“ “ Corn “ “ ... 3	2¼	2¾	2¼	2¼

P.S.—On lake freight, Chicago to Kingston, the whole number of vessels arriving with us was taken, and an average struck. The rates on river were fixed year by year.

JOHN GASKIN,  
Montreal Transportation Co., Kingston.

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 20th ult., *re* rates per 100 lbs. from Chicago to Eastern points, and furnish you with the following figures :—

	Montreal.	Toronto.	Liverpool.
1877. January .....	35c.	20c.	44.38c. and 48.13c
June .....	25	20	
October .....	35	22½	
1878. January .....	35	22½	
June.....	23	15	
October .....	30	20	
1880. January.....	40	22½	50
June.....	30	17½	40
October .....	30	17½	
1881. January .....	35	20	
June .....	27	17½	
October .....	17	12¾	
1882. April.....	22	15	

We did not draw Liverpool grain bills of lading during the months of January, June and October, 1878 and 1881, and have not for several months offered Liverpool grain rates at Chicago.

JOHN PORTEOUS, G. T. F. A., Montreal.

OTTAWA, 23rd March, 1882.

The Special Committee appointed to consider the effect of the National Policy on the Agricultural Interests met at 10 a.m. Dr. Orton, M.P., in the chair.

D. H. PRESTON was examined.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Where are you from, Mr. Preston?—From the County of Lennox.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Are you an agriculturalist?—Yes Sir, that is my calling.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. How long have you been engaged in this calling, Mr. Preston?—I have been engaged in it all my life.

Q. How long have you lived in the County of Lennox?—I was born in this county sixty years ago. I might premise, Mr. Chairman, by stating to the Committee, that I live in the southern extremity of the County of Lennox, and in consequence of this fact my opportunities for observing the working of the National Policy have been more limited than would have been the case had I lived in the interior, where more facilities would have been presented to me in this particular. You are all aware doubtless, that along the frontier, owing in part to the nature of the soil, which is very well adapted for the raising of barley—although we also have the means of growing good grain of other kinds—a great quantity of barley is raised in our district, and all you gentlemen are, doubtless, well aware of the fact, that the present National Policy has no influence on barley, which is sent to the United States, where we really find our only market for that article.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I believe that barley is your staple crop?—It is the principal one, we raise a great deal of it. Our land is very suitable for raising good barley. It is a good sample.

Q. You raise good grain?—We raise very good grain.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. In the first place, what is the character of the agricultural products which are produced in your section of the country?—Well, we raise barley and wheat, but bear in mind, gentlemen, that very few among our farmers attempt to raise fall wheat any more in that locality; it has proved a failure more than twice in three years, and for this reason it is not looked on with favour; but we raise a splendid sample of spring wheat, and oats of the first quality—also good barley and good rye. These are the four principal descriptions of grain that we grow in our section of the country.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Do you raise stock in your section of the country, Mr. Preston? Do you raise cattle?—Well, yes, we raise some stock; but this is not a section of the country where the fattening and the raising of cattle are made a specialty of, as is the case in the western parts of the Province of Ontario.

Q. Do you raise hogs?—Yes, sir, our farmers do raise hogs, but I must say that they do not go much into this department of farming operations. We can raise, however,—when we try—fine crops of corn.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Then you do not raise hogs chiefly?—No, we do not.

Q. What animals do you raise?—We raise all sorts of animals, that are usually raised on a farm, such as horses, horned cattle, sheep and hogs; and, of course, in this connection, we, in common with other men, raise the kinds of stock which pays us best.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you feed much stock?—No, Sir, we do not do so in our section of the country. The place where stock is extensively fed is in the West, but the people in our district are going into it more as a matter of course. The country in our quarter has long been settled; a great deal of dairy work is carried on through the riding, a great many cheese and butter factories exist, and so on.

Q. Where do you find a market for your barley, Mr. Preston?—We find it, Sir, at home, we find it at our own docks. We ship it almost from our own doors, and certainly this is a very convenient thing for us. I am speaking of the country all along the front, in fact, of the River St. Lawrence, including the Bay of Quinte, running from Kingston to Picton, you understand, and the barley is taken direct in most cases to Oswego, although some goes to Chicago and some of it to Cleveland.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Where do you chiefly find a market for your horses, Mr. Preston?—Well, the Americans often come over amongst us and buy them, but owing to the fact that the Americans have imposed a heavy duty on horses coming into that country from Canada, this reduces the prices which they offer us, as you will see, considerably.

Q. That heavy duty is imposed by the Americans?—A heavy duty is imposed on the other side on our horses. It is 20 per cent. I believe.

Are any horses exported to the Province of Manitoba from your section of the country?—I am not aware, Sir, that this is the case; at all events, none are sent to Manitoba from the immediate locality in which I live; at least I am not aware of it if any have been sent; but a good many fine horses change hands in our section notwithstanding. Some of them are taken to the city of Montreal and to the East, and some are taken to the States.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose, that when these horses are not sold in your locality, they go to the States?—With some of them this is the case; others remain in the neighborhood; but the Americans often come over, if they can get fancy horses.

Q. And for such animals, I presume, they are prepared to pay a fancy price?—They will pay a fair price for such horses as suit them.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. In the States there is now a great demand for fancy horses at the present time?—Oh, yes, and some of these horses are taken from our neighbourhood to Leprairie.

Q. And some, I suppose, are taken to the city of Montreal?—No doubt that is the case.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. With respect to the outside market, your horses go, not to the North-West, but across the border? You ship away most of them to the States?—As to horses, some of them go to the United States, doubtless. In fact, many of them are taken there. I may say that good horses have been in fine demand in our section of the country during the past year.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Would it be in the interest of the farmers of your section of the country to admit any kind of American farm produce free of duty?—I think not, Sir. I could never see my way clear to thinking that such admission would not prejudice their interests; I mean, since the imposition of duties upon American agricultural produce. I think that these duties have proved decidedly beneficial to our farmers.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What kind of grain could the American farmers send into Canada to the advantage of the consumer? What could they so send in if the duties were removed?—I do not know that very much grain is brought into Canada from the United States. Rough grain, such as corn and oats, have been brought in from there; but as

to wheat, of course, I understand that some of it has been brought into Canada when the duty would allow of this being done.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are oats brought into Canada? Are American oats brought in here?—I was going to say that so far as my memory serves me, this has been the case. Corn and oats brought a good price this year, but I remember when cargoes of corn were brought to Kingston and sold at exceedingly cheap rates. It was brought from the West. This was also the case at Toronto as well. This took place when there was no duty levied on our side against American corn, Sir.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would it not be to your advantage to purchase American corn for the purposes of feeding?—I think that when American corn is cheap, as it was on some occasions during the administration of Mr. Mackenzie, it would be an advantage to buy it for feeding purposes. A decided profit could be realized out of the purchase of American corn and using it for feeding; but I hardly think that a profit could be squeezed out of the the operation at the present time. I understand that corn has gone up in price in the United States, owing, I suppose, to the slightly increased market, of which the American farmers are possessed.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think, Mr. Preston, that it pays the farmers in your neighbourhood to buy Indian corn instead of keeping their own coarse grains?—I think that it would pay them to follow this policy, if the corn was sufficiently low in price to warrant them in doing so.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would it pay them to do so, if American corn was free of duty?—Of course, if this corn were free of duty that might make a little difference in the price, but I do not think it would very materially alter the circumstances. I think that we could raise corn if our people were only inclined to set about it in earnest. I know that I have grown a fine sample, and obtained a very good crop, I have raised 50 bushels of good corn to the acre, and I can do this any year.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. How does corn compare with pease for feeding cattle and hogs? How does a bushel of corn compare with a bushel of pease for feeding purposes?—Corn is not as good as pease for fattening. Feeding hogs with pease produces a very fine article of pork, and I may say that barley is considered one of the best descriptions of grain, when it is properly prepared for putting fat on cattle, but owing to the fact that the American market is so convenient to us, we generally sell it for shipment across the border. During some years, I grant, that it would be cheaper to feed barley than it would be to buy corn, for feeding purposes under the present Tariff; but during the past year, 1881, for instance, barley was a fine price, and I think that if a man was bound to feed grain, he would be safer in buying corn at the quoted price, than he would be in feeding barley. Of course, you are aware gentlemen, that oats are supposed not to be so good for fattening purposes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What was the price of barley in the year 1881?—We generally got 90 cents a bushel for it, and a few obtained 92 cents and 92½ cents a bushel. These prices were paid.

Q. What was the price of corn last year?—I cannot tell you that, Sir. There is no corn raised in our neighbourhood, I may say; at least very little indeed is grown in our locality for export.

Q. Would it not be better for you to feed corn, and to sell your barley? Is there not the same nutriment for profitable feeding purposes in a bushel of corn, that there is in a bushel of barley?—For the feeding of cattle?

Q. Yes.—Probably that is the case, but there is no proportion in regard to weight.

Q. You can get nearly two bushels of corn for one bushel of barley? If you sold your barley with the proceeds of each bushel of it, you could purchase two

bushels of corn?—You must always take into consideration the fluctuations of the barley market. With this reservation I think that this statement might be admitted, but some years ago, for instance barley was exceedingly cheap. It was only worth at that time about 50 cents per bushel.

Q. Do you use some classes of grain in your section of the country for feeding purposes?—I can speak on that point from experience, we have used grain for feeding purposes. We have fed it to horses and colts, we grind a great deal of oats for this purpose.

Q. What different kinds of grain do you use for this purpose?—For chopping purposes, and for the feeding of horses oats are always considered a good wholesome feed, but there is not much corn raised in our section. Many farmers do raise corn, but they do not make a business of it. I think, that when they do raise it they chiefly use it for feeding their stock. At least, I am not aware that they have been in the practice of selling any.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you raise any pease for feeding purposes?—We invariably feed our pigs on pease, but notwithstanding this fact, I do not think that the practice is economical. I think that you can keep hogs cheaper on corn than on pease in a locality like ours, where we can raise a good crop of corn, but nevertheless, we are in the habit of feeding pease to a great extent.

Q. Are not oats cheaper for feeding purposes?—I am speaking, mind you, from my own personal experience. We and many other farmers grind oats for use in the spring of the year, and we feed them to colts and horses during the year.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you use damaged barley for feeding purposes?—Well, we do not have much damaged barley, but when we have any of it, of course, we might utilize it.

Q. I might ask you now, Mr. Preston, can you raise corn as cheaply as you can buy it in the States?—Well Sir, I never made the calculation, and consequently cannot answer that question precisely. You can draw your own inferences from the facts. I know, however, one thing: that if corn is properly cultivated, and is planted in a proper kind of soil in our section of the country, we can raise splendid crops of it, and I am not at all exaggerating—I have raised, as I stated a few minutes ago, 50 bushels of corn to the acre; not on one acre mind you, but on several acres. It was as good green shelled corn as ever grew. I do not hesitate to say so, and I can take my oath on it, if it were necessary. This is practically the fact as far as I am concerned.

Q. You are relating your own experience in this relation?—I am. But mind you, I do not think that all the crops of corn that can be raised in our district can come up to that figure, but nevertheless the average is good in our locality; of course, the variety which we cultivate is the yellow corn. We do not raise the Western corn, except for green feed. I most unhesitatingly endorse the statement, that I have raised 50 bushels of corn per acre.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. The farmers in your locality do not go heavily into the raising of corn?—No, they do not go into it generally; but it is sown for green food broad cast. Considering what splendid results can be obtained, however, one can fairly be surprised at the fact that the raising of corn is not more extensive in our section of the country.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of a duty on Indian corn, on the price of corn grown in your section of the country?—As far as I know, the effect of the levying of the duty on American corn has been to raise the price of those coarse grains which we are in the habit of growing for sale, this is the case with oats for instance. We sell a great many oats and pease. I know as a matter of fact that pease have realised a very good price during the past few years, and it is very likely that the imposition of the duty on American corn has had some influence in that direction. I have no hesitation, however, in saying that the imposition of the duty has affected the price of oats, by advancing it.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. How does the feeding of pease and of corn to stock compare as to results?—I think, Sir, that the farmers in our locality do not feed pease to any extent to any animals, save to their pigs.

Q. Take a bushel of pease, and a bushel of corn, how do they compare in results, when used in the feeding of pigs? What amount of corn is equal to a bushel of pease?—I have fed a good deal of corn during the year past, and think that it is most excellent for this purpose in cold weather. We often fatten hogs, partly in the fall of the year, and partly in cold weather, and I am conscientious in saying, that I think that a bushel of pease weighing 60 lbs. will put on as much pork in cold weather—during which better results are secured than is the case in warm weather—than a greater quantity of corn. I contend that a bushel of peas weighing 60 lbs. will put on as much pork in cold weather as will 80 lbs. of corn, at the least.

Q. That is equal to pretty nearly two bushels of corn?—I am giving the result by pounds; of course corn weighs 56 lbs. to the bushel, and peas 60 lbs. to the bushel.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of the duty on American corn with regard to the price which coarse grains bring in your section of the country?—The imposition of this duty has certainly raised the price of oats.

Q. Specify what has been the effect of the duty with respect to rye also?—The effect has been beneficial.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you know, Mr. Preston, what is the price oats bring on the opposite side of the river?—I do not know what they are worth on the American side, at the present moment. The newspapers will give you the prices in outside markets.

Q. You have doubtless read the prices in the newspapers?—The newspapers will give you all the information you are now seeking to obtain. I am prepared to say that oats are higher at the present moment there than they are here, then, as a matter of course, if there was no duty they would not be brought in here.

Q. Then how do you undertake to say, that the imposition of the duty on oats has raised the price of oats in Canada?—I am not speaking of the present state of the market; I refer to the general effect of the duty.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Did duty affect the price when American oats were brought in?—Yes, it did.

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of the duty on American corn on the price of rye? A great deal of corn is used for distilling purposes; what has been the effect of the duty on rye?—The price of rye went up during the year 1881, and I think it has gone up this year and remained at a good price up to the present time; but Mr. Howard can tell you that better than I can. As far as I remember, it has had the effect of improving the price of rye. I know that the price went up last year a very great deal; the advance bore a very heavy percentage to the price that was usually paid for this article. For a number of years rye was very cheap; in fact it was a drug on the market; and so much was this the case that many farmers discontinued the growing of it altogether.

Q. Since when was this the case?—This was the case since some few years past.

Q. Since when has the price of rye been increased?—I have not raised rye to any extent myself. It has not paid well enough; but I can speak particularly with regard to the condition of the market during last year. It was a very good price. There was, in fact, a very decided advance in the price of rye last year.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Is rye sent over to the American side of the border like barley?—I think not.

Q. Where is this article consumed?—As far as I have been informed, it goes chiefly to our own distillers. I fancy that it has been employed in lieu of corn. Since the latter has become so dear, it is used instead; and in this way, the imposition of the duty on American corn has had the effect of raising the price of rye. This, at all events, is my opinion.

Q. Last year's return shows that less rye was raised there during the year than was the case before?—Yes.

Q. This is the reason why I asked you whether any of our rye was sent to the United States?—Some of it may go to the United States. I do not know that it is not sent there, for there are a great many markets for the grain which we produce.

Q. Oh, yes; and then the farmers who sell the grain do not themselves know where it is sent?—I am aware, however, that a considerable quantity of our rye is used in our principal distilleries. This is the case in my judgment. We raise very good rye.

Q. You raise good rye?—We raise very good rye indeed.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. What is the difference between pease and barley? How do they compare? What is their difference in value, when they are used for feeding purposes?—I think, gentlemen, that farmers who live in the western section of Ontario, and who are in the habit of feeding to their stock all kinds of grain, would be able to give you a great deal more information on this subject than I can. We do not grind up good barley in our locality to be used in the feeding of stock.

Q. What is the difference in value for feeding purposes between corn and peas?—I was speaking a few minutes ago about corn and peas, and I stated that I believed that in cold weather, mind you—for I draw a distinct line between cold weather and warm weather in this respect—60 lbs. of peas will put as much fat on a hog or a pig as 80 lbs. of corn. In the summer or early in the fall, however, I consider, that corn contains about as much strength in the way of food for hogs as peas, I am satisfied that I am not very far astray in my calculation, if at all, which I doubt. If anything I am under the mark.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Can you give the comparative figures with respect to feeding hogs in warm weather, in the same way?—I might make a guess at the results in warm weather, but I would not speak with any degree of precision.

Q. I understand that you are simply giving your opinion as to results in both cases?—Yes, I can approximate to the truth, but that is all that I can do. I should, however, think that I am correct; at all events, I know what I would do, if the circumstances presented themselves. If I wanted to fatten pork fast at any time—and I do not want to be misunderstood, I refer to feeding corn as a whole and peas as a whole to pigs—I would take 60 lbs. of peas as going as far in warm weather, say any day in September, or at or about that time of the year, as 70 lbs. of corn. I am now considering the question from the point of view of putting on fat and forcing rapid growth—where it is desired to obtain such results specially. I take the position that corn is very nice food for animals for use in warm weather; but I claim that in cold weather it is less advantageous for fattening.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Suppose this case: is not 80 lbs. of corn the cheaper of the two, admitting that 60 lbs. of peas are equal to 80 lbs. of corn, can you not get 80 lbs. of the one cheaper than the 60 lbs. of the other?—No.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. A bushel of corn is nearly as high in price as a bushel of peas at the present time, is it not?—That matter is easily arrived at, it all depends on the condition of the different markets.

Q. What has been the effect which has been produced on the price of wheat and flour, by the imposition of duties on these articles coming into Canada from the United States?—Gentlemen, I think that others could inform you better on this subject than I can.

Q. What has been the effect of these duties on spring and fall wheat?—I think that you could get better information from the *Mail's* market reports than from a farmer in this respect. I, however, claim that the duties which have been imposed on American grain have been beneficial as far as wheat is concerned. I contend that the present duty has been beneficial in raising the price of wheat.

Q. Could you state to what degree it has been beneficial?—I would not give an opinion as to the extent of the benefit which has accrued to the farmers from the

duty, simply because I have not made a speciality of this subject, I have not studied the question at all, not having been interested in it. If I were to give my opinion at the present moment, it would be on mere presumption, and I might possibly be in error.

Q. Have you obtained a higher price for spring wheat as compared with the price which you have received for your fall wheat since the duty has been imposed?—You see, Mr. Chairman, I am here to give my experience as it were, in regard to matters appertaining to agricultural implements, and I stated in the beginning that we raised very little fall wheat, because it was usually winter killed in our section of the Province of Ontario, and therefore, from my personal experience, I could make no statement before the Committee, I could not give an opinion on this subject without referring—and you can do this as well as I can—to the prices which are published in the newspapers.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. There is one question which I would like to ask you before we leave the subject of grain, and this is simply: Can you state in the course of your remarks on the question of rye, whether the price of it has been generally higher since the duty was imposed on grain coming from the United States, than it was during the years previous to the levying of these duties?—I did not make any statement in that shape, Sir. I stated that last year in particular—and I think that this was also the case previous to last year—the price was good, and higher than it had been. I think that it was used as a substitute for other grain, but I would not say to what extent. I am not prepared to answer the questions generally of the Committee. I could not state positively whether the price of rye was advanced in the year 1880, but Mr. Howard can tell you that. I find, however, that rye has been higher and is a good price now. Rye was considered an excellent crop, as far as pecuniary results were concerned, in the year 1881.

Q. I understood you to say in general terms, that you thought that the farmers got a better price for their coarse grains in consequence of the imposition of the duty on American grain?—I think that such is the case at the present, sir. I think that the duties in question have raised the prices of our coarse grains during the past two years.

Q. There is one thing which I would like to ask you: Have you taken any notice of the comparative advance in the prices of coarse grains on your own local market, and do you know whether there has been a similar advance in the prices of coarse grains on any of the market prices. If such had taken place, no doubt you would have been cognizant of it; that is to say: Are you in a position to state that in consequence of the imposition of the duty on American products, you are getting higher prices for your coarse grains?—I have not. I would not pretend to enter into that question, as I have not paid sufficient attention to the condition of the markets to be able to do so. I am not interested enough in the markets to induce me to give so much attention to the subject.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Does American corn come into competition with your coarse grains for feeding purposes?—I think that it has had such an effect hitherto.

Q. What effect has the imposition of the duty on American corn? Has it had a tendency to raise its price?—Do you mean on this side of the border?

Q. Yes—I should think that it would have this effect. That is my opinion.

Q. Then if the price of American corn was increased, by the levying of the duty, would it be as keen a competitor in your market with your coarse grains, as it would be if there was no duty on it? Would not an increase in the duties have a tendency to raise the price of our coarse grains, for instance?—I think so. I am of opinion that the levying of these duties has a tendency to advance the prices of our coarse grains, that is the view which I take of it.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Could you give any comparison of prices since the imposition of the duties, to show their effect?—I have not gone into that question at all.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Does American corn when imported enter into competition with Canadian coarse grains for feeding purposes?—I think so, I fancy that this is the case. I remember reading something to that effect. A good deal of American corn is imported, and of course, it comes into competition with the coarse grains of Canada, more or less. Doubtless a good deal of it is imported for whiskey making and for distilling purposes, but I think that it still comes to a certain extent into competition with our coarse grains. As far as I know this is the case. I am now referring to conditions which at present exist. I do not allude to the state of affairs which existed when American corn was duty free. Of course, then it literally swamped our market. The Western States, as is well-known, are naturally adapted to the growth of corn; they sell it cheaply, and of course, when it was duty free, the Americans flooded our market with it many a time. This is as it were a matter of history.

Q. If there was no duty imposed on American corn would it compete more keenly with Canadian coarse grains than is at present the case?—My impression is, that if there were no such duty, it would tend to reduce the price of our native grown corn and oats. I think that this was the result during the Mackenzie Administration. In fact, I have no doubt that such was the effect of the absence of the duty. Its tendency was clearly to keep the price of our coarse grains down. The competition from this source, in other words, reduced the prices which we received.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. American corn, when there was no duty on it, reduced the prices of your oats and corn?—Yes, my experience has been such as I have already stated.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Does the importation of American corn for distilling purposes effect the price of Canadian rye and of Canadian corn in your opinion?—I think that it does have such an effect, but to what extent this is the case is another question.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose that you do not know to what extent the price is affected, as a matter of fact, from your own experience?—No, I do not, I could not tell you from my own experience with regard to corn, but I have had considerable experience in raising oats for sale. As to grain used for the purpose of distilling, I think that the existence of the duty has enabled Canadian farmers to realize better prices for the grain which they had to dispose of.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Does, in your opinion, the existence of the duty on American corn benefit the Canadian farmer?—I think that on the whole, Sir, it does, and I am of the opinion that there are many reasons which could be given for believing that this is the case.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would it not be better for the witness to back up his opinion by figures, and show the reason why he entertains these views?—I might say to that gentleman that I was requested to appear here but a little while ago, previous to which I had no intimation, and it is not likely that I could arm myself with statistics in that short time. Otherwise, I must of course state the opinions which I hold with regard to the practical effect of the Tariff on the agricultural interest.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What has been the effect of the increased duty on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard, with regard to the average price of these articles in your market?—I would not like to venture to give an opinion on that point. I am not a commercial man, and therefore I would not like to give an opinion on the price of live hogs. We do not deal in them. When we have a surplus of hogs, we fatten, kill and dress them and send them to the market.

Q. Is the market for the sale of poultry, eggs and butter improved under the present Tariff as far as your experience goes?—I would not say what has produced the increased prices, but poultry and eggs have very much increased in price recently. Eggs have been producing a good price, probably during the past three years. I

have been told that there is almost a countless number of eggs exported to the United States, and that this was one of the principal reasons why eggs were in such extra demand; and I think that there is some truth in that view, too.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I understand that eggs were shipped largely to the States from your section?—I have understood so. In fact, there can be no doubt of it at all. In other years it was the case, and the export has been very large of late years. From our section there has been an immense quantity of eggs sent across the border.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What have you to say about the prices of the ordinary fresh butter and those articles which are taken daily into the market—Well, I should think that the effect of the Tariff has been beneficial in this respect. Butter has been a good price, and it has been in keen demand for some time. I think that this is owing a very great deal to the fact that vast quantities of milk are being worked up into cheese. As a general thing, you are all aware that farmers believe that they can make more money out of cheese—in sending their milk to the factories, and having it converted into cheese—than in making this milk into butter. Of course, under these circumstances, less butter is made, and consequently there is more of a demand for it than was the case during the last few years, when the market was over supplied with butter.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Your cheese factory system is a pretty large one, is it not, locally?—We have a great many cheese factories. In fact a great proportion of the milk which is produced in our part of the riding is, I may say, worked up into cheese.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are there any manufactories in your section of the country?—I might add, with respect to cheese, that I know many practical men near Wallaceburg and Ernestown who buy their butter, so satisfied are they that they can make more out of converting their milk into cheese. They send their milk to the dairy and buy their butter, simply because they think they save by the process—and farmers, as you know, are, in common with others, very fond of the dimes and the dollars.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have the articles of cheese and butter been increased in price and in value during late years?—In 1880 if my memory serves me rightly, and also in 1881, these articles were very dear, they were unusually dear in 1881—I may say, even fictitiously dear; for when butter gets to be 25 cents a pound, I think that it has reached its full value.

Q. Do you attribute this state of things to the National Policy?—I do not know exactly what effect the National Policy has had on the prices of these articles. I have already alluded to the fact of the making up of so much of the milk in our section of the country into cheese, and this necessarily reduces the quantity of butter which is made. In many cases in my locality there is hardly enough butter produced to supply the demand.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You are now referring to the local demand?—Yes, I mean the local demand

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. There has been no change in the duties on these articles since the Mackenzie Government went out of office?—I am speaking of the local demand, I do not refer to the trade regulations in this respect; it is a matter of demand and supply. I can speak with undoubted confidence as to the state of affairs about my own place, and around the Bay of Quinte. I believe the same statements hold good for districts outside of this section as well.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the manufactories and lumber industries existing in your section of the country, of late years increased the demand for these articles, since the Tariff was introduced?—We have neither. I may say that with the exception of Napanee, we have very few factories, but new ones are springing up in Lennox and thereabouts, but in my locality there is no lumber. It is an old settlement, and of course the lumber business has become exhausted.

Q. Would Canadian farmers be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?—I think so; judging from our experience during the time when we had a Reciprocity Treaty, there is nothing that would be mutually more beneficial in its effects. I think that a Reciprocity Treaty would be a decided benefit, though I may be mistaken. Bear in mind that I mean a Reciprocity Treaty arranged on a fair, equitable basis, and not the one-sided arrangement which many Americans would like to see in force. Such a Treaty would be, in my opinion, fully equal to, and perhaps more beneficial to the Canadian farmer than the present system.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You mean a treaty which would allow of an exchange of products on equal terms?—Yes; it is always supposed that the terms shall be equal, but you are aware that the Americans have hitherto contrived to get the best of the bargain. We send a great deal of barley to the States, and they charge us 15 per cent. on all we export to them.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. The duty which the Americans impose on our barley is 15 cents a bushel?—It is 15 cents a bushel, and that is more than 15 per cent.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Would the Canadian farmer occupy a better position if a fair Reciprocity Treaty was negotiated with the people of the United States, or with duties imposed on their produce in the same way that they place duties on our products?—I think that if the Americans ever desired to meet us half way, it would be under the present system. Our imposition of duties upon their products should at least give an impulse desirous in this direction, but of course all that we can glean as their opinion on this subject, from their public press, you are well aware of.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What articles of American produce are affected by the imposition of our duties on them? Can you name any articles which these duties affect?—They shut these articles, to a certain extent, out of our market.

Q. I am not referring to the comparative influences of the Tariff on our productions. We have a Tariff which, it is assumed, will enable us to negotiate, under better terms, a Reciprocity Treaty with the Americans. I am now, however, merely asking you what particular articles of American produce our Tariff would affect, because if it has no effect on any of these articles, the American farmers would naturally say that the existence of the Tariff did not make any difference to them. Do you see the distinction? I am not speaking about the general influences of the Tariff; but suppose that we could negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty now, as compared with the time when we only had our old duties in this respect, would the duties which now exist enable us to do so on better terms? What class of articles of American production does the Tariff affect?—There are many things outside of the productions of the soil which our Tariff affects. I think that it affects machinery somewhat.

Q. I am referring to the principal products of the farm, and what the farmer has to sell?—We have been speaking about the probable advantages attending the existence of the duties on American agricultural products, upon rye and corn and oats, but we did not take barley into account. You are all aware, that the United States is to-day our great market for barley.

Q. Do you say that the Tariff makes no difference in the price of barley?—I think it has no effect on it, Sir.

Q. What effect do you think that the duty has on wheat?—I think, that there is perhaps one grievance, which the Americans would be slow to make. We send them four or five million bushels of barley and pay on it 15 cents a bushel in duty, making \$1.50 on every thousand bushels, and amounting to a great deal of revenue, which they would not like to lose.

Q. We sent them eight million bushels of barley last year?—I suppose that we did, but I have not a bit of doubt about it in my own mind, that if the Americans were

to take the duty off from our barley, this would give a great impulse to our barley trade.

Q. With reference to the other duties—of course, barley seems to be a settled question—with reference to wheat, flour, oats, pease and corn, what effect have the duties on these articles?—With reference to the most of these articles, we have always been led to believe that there was more of them imported into Canada from the United States than was exported from us to them; though it often happens, I suppose, that when the crop has been abundant here, and perhaps the price has been in consequence increased a little in the States, we have sent to them some of these productions, but I think that on the whole the Americans would meet us perhaps half-way more cheerfully on rough grains than on any other article. When I say rough grains, I mean pease, oats and corn and so on. It is understood of course, that barley is out of the question. It goes to them instead of coming to us. I think that they have been in the habit of sending a good deal of their rough grains into Canada, when there was no duty imposed on these productions on our side of the border, and when they had of them a surplus.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you import American pease occasionally?—No, I do not. We do not import any pease.

Q. Then, a duty placed on pease makes no difference in their price?—Well, it would have such an effect. If they came into Canada in large quantities, and a certain duty had to be paid on them, it would make a difference.

Q. But if no pease are imported, what difference can the duty make in the price?—They are not imported, it is true, but if there were a duty, they would be. In the Eastern States, however, I know that the farmers are almost unable to raise any pease, owing to the ravages of a bug. I can speak confidently in this respect of the State of New York—at any rate of a great portion of it.

Q. I suppose that practically, the great question is—whether corn and oats are affected by the duty?—I think so.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. And rye as well?—Yes; and rye.

Q. And rye comes as fully under this category as either of the two articles mentioned?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Does the imposition of a duty affect the price of rye?—I know that some years ago, when we had no duty on rye coming in from the United States they did import it; that is to say, that then rye was imported from the United States, in here.

Q. This article was imported during that period?—Yes; a great deal of rye is raised in the United States. In fact, a vast quantity is raised there, and when they had a surplus of it they sent it in to our market.

Q. Then you think that the existence of duties on corn, rye and oats would facilitate the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty?—I think so. This would be the tendency, as nearly as we can come to a conclusion on the matter.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Upon the whole, are we in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the present Tariff in existence, than we were when American farm produce was admitted into our country free of duty?—I thought that the existence of these duties would give a decided impulse in that direction. I do not see why the Americans would want to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with us, if there were no duties to be removed and no inducement for making such an arrangement. I do not see where they would obtain any benefit from such a Treaty otherwise, if they had all the benefits already. Of course, machinery and other matters would make some difference.

Q. Can you answer what it is that prevents the Canadian farmer from having access to the markets of the United States, when those markets are higher than ours?—When they are higher than ours? You say that this is the case.

Q. I will put it in this way: Have our farmers access to the American markets when the latter are higher than ours?—If they pay the duties which are imposed by the Americans on produce, doubtless they could have such access. Under such circumstances I do not see anything to hinder them from having it.

Q. This is an important point. We are told that the effect of the Tariff is to shut Canadian farmers out of the American market. Does the Tariff in any way prevent, or effect in any way such success?—Canadian farmers can take produce there if they pay duties.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Does the Tariff in any way interfere with the export of Canadian grain to the United States markets?—The present Canadian Tariff?

Q. Yes; does it interfere with the export of Canadian grain to the United States?—I cannot see it.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Of course, it is stated constantly in speeches and in the public press, that it has such an effect. This charge is made against the National Policy?—I do not see the logic by which such a charge is sustained.

Q. Has the cost of agricultural implements been increased under the present Tariff?—So far as my experience goes, they are clearly quite as good as they used to be before this Tariff was put in force, and I am safe in saying, at the same time, that they are cheaper. I am quite satisfied of this. I can purchase—and we are all purchasing—these things \$10 cheaper than we could four years ago; and we are buying other machines and implements as cheaply in proportion. I am sure of this; as to the cause of this state of things, that is another question.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You give no reason to show why this is the case?—I am not called to appear here, I suppose, to give any reasons for what is shown to exist, but simply to state my knowledge of the facts.

Q. Are these machines of the same weight, and as similar in make to what they used to be?—I think that, as far as I know, they are quite equal to the machines which we used to buy. Indeed, I think that they are superior to what they were. I am sure that they are superior in point of draught, to what they were a few years ago. But this is a matter which concerns mechanical progress. I consider that these machines, as they are now made, are improved in every way. They are fully as strong as they used to be, and they are otherwise improved as well. I am satisfied, at the same time, that they are cheaper. In fact I purchased one not long ago, and I know.

Q. Do you think that the machines are of the same weight as they formerly were?—They are fully as good an article in point of material, and they are improved in other respects besides; of course this is an outside issue which belongs more properly to mechanical science.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Did you say that they are cheaper than they were a few years ago?—I said that they were cheaper than they were four years ago, or four years and some odd months—I am not prepared to give the exact period.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You have no idea as to whether there has been any reduction in the weight of the material with which they make up these particular articles which you specify?—I think that on the whole, the Canadian manufacturer makes a better article than many which were once imported before there was a duty on these machines. Perhaps some of them are imported, still Canadians make an article fully better than the American; but this has nothing to do with the duty. It is in the interest of the manufacturer to supply a superior article.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. You think that the agricultural machinery which you buy to-day is at a less price, and equal if not better than the machines for which you paid higher prices some few years ago?—Most decidedly I think so. I never bought American machines but I have seen them.

Q. You are speaking of the excellence of Canadian machines?—I am making a comparison between the Canadian machines and those of American manufacture. As a matter of course, many of the American machines were introduced into this country many years ago.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Are the Canadian as durable as the American machines?—Yes, I think so. They are quite as durable.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the weight of a reaper or a mower?—Yes, I had a very tangible knowledge of their weight years ago; they were then made far too heavy. As to what may be their actual weight at the present time, I do not know what it is.

Q. Are you aware that they are reduced one-third in weight compared with what they formerly were?—I am aware that they are nearly one-half reduced in weight to what they formerly were. The horses used to be almost killed in drawing the old machines.

Q. The improvement made in the machinery has reduced the price of it?—You are quite aware that if machinery can be materially improved it is a benefit; and some few machines are now made which are 100 per cent. improved in point of draught. But bear in mind that they, at the same time, are strong for all practical purposes as ever they were. If they are not so heavy they are built with superior material, and thus a better article is produced.

Q. Do you think that they are as durable as they need to be?—I am sure that they are. I know all about this matter, for I have bought several machines and one lately. It was a splendid machine. It is one of Massey's manufacture. Of course our farms are pretty clear, and the machines, so to speak, do not run against many snags.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. To be fair you should mention the fact that the draught of the machine is lighter?—Well, gentlemen, with respect to four years or so ago I know something, that is to say, I took a little notice of this machinery. I would not say much about the draught of these machines four years ago. The heavy draught to which I referred is of an older date than that. I bought, for instance, a machine in 1871, and one lately, and there is in the latter a marked improvement in the draught; that is to say, in the draught of the horses. I want to be clearly understood on this point. There is a most decided improvement in this respect. Of course, this other was not one of the heavy kind of machinery, it was one of the wood machines. It would not be a good thing if the decreased weight of the machines were obtained at the expense of producing an inferior article; but it is made out of good material, and is composed of good iron and good wood, that difficulty can be got over; and it has been got over. I can assure you that in many cases it has been successfully overcome.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. The great question is this, these machines are not dearer than they were?—No, they are not; on the contrary, they are very cheap. This is a certainty. As a matter of course, I do not speak positively as to the weight of these machines, I merely mentioned the undoubted fact, that there is a decided improvement in the draught of them, and I think that this is the best criterion as to the improvement. If one horse can now draw a machine as easily as two horse could draw it twenty years ago, or a good many less years ago, is not that an improvement and a saving of horse flesh, and all that kind of thing?

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. There is no mistake about that?—That is a question that ought to be understood.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I wish to learn whether the manufacturers have reduced the quantity of raw material entering into the construction of these machines? Do you think that a reduction in the quantity of the raw material used would not reduce the price? You say that these machines are cheaper now than they were a few years ago?—I think that they are cheaper. I believe that I am safe in saying that they are \$10 cheaper.

Q. They do not use above two-thirds of the raw material which they formerly used up in the manufacture of these machines; and would not this reduce the price of the article?—As far as the iron is concerned the weight of the machine is reduced.

Q. We want to show you why they are not increased in price?—Of course, I am not a manufacturer, and I do not, consequently, know anything about the way in which these machines are made. Neither have I paid any particular attention to this subject. When I want an article I buy it and that is an end of it.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Have woollens, cottons and hardware increased in price since the National Policy was introduced?—Mr. Howard can answer that question far better than I can; he is a dealer in such articles.

Q. But what is your experience in this respect?—My experience has, of course, enabled me to know something about these articles; but I would not say as to any reduction in price.

Q. Are those articles in this connection, which are in common use, increased in price, owing to the Tariff; or is the effect of the Tariff otherwise?—I do not think that there has been any increase at all in the prices of these articles; but I cannot speak positively. I cannot see, however, any noticeable advance at all events. There may be an advance in some few articles, but if so, I think that these articles are very few in number. I cannot name one article that has increased in price to any extent. Perhaps some other gentleman would be able to explain these things better. As far as my experience goes there is no noticeable increase to any extent in any department.

Q. Has emigration to the United States increased or decreased in your section of the country since the present Tariff came into force? Has the present Tariff given diversity of employment to the people, and offered encouragement to the industrial classes in the country, and encouraged the Canadians to come back to this country?—The only subject which I could touch upon, relates to farm labourers and agricultural interests. Now I think that on the whole, the Tariff has done perhaps more good to the poor man than to those who are engaged in any other branch of industry; and I will give you one or two simple reasons for this.

Q. Is the general condition of the farmers and of the labouring classes improved since the year 1878?—Well, with regard to the labouring classes, although farmers have necessarily to pay out a good deal of money in wages every year, I would much rather see a little difficulty in securing a farm hand, even at an advanced price, than to see fellows coming along day after day and asking for work, when you did not want them and cannot give them any work. I think that this shows a much healthier state of things. It indicates a much better tone, when labourers are difficult to get, than when one sees idle men going about the country wanting work, but unable to get it. I mean to say that even the farmers who are paying more for the services rendered to them, than they used to do,—as we are doing now—prefer this, to the former state of things. Everybody is aware that wages have gone up.

*By Mr Bain:—*

Q. But what about the condition of the labouring class?—I am now speaking of labouring men. Well, I suppose, in order to account for the changed condition of affairs to which I have referred, you must look to the factories which are springing up all over the country. I could not say that there is anything new in this respecting my own locality; but of course, that is out of the question.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You are speaking from hearsay, are you not? There are no factories in your neighbourhood?—I do not want any gentleman to mix me up in my statements. I mean to say this: that owing to the factories which are springing up under the fostering care of the National Policy so-called, the idle men of Canada, who in many cases previously visited our localities looking for work, now find work more readily. Their families are not necessarily starving. This follows as a matter of course. I want to be clearly understood. Many farmers are very selfish men, and they think that it is a very great grievance if they have to pay \$20 or \$30 advance to a man for a year's service. I do not view it in that light. I think that this state of things speaks well for the growth and prosperity of the country, when men are better employed and paid a reasonable rate of compensation for their services.

Q. Do you not think that the scarcity of work hands is due to such an exodus to the West? Can you not account for it in that manner?—That will account for a part of it no doubt. I think that more have gone to the West since the fall than I ever knew before to move in that direction.

Q. This migration will account for that scarcity of labour more than the establishment of factories in our midst?—I think that both these causes have had a tendency to advance the state of things to which I have been referring. There is no doubt that thousands and thousands of men are now employed who, a few years ago, were out of employment; and I am forced to arrive at the conclusion that the factories which have sprung up during the last three years have had something to do with the present prosperity of the poor man.

Q. Where are they? I do not know where they are?—If Sir Leonard Tilley's opinion is worth anything, a great number of factories have sprung up. I have the list of them at home.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I merely wish to ask you one question: I believe that you stated that your neighborhood is strictly a farming locality?—It is strictly a farming centre.

Q. Do you know of any cases where parties have moved from your immediate neighbourhood—who were formerly employed about farms—in order to be employed in factories?—At the present moment I could not name any person who has done so. The population in our neighbourhood has varied very little during the past few years. But the other day a lot of young fellows started off; they had the fever very bad about Manitoba.

Q. That is an experience which we are all going through?—I am referring to what experience I have of men leaving our locality, and embarking in other engagements.

Q. What is the state of things in regard to your own immediate locality?—I am speaking of men who lived in our immediate locality.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Have wages advanced in your section of the country?—Yes, they have advanced most emphatically. There has been a decided increase in the wages paid.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Has real estate been reduced in price much during the last few years?—It has advanced in price.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has the general condition of the farmer and of the labouring class improved since 1878?—Most of our people are farmers. We have very few mechanics among us, but the mechanics who live in our neighbourhood are all tolerably well employed. There are very few men who do not have all they can do. We have no paupers, and we have no tramps.

Q. Do you now find men coming to you to seek employment, when you are unable to give them employment? Were there more of that class some years ago than is at present the case?—We had decidedly more of them a few years ago.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Then there were a lot of scallawags roaming about the country, who did not want to work?—I do not know about that, there may have been a good many scallawags, but I know that there were many honest men, who could not get work at that time, although they were anxiously seeking for it. The demand then was not equal to the supply. The number of these men has diminished in some way or other. There are not now to be found thousands of men looking round for work. Where they are gone I do not know. They may have gone to Hades, or some other place perhaps, but hundreds of factories are in operation now, and this may account for it.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Wages have been increased in your neighbourhood?—They have been decidedly advanced. I have no hesitation in giving my opinion on that matter Mr. Wallace. These are points upon which we can answer with certainty. It is unquestionable as I have stated. I may say we never had any tramps in our neighbour-

hood. I do not like the word, but there were many men who came into our locality looking for employment as labourers a few years ago.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Were these men farm labourers?—They were at all events willing to undertake farm labour.

Q. Were they of the class of men who may properly be called farm labourers?—They were willing to take hold of anything and make themselves useful—drive horses, &c. You must bear in mind the fact that farming is revolutionized. We used to ask a man—can you mow? or can you cradle? &c., but we do not think of asking these things now.

Q. I am a farmer and understand that.—Then you are posted.

Q. Yes; that is my experience. They belong to a class of men who had not been raised on a farm, but who were willing to do farm work?—Decidedly, that was the case.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. What is the condition of the wages paid to farm hands at the present time compared with what it was four years ago?—I do not know that. On the spur of the moment I could not give you an accurate statement under that head.

Q. Give your figures. Do you pay \$8, \$10, \$12 or \$15 a month for labour?—Many people engage farm hands in very different manners. We live in an old settlement and we do not do much winter work, and a great many of us now do not hire men by the year, but for a term of eight months, for instance, or some such period, and so on; and these men are paying their men at the rate of \$15 a month. I have heard of several cases in which that rate was paid; but how much more is paid I could not say at the present moment. This state of things has been, mind you, going on increasing. Doubtless the exodus to the westward has had something to do with it, and the factories have unquestionably had something to do with it too.

Q. You state that the rate of wages has advanced in your neighbourhood? What is the average increase in the wages which are paid to farm labourers and to working men in your locality?—I think that I would be quite safe in saying that they have advanced 15 per cent. That is about the figure in advance, which I might have paid.

Q. You know that you have paid your men higher wages?—Yes, I have.

Q. You know that two or three years ago, you were paying your men \$10 or \$12 a month, and that now the least you are paying, is say \$12 a month?—I think, gentlemen, that I am perfectly safe in saying—and I do not think that I am over-representing the case at all—that there has been an advance in many cases in the wages, which are paid to farm labourers, of 15 per cent.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. And you account for this advance by the exodus to the North-West?—Not in all, but it is due in part to this cause, and in part to the activity displayed in the factories. It is due to both these causes.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. You have given your reasons for this advance, and I now want to know to what extent this advance has taken place. You say the wages which are paid to farm labourers are higher than they were, and you attribute it to two causes, to the North-West and to the activity of the factories; but I now wish to learn exactly what advance has occurred in these ways?—I know that the question is strictly plausible and sensible; but what little I have already said I have stated without the slightest preparation. You have taken me at a great disadvantage. I knew nothing about my examination until I came here, and I had no time in which to make for it any proper preparation.

Q. But you know your business?—At the same time, on the spur of the moment I could not reckon up the exact advance; but you are aware, Mr. Wallace, that you hired men \$10 cheaper and \$20 cheaper a few years ago.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. There is one thing that I can see clearly, you know your own business?—I know how to hoe potatoes.

Q. How many young men left your locality to go to the North-West?—I might venture to say that three or four persons left our neighbourhood to go to the North-West last year. One of them was a carpenter. I think that I am safe in saying that three or four persons went up there to my personal knowledge; but this spring I think that twelve persons went up there; and some of these, as you are aware is the fact in every case of emigration, went east, some west, some north and some south. A few of them were very promising young men, and I am sorry to say that they did not all go to the North-West, some of them were induced to go, on the representations made by a certain person, to the Western States. This person, last year, went to work upon a big farm in the State of Minnesota. Money will do everything that can be done to take men away, and they were offered \$20 and \$25 a month to go to Minnesota, or anywhere in that region, to work upon these big farms.

Q. You are not referring to your own immediate neighbourhood?—I am speaking of my own locality. Some went from about Ernestown, quite a number went up, they were seized with the fever of speculation.

Q. I suppose that it is safe to say, that a few persons went up there from your neighbourhood last year, and that quite a number went up this year?—I could name three or four persons who went up there and one of them has succeeded tolerably well; he has become foreman, or something of that sort, on one of the big farms in the State of Minnesota, and he was told that if he would bring over a number of good thrifty, faithful and reliable Canadians, the company who own the farm would guarantee to pay them \$20 and \$25 a month; and this is the way in which they draw our people off to the United States. These are the wages which are paid on the wood farms of Minnesota, but the ordinary farmer in Canada could not afford to give that scale of wages. These large companies alone, who control and work 10,000 acre farms, as I understand it, can do that sort of thing. I have endeavoured to learn something about their operations, and I believe that this is the case. I was going to say, that of the four men who went to the West last year from our locality, I think I am safe in saying that two of them permanently settled in Manitoba, and two of them who went also to the Province of Manitoba, did not altogether approve of Emerson and its surroundings, and thus crossed over into Minnesota, having something to do with some big farm and getting high wages. As a consequence of this state of things, half-a-dozen or more persons have been drawn over there this season, but some of these persons will eventually come back to our own country.

Q. I suppose that in common with others in a similar position, you are losing by these departures some men whom you do not like to lose?—We are losing some persons whom we are very sorry to see go away from us. One young man in particular, of those of whom I have spoken was most promising, he owned 150 acres of land, but like a great many more young men, and I dare say that they crop up in your localities sometimes, the fever got possession of him and he went off to Manitoba. He was really in good circumstances, but the North-West fever had caught him very badly. There is one thing which I am sorry I did not explain better—a few have left Manitoba; but I think that out of these few—out of the four I spoke of—two went to the Province of Manitoba and settled, and took up land. They have made Manitoba their home and taken land, and all that sort of thing.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the general condition of farmers improved since the year 1878?—I want to be candid in every case. I would not venture to say that there is a distinct line drawn about 1878, or immediately after the introduction of the present Tariff or the National Policy, as it is called by some; but I know one thing, and this is that the times are decidedly better, money is plentiful. I do not say that the beginning of this era is to be found exactly in the year 1878, but I do know that at the present time, as far as our locality goes, things are really in a very prosperous condition.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Everything in fact is booming?—Well, there is plenty of money in circulation; any how, farmers have money, and they can buy what they want.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Is real estate in good demand in your section of the country?—Yes; it is really in good demand. I do not know that in this respect there has been any diminution in the price of farm land, or any decline in value in one or two parts of the country that I could name. In the upper portion of the Province I believe that the price of farm land has fallen off owing to the fact that people are moving off and emigrating to the Westward; but this is not the case with us. Farms in our locality are commonly sold for \$60 an acre, and I think that this is very fair compensation indeed, and I know that this is literally true to the letter. I am not speaking about grain, or the effects of duties now, but of what I know to be undoubted facts.

Q. Has real estate depreciated in your locality of late years?—In reply to your question, I beg to make this statement: Within a few years back—I would not limit an answer to such a question to the matter of merely four years, for these things do not spring up in a year, and farms do not sell at \$50 an acre this year and then at \$40 an acre next year—I see no diminution in the price of farm lands; in fact, there is no diminution in the prices that I am aware of; there is no depreciation at all in these values. Land for farming purposes is as high now as it was when Sir John A. Macdonald left office in the year 1873, and then times were very prosperous; but farm lands are nevertheless higher now than they were at that time.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Has there been any fluctuation in the prices of farm lands in your neighbourhood?—No, they are too high, if anything; this is the real truth of the matter.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Has the price of farm lands increased during the past few years?—\$50 an acre is as high as they ought to be, and they bring that price.

Q. Are farm lands as saleable at the present time as they have been for some years back?—Yes, they are just as saleable now as they have been, in every respect. At this point the examination of this witness was closed.

---

R. E. HOWARD, of Bath, appeared before the Committee, and was examined as follows:—

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Mr. Howard, what occupation do you follow?—I am a farmer and merchant.

Q. Are you a dealer in produce as well?—Yes.

Q. I would like to put to you this question: What has been the effect of the increased duties on the price of live hogs, dried hams, bacon, lard, and such articles?—Well, as regards the effect of the duties, I would much rather place it in this way: What were the current prices for hog products extending over a period, or whatever period of years for which you wish me to give the scale of prices? For what number of years extending back do you wish to get the prices?

Q. The object of the Committee is to ascertain, if possible, whether the duties have had any effect on the prices which have been received for these articles? I refer to the increased duties on live hogs, &c.?—I can give you the prices for the following years—as nearly as I can remember them—1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881.

Q. That will do?—Then I will give them.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. We would like to know whether the imposition of the duty has raised the prices to the extent of the duty or less. Have you an export trade, or do you come in contact with the American trade, so as to be able to say whether, when these duties were levied, the prices of the articles concerned went up in consequence?—I can only speak personally with reference to the local hog market.

Q. You do no export trade?—I do not buy from the West at all.

Q. Pork from the West does not come on your local market to compete with you in your operations?—The only articles that come on our market are barrelled pork and American beans and bacon, &c.

Q. Did the imposition of the duties affect the prices of these articles or not?—If you will allow me to give the list of the prices which I have paid for these articles, you can then judge for yourselves whether the duties have affected prices or not. I do not wish to speak from a partizan point of view at all. If you will put the matter in the light of a question of that kind, I can answer it.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. The best way to ask the question is this: Did live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard, which are imported from the United States, come into competition with similar articles in your section of the country previous to the increase in the duties?—Yes, very much, they came very strongly into competition with our products. If you desire it, I can give you the prices which I paid during the four years which I have mentioned.

Q. Have the increased duties reduced that competition to which you were subjected from the States, and increased the price of these articles in your section of the country?—The imposition of the duty has increased the prices of all hog products to more than the extent of the duty.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What is the duty at the present time?—It is \$2 a barrel on pork.

Q. Was it not that before? Was any change made in the duty imposed?—No.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Will you give us the relative prices which you mentioned?—I will.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Have you the prices for the year 1877?—During the years 1877 and 1878, the prices of these articles were much on the same basis. They were about the same. I bought pork in the fall of the year 1878; and I can remember with greater distinctness the prices which I paid during the years 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881. In 1878 I bought pork from \$3.50 up to \$5.60.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. You are speaking of dressed carcasses?—Yes. These are the figures which I gave per 100 lbs. Possibly, in some instances, I gave a little more. In the year 1879 I paid for dressed carcasses from \$4 to \$6.50 per 100 lbs.

Q. And what did you give in 1880?—In 1880 I paid from \$6 to \$9.50 per 100 lbs. Early in the season, as you are perhaps aware, we can always buy pork considerably cheaper than we can towards the last of the season. In 1881 I paid for pork from \$7.50 to \$9.50 per 100 lbs. Q. For dressed hogs?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you buy your pork from the farmers who live in your neighbourhood?—Yes, I get it chiefly from them.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Have you ever dealt in live hogs?—No, I never deal in live stock of any kind.

Q. Do they dairy much in your section of the country?—Yes, Sir.

Q. And have they carried on these operations more extensively of late years, than was the case a few years ago?—I do not know that there has been any increase in these operations during the past three years. There are any number of factories in our section of the country, and any number of cows which supply the milk to the numerous factories. The people in our section are almost wholly engaged in making cheese. They make very little butter.

Q. The farmers would not likely raise much pork, while they were encouraging a branch of business of that kind?—The country was formerly full of it, and the production of pork has shown very little falling off during the last six or seven years.

Q. I suppose that the factories produce quite as much pork as they used to do? How much of the increased price of pork do you attribute to the duty?—I attribute an increase in the price of this article, equal to the full amount of the duty.

Q. That would make an increase at the rate of \$2 a barrel?—Yes.

Q. That is your opinion?—That is only my opinion. I do not advance anything, save an opinion on this subject, and the figures which I have mentioned.

Q. You have had no experience in connection with the American market?—I have given you the results of my practical experience.

Q. On what do you base that opinion, Mr. Howard?—I base it on my former dealings in pork, before this Tariff came into force.

Q. With American pork?—Yes, with American pork. I did not deal in their pork in the hog, but in barrels. I then sold a great deal of American pork. I now chiefly buy the Canadian article. Formerly, however, I used to buy the American barrelled pork.

Q. Could you give us the quotations for those articles? What prices were you then accustomed to pay?—I do not remember the prices very precisely.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Do you buy hams and bacon—American hams and American bacon?—Yes, we buy a great many canvassed hams.

Q. Do you buy them from the Americans?—Yes, but I am more thoroughly posted in the prices of the articles, which I buy from the farmers. In former years, before the Tariff came into force, I bought a great deal from the Americans.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You say that you cannot give us the exact figures?—On what?

Q. You cannot give us the American quotations?—I have not with me the American quotations for pork.

Q. You cannot give the price per barrel?—Well, you can easily make up the price per barrel, and put it on the same ratio. Reduce the hog product, the pork in hog to a barrel of pork, make up the cost and then add the duty to the cost and you will place the American product on the same basis. I think that you will find that you are not out of the way.

Q. Of course, I understood you to say that during a certain time you handled American barrelled pork, but that as to the quotations of American pork in barrels for the year which you have mentioned, you could not give them?—I cannot give the exact figures from memory, but the prices can be placed on the same basis in the manner which I stated.

Q. I think it is only fair for you to add that you are not able to give the exact figures?—I could not give the prices of American pork in barrels from memory, but you can reduce the hog product to a barrel of pork in much the same ratio by the addition of the duty. I know that immediately after this Tariff came into operation we had to pay that much more for American pork. The duty was then added at once to the price of whatever American pork that we bought. Of course if I had known that I was to be examined on this subject I could have referred to my books, and I could then have given the figures at once.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Where do you find a market for the pork which you purchase?—I sell it chiefly to farmers.

Q. Do you deal much with lumbermen?—Yes, I do a great deal with Rathbun during certain years if I can buy cheap enough. I found, however, that during the last two years he could get his pork cheaper in Hamilton, Toronto or Chicago, where the price was very much lower.

Q. Would not the extra duty which has been imposed, have a tendency to injure the lumber interest if they had to pay in consequence an extra price for their pork?—Of course, if they have to pay more for their pork.

Q. Then this duty would hurt the lumber interest?—I am not going to enter upon a discussion of this question. I sold him a few barrels of pork last year, but it did not amount to much.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Are you aware that Mr. Rathbun is actually buying in Chicago?—I know that he formerly bought pork in Chicago. I do not know, however, that he did so during last year. At all events he bought a great deal of Western pork from dealers who have imported it.

Q. What is the effect of the duties on dried hams and bacon and lard?—They are in the same position as pork in this respect.

Q. All of them?—Yes, they have advanced in price in the same ratio, and the advance has been due to the same causes. They stand in the same proportion, and they are exceedingly high in price this year.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Are they higher than the duty, has the advance in their price been greater than the duty?—Yes, relatively.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What has been the effect of the duty on Indian corn, on the price of the coarse grains in your section of the country?—There has been an increase in the price during the last year and a-half of all coarse grains. Corn, which stood at 50 cents a bushel a year and a-half ago, and which was even as low as  $47\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel, is now quoted at 75 cents a bushel, or has been so quoted. It is, however, somewhat lower to-day.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What was the highest quotation?—Corn, when it was at its highest point, was 77 cents a bushel.

Q. What is the price of oats?—I purchased oats during the last few years previous to 1880 and 1881, at about 30 cents a bushel. In 1880, however, the average price was 35 cents a bushel, and, in 1881, the average price was 40 cents a bushel.

Q. Are they the same price this year?—I speak for the year 1881. With reference to fall purchases, most of our oats are now sold in the fall of the year. Oats to-day are, however, as dear as they were in the month of November last.

Q. How has the price of rye been affected?—Rye has been exceptionally high in price during the past two years. In 1878 and 1879, I bought rye down as low as 45 cents a bushel.

Q. What is the price of this grain now?—The price of it ranged from 45 to 60 cents a bushel during the years 1878 and 1879. In 1880, I commenced buying it at 60 cents a bushel and I bought it up to \$1 a bushel. In the year 1881, during the fall, I sold rye in the month of October at \$1 a bushel, free on board, but it has since declined; and to-day it is worth 80 cents a bushel. We paid from 95 to 98 cents.

Q. Give us the range of prices?—In 1880, the usual paying price was \$1 a bushel, and it sold in our neighbourhood as high as \$1.10 a bushel.

Q. Have you any experience in connection with wheat and flour?—Formerly I sold wheat; of course I am a large buyer of flour—I am a retailer of it.

Q. We might ask you one question:—Where did you buy your flour previous to the introduction of the National Policy?—What flour I have bought, I have always obtained from Canadians. I always purchased from Canadian manufacturers. Relative to the question of rye, I would like to make one statement, which is, perhaps, due to both sides of politics: our surplus shipments of rye during the last two years have been almost wholly made to Germany, and this is one reason why the price of this grain has gone so high.

Q. Are you still shipping this year to Germany?—I think that a good deal of rye will go there this spring, this will come out of our surplus. This has been going on perhaps for eighteen, nineteen or twenty months.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. In your opinion, it is the duty which has been placed on American corn that has increased the price of coarse grains in this country, is it not?—I do not think that I could for one moment hesitate to say that this duty does increase the price of our coarse grains. This is the result of my experience in dealing in grain.

Q. Now, as a rule, have not the prices of oats and pease, and the coarse grains which we raise—barley is out of the question here—been advanced in consequence of the duty on American corn? As a rule, have not your oats and pease latterly been more valuable than corn, even with the duty added, I mean more valuable per pound?—Pease are always worth more than corn.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. In that case the farmer would not feed pease to any extent, if he could buy cheaper corn? The price of corn would not affect the price of his pease?—We find a market for our surplus pease.

Q. Do you send them to the East?—Yes.

Q. But they say that pease at our ordinary figures are too valuable to feed in this way; that it is that they are a higher price than corn at all times?—Pease are with our people, one of the chief grains that are used for fattening purposes, that is for fattening hogs.

Q. The farmers raise a small quantity of pease for their own use?—Yes, they raise a small quantity of them for the fattening of their hogs, and some few for market. But farmers will not grow as much pease as they were accustomed to do.

Q. Now, it would be an advantage for the farmer to import cheap corn, unless he can raise it cheaply?—I was very much struck, when I was travelling through the country last year, at seeing the large corn fields which were frequently visible. Some other grains are less productive than corn, and as the farmers are running their land out with continued crops of barley, it is a great advantage to have that article raised.

Q. It is to the advantage of the farmer to raise the highest priced article, whether they take one or another. What is the average price raised at ordinary sales of pease and oats; I am not speaking of barley?—I could not answer that question fully. I could not give such statistical information as would be satisfactory to myself, and therefore I would not give it at all.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. You have no doubt in your mind that the prices of coarse grains are increased by the imposition of the duty on corn?—I have no hesitation whatever in answering yes to that question.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I asked you for some basis by which you could show us that they have been in this manner increased in price. I would like you to show clearly that the higher prices are due to the duty?—I could not answer that question more fully than I have done. You have the price of oats there; you have also the price of rye. Now, take pease for instance: I can quote you the figures which I have paid for them during the last four or five years, as well as my memory serves me; at any rate, I can come within a very few cents of the actual prices paid, and this will give you an idea as to the effect of the duty, and this will be a partial answer to your question. In the years 1878 and 1879, pease cost me 62½ cents a bushel; in 1881, their average cost to me was 75 cents a bushel. We are now paying a little more for them. We are giving 77 cents a bushel.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. You stated that the land was being run out with barley in your section of the country, and that the raising of corn was a decided benefit to the land?—No doubt there was a greater breadth of land applied to the raising of corn last year, and there will be a still greater breadth of it utilized for this purpose this year.

Q. Is this in consequence of the failure of the crop of pease?—Yes, and it is also owing to the high price of Western corn.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I understood you to say that it was in consequence of the failure of the crop of pease?—It is partially in consequence of the failure of the pease, but it is also partially due to the high price of corn.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. And the higher price of this corn is caused by the duty?—You can draw your own inferences. Any man of common sense will draw his own inferences from it.

Q. We wish to arrive at the results?—In the first place, I am not here to give a comparative statement, I simply want to give a statement of the facts, as nearly as I can state them from memory.

Q. Are woollens, cottons and hardware increased in price or otherwise, in consequence of the putting in force of this Tariff?—I have an interest in a cotton factory in King-ston, in which I am a stockholder. We have not as yet commenced the making of cotton, but we have spindles running. We are spinning, and we expect in a short time to commence weaving. As regards the products of cotton factories I cannot say for a certainty whether there has been any increase in the prices of the goods or not; but in regard to woollens, there has been no increase whatever. I can buy woollens as cheaply to-day, and 10 per cent. better in quality than I could six or seven, or eight years ago; they are fully 10 per cent. better in quality.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. There is virtually no duty on wool?—The duty is not heavy.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. There is another reason, in so far as wool is concerned, for this state of things; perhaps for one thing, the farmers have to content themselves with reduced prices for their wool?—I have heard of an increase of half a cent in the price of cotton; but on making an examination into the quality of the goods—and I looked into it very closely—I could not say that it struck me that such was the case. I buy wool from year to year; I examined into the quality of cotton, owing to the fact that I was led away by what I had heard as to there being an advance of  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent—or something like that—a yard in this article; but in closely examining the goods I could not see it. Woollens, however, are just as cheap as they used to be, and the quality of the goods is 10 per cent. better.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Have you been in the habit of purchasing wool?—Yes, Sir; I have bought wool for twenty-four years.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What are the quotations on your local wool market?—I can give the average rates.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Give them for the year 1878 and for the same years you mentioned in connection with the the other articles?—There has been very little difference in the prices which have been paid for wool during the last four years. The prices paid have ranged from 50 to 25 cents a lb.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Will you be so good as to give the quotations for each year?—I will give the average.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What was the price which you paid for wool during the year 1878?—I think that I can meet your wishes in this way: I commenced each year by paying for wool about 22 cents a pound, and the price ranged from that up to 25 cents a lb., with the exception of last year. The highest price which I paid for wool last year was 24 cents; but I paid up to 25 cents a lb. previously, with the exception of the last season, 1878, when I commenced at 22 cents a lb. and paid up as high as 24 cents a lb.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Then the imposition of the duty on wool has not enhanced the price of it?—The duty is not placed on wools like ours, but it is levied on fine wools. It is not collected on coarse wools.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Was not the price of wool very low in the spring of 1878?—It was then lower than the price which was paid before.

Q. To what figures did it go down?—It went down to 16 and 17 cents a lb. during the year 1878. I might as well give an explanation while I am on this question. Our wools are all coarse, with rare exceptions. Now and then a farmer who has tried to bring his stock into fine wools, will bring in some wool of this quality. I had offers from manufacturing houses as high as 33 cents a lb. for such qualities of wool as are used for manufacturing purposes in this country.

Q. Are you referring to Southdown wools?—Yes; but we have none of them. The wools for the purposes of manufacturing—such as are used in our factories—are almost wholly imported.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do they work up much wool in your locality?—There is no woollen mill there; Napanee is the nearest place for this purpose.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Where do you find a market for your wool?—I have sold what I have purchased chiefly to large holders in Toronto and Brockville. There is a large holder of wool at the latter place—Mr. Boyce—who buys from the local dealers, and holds the stock until such time as it suits him to sell. He is a large capitalist and he stores it away, awaiting the opportunity to make disposition of it. Of course he endeavours to buy as reasonable as he can. He has been a buyer of this article for a great many years.

Q. Where does he find a market for his wool?—He selects whatever portion of his stock that may answer for the uses of our manufacturers, and ships the balance of his stock to the other side—to Boston; where it is worked up in the manufacture of delaines and blankets. Of course, we have more than a sufficiency of coarse wool to supply the blanket factories in this country.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Our own manufacturers are using rather more Canadian wool this year than was formerly the case. I think that this is in consequence of its cheapness; at least, that is what they tell me up West?—Perhaps.

OTTAWA, 30th March, 1882.

The Special Committee appointed to consider the effect of the Tariff on the agricultural interest of the Dominion met this morning.

THOMAS DIGHT, of Lucan, was examined.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Dight?—Well, at present I am a miller and produce dealer.

Q. Have you ever been engaged in farming?—Yes; I was farming for ten years in this country, or for about ten years. I was brought up to the farming business in the Old Country.

Q. In what section of the country do you carry on business at the present time?—In Lucan.

Q. In what county, is it situated?—In the County of Middlesex.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What was the extent of your farming operations?—I was brought up on a farm which consisted of 500 acres.

Q. That was in the Old Country?—Yes. And here I farmed 100 acres in the township of Etobicoke, and in the township of McGillivray I also farmed 100 acres.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I believe, that you were Reeve in the township of McGillivray?—I was Deputy-Reeve of McGillivray.

Q. But you were Reeve of Lucan?—Yes; I filled that position for three years.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Where do you find a market for your flour?—At present, we find a market principally in the Lower Provinces.

Q. Did you have this market for your flour before the imposition of the present duties?—No. We then used to send our flour either to the city of Montreal to be sold by commission agents, or to Liverpool, or otherwise we sold it to exporters. At that time we sold some flour to dealers in the Maritime Provinces, but it was very little.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What is the capacity of your mill?—We can grind a car-load of flour in a day, that is in twenty-four hours. I brought along with me a memorandum giving the quantity of wheat which we took into the mill from the 1st day of September to the last day of the year, and this quantity was 58,606 bushels. It was not all ground during the period in question, however, there was a good bit of it left in the mill at the end of the year, but considerably over 50,000 bushels were ground at that time.

Q. What are you paying for wheat at the present time, Mr. Dight?—We were paying from \$1.20 to \$1.25 a bushel for red wheat when I left Lucan.

Q. Can you pay that price for wheat, grind it up into flour, and ship the flour to England? Have you ever shipped flour to England, in the first place?—Yes, we have shipped flour to England, but we have not done so for some time. I can tell you when we shipped flour last there. I brought along with me some returns, for I thought that you might want to look at them, and in order that I might be able to answer precisely any question on this subject, and I find that our last shipment to Liverpool was made on the 31st of May, 1881.

Q. That was your last shipment to that point?—Yes, we sent to John Jackson & Co., 500 sacks of flour on that date.

Q. Can you pay as high prices for wheat to be shipped to England in the shape of flour, as you are now giving for Canadian wheat?—I could not do so, according to the present quotations. I see by yesterday's *Mail*, that the quotation for flour in the Old Country was 12 shillings. This was in the Liverpool market. We could not pay over \$1.10 a bushel for wheat to be shipped over there in the shape of flour, at the price of flour quoted.

Q. The quotation is per bag?—It is per 100 lbs. The price of \$1.10 for wheat is equal to \$3.09 laid down in England, and the quotation there is \$2.88 per 100 lbs.; and the expenses which I have just been figuring according to the rates which used to be charged us, are \$1.24 per barrel.

Q. What difference does it make in the price of wheat in your locality to have the home market for flour?—According to the report which we have from Liverpool to-day, if we had to send our flour to that market it would make a difference to the Canadian farmer of fully 10 cents.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you mean that it would make a difference to the Canadian farmer of 10 cents a bushel?—Yes, and we are paying \$1.20 a bushel for wheat; this is the lowest price that we give, and it would be equivalent to \$3.32 per 100 lbs. for flour delivered in Liverpool.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. How do the bonding arrangements work in the case of flour going from Canada through the United States to the Maritime Provinces?—We do not ship to the Lower Provinces through the United States. We send our flour by all rail route *vid* the Intercolonial Railway. We did ship some flour to that market through the United States, but we experienced a good deal of difficulty in doing so, and for this reason we had to stop it. We shipped it to Fredericton, but it lay a long time at the junction before it reached the city of Fredericton; and consequently Mr. Randolph, to whom we sent it, preferred that his flour should go down by way of St. John.

Q. Have you noticed any difference in the price of certain classes of wheat since the present Tariff came into operation?—Yes. I was first making a note of certain differences in quotations which I took from the columns of the *Globe* newspaper. I wanted to get the *Globe* and obtain the prices for the years 1877-78, but it seems that no London *Free Presses* or *Advertisers* are to be had. My intention was to make a comparison between the prices which are quoted in London and those which are quoted in Toronto. I see that in the year 1878 fall wheat was quoted in the city of Toronto from 85 cents to \$1.06 per bushel, while in London it was then quoted at from 80 cents to 90 cents per bushel. Spring wheat, at the same time, was quoted at from 80 cents to \$1.01 per bushel in Toronto, and red wheat was quoted in

London from 84 cents to 87 cents per bushel, showing that this wheat was a great deal dearer in the city of Toronto than it was at the same time in the city of London. But I see that the quotations for this month in Toronto, according to the *Globe*, is from \$1.28 to \$1.29 per bushel for wheat, while the quotations in London is from \$1.29 to \$1.32. The last report shows that the price of wheat was, on March 8th, \$1.20 to \$1.25 in the city of Toronto, while it varied from \$1.25 to \$1.28 in the city of London.

Q. The effect of the duty on wheat has been to improve the prices on the market in London very considerably?—Yes. You see from the figures which I have given, that, in the year 1878, wheat was a great deal dearer in Toronto than it was in London, and since that time wheat has been dearer in London than it is in Toronto. This is the case this year at all events.

By Mr. Trow:—

Q. How do you account for this, seeing that the wheat has to pass east for a market?—I account for it in this way. In the year 1878, the millers of London ground up a great deal of Minnesota wheat, and consequently they did not pay so much for the wheat which was offered on the local market, because they did not want it; but since the duty has been imposed on the American wheat they have had to buy the wheat they required from the farmers who live in the neighborhood of the city. And this is the reason why the price of wheat has gone up so there. That is the only view I can take of the matter at all events. In the year 1877, I am aware that there were very large quantities of Minnesota wheat, which were ground by the millers in London, and the flour from which went into home consumption mostly in the city.

By Mr. Bain:—

Q. Do you know that these millers do not grind up Minnesota wheat now?—No, I do not know that they do not. This is not to my personal knowledge, but I take it for granted that they are not able to pay the duty on that wheat, and grind it up for consumption at the present time. The millers in our neighbourhood use red wheat as a substitute for Minnesota wheat for bag flour. I refer to red winter wheat. We find that red winter wheat makes very good bag flour indeed.

Q. I suppose that you do not have spring wheat offered in any quantities on your local markets at the present time?—This is not so much the case as it was formerly.

Q. I presume that it does not do as well with you as with us; farther to the East the crop, I suppose, has of late years been a partial failure with the farmers?—Yes, that is the case, it has been a partial failure. I got some spring wheat last year from the Province of Manitoba, to try it, and to see how it worked; but I would rather have the red winter variety than the Manitoba wheat, and this is also the opinion of the bakers who used it.

Q. Your experience under this head is a little different from the experience of millers farther East?—I only got some of it to try it, but the bakers who received it did not like it.

Q. You found that it did not make as good flour for your own purposes as does the red winter wheat?—No, I sent it to the bakers, and praised it up as an extra choice article, which I expected it would be, from all that I had heard of the article, but the bakers found fault with it. They did not like it as well as the flour, which I had supplied them with from the red winter wheat. I can safely praise up the quality of the wheat which is produced in Western Canada. I sent a car-load of the flour, ground partly from this Manitoba wheat down to Belleville. I used about one half of Manitoba wheat, and about one-half of our own wheat, mixing the two together, but he said that the bakers in his vicinity did not like the flour anything like as well as they did the flour which was produced from our own wheat.

Q. I suppose that this state of things is due to the bakers demanding Red Wheat flour; consequently it becomes more valuable, and you pay a better price for it?—In the year 1878, we used to pay two cents less a bushel for red wheat than we did for white wheat, but we now pay about five cents a bushel more for red wheat than we do for white wheat.

Q. At that time you could get more spring wheat on your market?—Yes; that was the case, but I look upon the matter now in this light. If spring wheat was allowed at the present time to come in free of duty from the United States, red wheat would not be worth more now than it was then.

Q. Under these circumstances, their spring wheat would come into direct competition with our red wheat?—Yes; and this would lessen the price of our red wheat from 5 to 6 cents a bushel.

Q. You never ground up any Minnesota wheat?—No, I have not.

Q. You do not know how far it compares in quality with the wheat which is grown in the Red River Valley or the North-West?—I do not.

Q. Because if the qualities of these wheats are alike, your experience would seem to indicate that our red wheat is better for bakers' purposes than our own hard spring wheat?—My own belief is, that red winter wheat is as good for bakers' purposes as is any spring wheat, save Scotch dark Fyfe. The Fyfe wheat is the best spring wheat grain, and it makes the best flour of any grain. I never saw anything that makes as good flour I may say, as the Fyfe spring wheat.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. The Minnesota wheat is really the Fyfe grain of Canada?—I could not say as to that.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose that you remember the time when our millers would not take the Fyfe wheat?—I remember, and I was a farmer at that time. When we had 500 or 600 bushels of this grain, they said that they did not like the Fyfe grain very well; and so, before selling it, I took a grist to the mill. I had the stones arranged and turned out, and I never saw better bread than that which was produced from the flour that we obtained, only you did not want to grind this wheat under sharp stones. The great trouble when this variety first came in, was that the Malden wheat was pretty nearly the only kind of spring wheat that we had in this part of Canada, and for it you required to dress the mill stones very heavy, because it was a little soft, but when you had the Fyfe wheat to grind, you had to dress the stones as lightly as you could, in order that it might not be cut up too much. It was more the fault of the miller than of any one else that it did not give satisfaction.

Q. I fancy that there is something in that, I think it likely that every new kind of wheat requires different treatment?—Oh yes; that is the fact.

Q. Do you not think that there is something in our climate which improves the quality of these wheats, including the red wheat of which you have spoken?—Either one of two things is true—either the red wheat is improved, or we know better how to handle it.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have you adopted a new system of grinding wheat?—No; I have not.

Q. Do you use stones for grinding?—Yes, I do. I was just looking through the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I see that in the year 1878 there was an immense lot of wheat brought into this country; and also of flour. The quantity of wheat was 1,522,309 bushels, which was ground into flour, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, which also state that this flour went into home consumption. These returns also state that there went into consumption 311,406 bbls. of flour, which were directly imported into this country, making a total of 662,708 bbls. flour for the year 1878.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. This wheat was ground into flour in Canada?—Yes; it was.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have you the exports for that year?—You can easily ascertain the quantity from the Trade and Navigation Returns. I suppose all you gentlemen have these books at your command. In the year 1881 there were only 76,652 bushels of wheat brought into Canada, which would make a capacity of 9,998 bbls. of flour.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. This flour went into home consumption?—Yes; and there were imported also 197,581 bbls. of flour, which makes a total of 207,579 bbls. of flour that were brought into Canada during the year 1881.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would that not displace a similar quantity for export?—It must have done that. The Americans at that time had our home market and they made us export. At all events that was my experience in this respect. We had no market during that period in the Lower Provinces, but the Americans had it all. When I speak of the Lower Provinces, I mean the Maritime Provinces. I do not think that we shipped any flour to that quarter during that time, save a few car loads to St. John. I think that I shipped some flour once to Mr. Bullock, and I sent some once to Halifax to be disposed of on commission, but we found that the business was not very satisfactory under the then conditions.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You found that it did not pay?—We sold the flour well enough, but the commissions which we had to pay ate up the profit, and this was also the case with the flour we had sold in the city of Montreal.

Q. Can you give us any idea as to how the commissions which you were forced to pay, affected your profits?—It affected our profits in this way: I have brought along with me some of my bills in order that you might see how matters stood for yourselves, if you like to look at them. We have not shipped any flour to the city of Montreal since the harvest; everything that we have sent out has gone to the Maritime Provinces, or to the Eastern Townships, since harvest.

Q. Since last harvest?—Yes, since last harvest we have not sent a pound of flour to market, or to any other place, to be sold on commission. When we did send flour to Montreal, we had to pay about 12 cents a barrel in commission, insurance and in connection with like charges. You can look at the memoranda which I have brought with me. I did not pick out any particular ones, I only took a few indiscriminately off from the fyle on which they hung. It used to cost us about 12 cents a barrel for the expenses we were obliged to pay in the City of Montreal. But we save all that now by sending our flour down to the Maritime Provinces, and we not only do that, but this gives us another great benefit, we probably save from 5 to 6 cents a barrel in freight, on what would be shipped to Montreal, to be from thence shipped away a second time. In fine, we save a double shipment by sending it direct to the market.

Q. Are you positive that you millers are now giving the Canadian farmers more for their wheat, as compared with what they used to receive formerly, when they depended on the Liverpool market alone for the prices which they received?—I am quite positive, Sir, that for every bushel of red wheat, especially, that we have used, we pay now more than we would under the other circumstances to which you have referred, by 5 cents a bushel.

Q. The millers then do not receive the whole of the benefit, which has resulted in this respect from the change in the Tariff?—No, they do not. The millers are just a class of men who are willing to live and let live. We do not like to take too much.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You think that the farmers get the benefit of the change in the Tariff?—I think that millers are very moderate men.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. The reason I ask you this is because it is frequently stated that the farmers receive no benefit under this Tariff, and that if any benefit is obtained by any one under the Tariff, the millers get it all?—I am quite positive on this point. I know that there are some gentlemen in this Committee who are opposed to my views; but I respect the opinions which they hold; all the same, I am, however, positive that the farmers in our part of the country received for wheat this winter, at all events, fully 5 cents more than they would have obtained had there been no duty on wheat, be-

cause the wheat in question was not bought for the purpose of shipping it to Liverpool, but for home consumption. It is in the interest of dealers to give paying prices. We expect to sell the wheat which we buy in the local markets, for home consumption, because the profits from other transactions in the past have been quite the reverse.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose, as a matter of fact, that the buying of grain for shipping purposes has not been a profitable business for quite a number of years?—It has not been a profitable business when purchased for shipment to the Old Country. I do not think that it has been profitable; at all events, I know that what we shipped to the Old Country did not pay us.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I suppose that this is in consequence of the state of things which prevails in the Old Country. It pays the buyer to ship wheat, rather than to ship flour to Liverpool?—Yes, I think that this is the case.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Is it not due to the fact that the English millers like to mix their wheat in grinding, and to buy dry foreign wheat for this purpose, although they pay for it relatively a higher price, in order that they may mix it with their own? This makes the latter grind better, does it not, and produces a better grade of flour in consequence?—I could hardly answer that question. Any one of you would know how that is as well as I would myself.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Could you pay the prices which you pay now for wheat in order to export it to England?—We could not pay the prices for shipment which we are giving at present. You could neither export wheat nor flour at existing rates.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you grind up all the wheat which you purchase?—Yes, nearly all. I just sold, however, 3,200 bushels that we had in store. A man came along, and he said: "I will give you so much for eight car-loads," which make 3,200 bushels.

Q. Where did he ship it to?—I could not tell you that. I think that he shipped it to local millers. If he had intended to export it he would have had it shipped all at one time. But he directed that one car-load should be shipped one day, and then another car-load to-morrow, and then another three or four days afterwards, as if he had got another order for it.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What kind of wheat was this?—It was red winter variety.

Q. Was it used in our own market?—I think that it went to Wheeler Brothers. I fancy that this was the case at all events.

Q. You purchase red wheat mostly, do you not?—Yes, I do. They used to grow white wheat altogether. A few years ago we could not pay so much for this variety, but since we have used red wheat as a substitute for spring wheat, the farmers in our section of the country have gone into the raising of it largely.

Q. How much of the advance in red wheat do you think is due to the fact that our farmers are not raising spring wheat?—I think that the advance in the price is due entirely to the fact that the duty keeps the spring wheat of other countries from coming in here.

Q. We do not raise spring wheat in the quantities in which we used to grow it, do we?—We do not want to do so. The red wheat is a splendid substitute for spring wheat.

Q. But of course, as long as our farmers could raise spring wheat successfully, they were not obliged to lose two seasons?—The present state of things is just as advantageous to the farmer. There is less money in raising spring wheat. The farmers get in consequence so much better crops of fall wheat.

Q. I suppose, that the farmers in your section of the country have had the same experience in this respect, which we had five or six years ago, when fall wheat was a

steady failure?—No, I cannot say that fall wheat has ever been a failure up around where I live, since I have been there at all events.

Q. Has it been a success as a crop right through?—It has been a success since the land in our neighbourhood was broken up and drained; of course, there used to be seasons when in low and damp spots, it was drowned out and frozen out; but since the land has been properly drained, we have had very little trouble in this respect.

Q. Your fall wheat crop has been steadily successful?—Of course, it has been a pretty good one during the last ten or twelve years. During some years, it has naturally been worse than it was during other years; but in the land which has been drained, it has been a success for a great many years.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You made a statement in reference to flour :—What difference would there be in the prices given for wheat if it was bought for shipment to England?—We cannot at present ship wheat to England, as we are paying what is almost exactly the price of wheat there. Not being wheat shippers, we do not look very much at the prices which are given for wheat in the Old Country. It does not affect us now.

Q. Then you are not prepared to say what difference it would make in prices if you were buying for shipment to the Old Country?—No. I am not prepared to say what the difference would be.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What difference does the existence of the bonding system make in your milling operations?—I cannot answer that question, because we do not ship anything in bond.

Q. Do you think that it gives the millers any preference?—I do not understand what you mean by shipping in bond.

Q. You have the right to grind grain and to ship in bond, under the present system?—We do not grind any grain in bond and ship it out again. I do not know anything about that system, and I could not say whether it is a paying business or not. I do not want to answer anything that I cannot answer correctly.

Q. Do you think that it gives any preference to the millers, who can grind 500 or 600 barrels a day?—If you could not get Canadian wheat to grind, no doubt it would be a good thing to be able to grind American wheat in bond rather than keep their mills idle. I suppose that if this were not profitable, they would not grind in bond. What has helped us greatly in the milling business during the last couple of years, has been the keeping of the American corn out of the country; in consequence of this fact, our bran and shorts have been worth to us a great deal more money. It gives us a better demand for our shorts, as the farmers are beginning to use them now very extensively for feeding their cattle.

Q. They are probably feeding more cattle than they did in former years?—I fancy from the quantity of American corn which was brought into this country during the year 1878—I see that over two million bushels were imported during that year—that they must have fed something, or drank something at that time.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. But American corn still comes into this country?—It does not come in here in such quantities, however.

Q. Are your bran and shorts all consumed at home, or do you ship any of them away?—We ship some bran away during the fall of the year; but the farmers ought to buy the bran when it is cheap and keep it for their own use. We have cheap bran to sell in October and November, when we have to get rid of it elsewhere, as we cannot consume it all at home.

Q. Where do you find a market for it?—We sent some last year to New York State, where the grass last season, I believe, was a very short crop: consequently there was a good demand for bran in that section.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. So the farmers in your neighbourhood do not use all the bran which you make?—They are not able to do so at this period of the year, when we have so much of it on hand. We grind over 500 bushels of wheat a day.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose that you had a demand during the whole of last fall for bran and shorts from the American market?—I do not know about that, we did not have a large demand for shorts, it was mostly for bran.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I suppose it was fed to dairy cattle?—I expect that it was, but I only presume that it was for the use of cows that they wanted this bran; in fact I was told that it was required for this purpose. The gentleman who purchased the bran said that he thought that he would want three or four car loads more of it, but owing to the grass springing up so rapidly late in the fall, he afterwards thought that he would not require so much of it. We have a very good demand for bran and shorts all the year.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose that this demand is partly due to the high prices which coarse grains command?—Yes; that helps up considerably.

Q. Oats and pease and barley have brought high prices this season, have they not?—Yes, they have all brought good figures.

Q. I suppose, taking a series of years, that it is not your opinion that the high price of coarse grains has had the effect of raising the price of bran and shorts?—Not so much as this year. This was the best year we have ever known for a great many years; although there was a splendid crop of oats, it was the best crop of oats we have had for ten years around us, that of last year, they brought 37 cents a bushel. We paid 28 cents a bushel for them in 1878.

Q. Did you ever handle Western oats?—No, we always have had plenty of oats.

Q. The neighbourhood supplied all you wanted?—Yes, we live in a very good farming country, and the crops have been very good all round here.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. They are shipping oats from Manitoba to St. Mary's I think?—The oats that were brought in from the United States last year were only 70,359 bushels, instead of 2,000,000 bushels as in 1878. If these 2,000,000 came in this year, oats would have been down to nothing with the crop we had.

Q. Can you tell me what the Chicago prices are this year?—I do not know, they are about as high as here.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. If it had happened that the crop of oats in the United States had been good, and the duties off, we would have been flooded with American oats, would we not?—Of course. I do not see any reason why they should not have brought them in as they did in 1878. The effect would have been to make oats cheaper in consequence of there being a large crop in Canada and the United States. Our home market would have been divided between the Americans and our own people.

Q. And prices must have gone down?—Of course. It is all nonsense for anyone to say foreign markets govern the prices. The home market is what really governs the market. When there is a demand for oats here the supply can hardly be too large for home consumption, because the other is kept out. The same is true also as to wheat.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How is it when a country produces more wheat; what fixes the price then?—During the time farmers are delivering more than is wanted for home consumption, I fancy the price would come down.

Q. Well, taking the year's business of farmers in Canada, for instance?—My experience of the year's business during the months of September, October and November, was that we were governed considerably by Liverpool prices; but the balance of the year I do not think we were so guided. Those are the only months in the last two years during which anything was bought for shipment on the Grand Trunk.

Q. Yes, but I am speaking of our business in the aggregate?—I could not say.

Q. Do we not, as a fact, produce more wheat than we consume?—I do not think so.

*Mr. Bain.*—Our shipments show it.

*By Mr. Trow:*—

Q. Do you think the imposition of a duty on corn keeps out American coarse grains?—I think so.

Q. And enhances the price of our own coarse grains?—I think it does.

Q. Do you know the prices of coarse grains in Chicago and Detroit?—No, I do not. I, however, look at the prices of wheat there every day.

Q. You do not look at the price of oats there?—No.

Q. How does wheat compare in Chicago and in Canada as far as price is concerned?—In Chicago, No. 2 is quoted at \$1.35, I think. The same wheat is quoted at \$1.25 to \$1.30 in New York. That is rather strange business, is it not? But Chicago, of course, is not a market to govern any country. It is kept up by rings of speculators. It would almost pay to ship wheat back from New York to Chicago. It has been that way all winter. I have seen it fluctuating from \$1.34 to \$1.17. This is due to selling wheat on margin.

*By Mr. Coughlin:*—

Q. Is there not wheat bought in Chicago which is never delivered?—I do not suppose that for every 1,000 bushels of wheat sold in Chicago, there is one bushel delivered. It is bought and sold on margins.

*By Mr. Bain:*—

Q. Do you mean to say that they handle no wheat in Chicago?—No; thousands of bushels are sold, but most of the business is done on margin.

Q. But it must change hands at some price?—Yes; the great operators are operating on margins all the time, and whatever wheat comes in during the month they buy and share, so as to command such prices on selling day at the end of the month. I suppose they make money on margin and sell the wheat for just what they can get, or else wheat would not at times be \$1.35 in Chicago and \$1.30 in New York.

*By the Chairman:*—

Could the same prices be paid in Chicago for shipment to Liverpool as are paid in Liverpool?—I do not think so.

Q. Do the United States produce a surplus?—Of course they do.

Q. Then the price in Chicago is not regulated by the price of the surplus sent to Liverpool?—I should think not, according to the prices paid there now.

Q. Still you would not like to have it stated as your deliberate impression in print?—I do not understand the shipping business from Chicago to Liverpool.

Q. You have had experience in the shipment of grain from Canada to Liverpool?—No; I never shipped any; but a few times I have shipped flour.

*By Mr. Trow:*—

Q. How many bushels of wheat does it take to make a barrel of flour?—About four bushels (200 lbs.) Some millers seem to think it takes more.

*By Mr. Bain:*—

Q. Have you ever ground western corn to any extent for your local market?—No. They used to bring it there a good deal two or three years ago, but it was taken to custom mills. We do not do any custom work.

Q. You grind solely for shipment?—Yes; except sometimes as a matter of accommodation.

*By the Chairman:*—

Q. Can you state the effect of the duty on Indian corn and other coarse grains as compared with the price of coarse grains in your part of the country?—I am quite satisfied that it keeps Indian corn out and enhances the price here of oats and corn. I do not think it affects barley.

*By Mr. Bain:*—

Q. How is it with pease?—Well, I could not say. I cannot give a definite answer.

Q. It is a grain you never handle?—Oh, yes, we do. They are the best feed we have to-day in the country, I think.

Q. Were your pease mostly shipped, or did you grind them?—Shipped.

Q. Where did you find a market?—Generally in Montreal.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. How is it in regard to rye?—We do not grow any rye in our section to ship.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Scarcely of any account?—No.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You will find that wherever unsuccessful, rye is not grown as a rule?—No.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Would not farmers, particularly those who feed stock pretty extensively, find it profitable to import corn?—No. In my opinion a farmer should never import anything for himself if he wishes to be a successful farmer. I believe if a farmer would grow his own pease and oats, and then buy sufficient bran and shorts to mix with them, that he would have a better feed than American corn. Say one bushel of pease and one bushel of oats mixed with about the same weight of bran and shorts. Canadian corn, I think, is better than American corn—it is more feeding.

Q. Is there more nourishment in it?—I think a bushel of our corn is worth a bushel and a peck of imported corn.

Q. You do not grow much corn?—We do not grow very much in our section, but it grows splendidly here.

Q. You are getting to grow more, are you not?—Farmers do not grow enough corn. It is a very heavy crop.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose you substitute it for pease, when spoiled by bugs?—Yes; the farmers during the last few years have grown it very successfully.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. A bushel of Canadian corn is worth a bushel and a peck of American?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. How do you account for that?—It is thick and plump, and weight for weight, ours is much better than theirs.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I understand you to say that there is more nutrition in the mixture of oats, bran and shorts, than in corn?—I think so with pease added.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Do you think pease compare with corn for feeding purposes?—I think they are superior, but they require bran and shorts mixed with them; they are too strong alone for cattle. It is a splendid feed when mixed as I have stated.

Q. Does it make any difference as to hogs?—A hog will stand almost any kind of food.

Q. Do farmers in your locality feed much stock for shipping purposes?—Yes; during the last two seasons there has been a good deal of cattle fed for the Liverpool market in our locality. They use half bran and half shorts in the feed.

Q. That ought to make a good local demand for your bran and shorts?—Yes.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. What are shorts?—They are called “middlings” in some places.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. But with skilful milling they are very little else but bran?—It is rather better food since purifiers have been employed, though it looks a little browner.

Q. And when the wheat is a little soft it is a good deal better still?—Yes.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Is the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs, butter and fruit, improved from the effect of the present Tariff?—I think you may cover that all in a very short space. Since I have been in Canada I never knew of prices being so good for farmers as at present. They have a splendid market for everything.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. For fruit?—Yes, for everything, wheat, barley, oats, pease, eggs, fowl, turkeys, ducks and all sorts of things. Since I have been in Canada I have not known of such good prices, taking agricultural produce all round.

Q. You do not grow much fruit in your section do you?—We grow a great many apples, and probably shippers never had a better year than last year.

Q. What was the price of apples last year?—The dealers paid the farmer a \$1 a barrel. I think they bought them in the orchards, picked them themselves, and paid the farmers for delivering them at the station. Potatoes also were a very fine crop last year.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think the Canadian farmer would be benefited by Reciprocity with the United States?—I would be very glad to see Reciprocity with the United States, provided we could have fair Reciprocity. I would be glad to see the duty taken off Indian corn, if they would take the duty off barley. I do not want to see a one-sided Reciprocity. I think that it was a great mistake on the part of our public men that the moment the Americans abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty, they did not put on the same duties as the Yankees did. If we had done that, we would have had Reciprocity ten years ago. We had nothing to offer them in exchange for Reciprocity.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You said high prices ruled for potatoes, were they for local consumption or shipment?—I think a good part of them were for shipment.

Q. Of course, you have seen that a great lot came from Scotland and Ireland to New York?—Yes.

Q. It shows you that the American market for vegetables was high?—Yes, I saw the farmers bring in a good many vegetables and sell them at remunerative prices.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think we are in a better position now for negotiating a Reciprocity Treaty than before?—Yes, because you have something to offer them; before we had nothing.

Q. Have you any experience in reference to the prices of woollens and cottons?—My partner, Mr. Barney Stanley, has a large hardware store, and before I came away I asked him for the prices of 1878 and 1880 in order that I might answer intelligently any question put to me. If you wish to hear these figures I will give them to you.

Q. Will you be kind enough to give us any information you have on that subject?—After looking over the invoices in regard to sugar, having heard a great deal upon the subject of sugar, I found there was really very little difference in the prices of that article for four or five years. Indeed it is not worth mentioning. In 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881, the prices of sugar seem to be about the same, as far as I can see it was neither higher nor lower.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. That is the wholesale price?—Yes. Scythes, forks and hoes in 1877 were 5 per cent. dearer than 1880, and 8½ per cent. dearer in 1877 than in 1881. These things are bought with a discount off the list prices. In 1877 the discount was 25 per cent.; in 1878, 30 per cent.; in 1880, 30 per cent.; and in 1881, 33½ per cent. Axes were the same prices in 1877 as in 1878, and 5 per cent. cheaper in 1880 and 1881. There was 25 per cent. off in 1877 and 1878; 30 per cent. off in 1880 and 1881. Cut nails in 1877 were \$2.85 per keg; in 1878, \$2.75 per keg, in 1880, \$2.60 per keg; and in 1881, \$2.45 per keg. That was at the factories. So they were cheaper in 1881 than they have been for five years. For shovels the discount off the list prices in 1877 was 30 per cent.; in 1878, 20 per cent.; in 1880, 20½ per cent.; in 1881, 25 per cent. Shovels are now 5 per cent. cheaper than they have been for four years.

Q. How do you account for that?—In this way, by having a home market for the goods, and a great many of them being sold in the country. The Americans used to send in a great quantity when we saw fit to employ Americans instead of our own people.

Q. Do you know the relative cost of ours?—I see horseshoe nails are cheaper in 1881 than for the last five years, and I suppose from that iron cannot be any dearer. There is something said about horseshoes on this paper, but I do not understand it.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are you a partner with M. Stanley?—I am partner with him in the grain business, and I am able for that reason to have access to his invoices and get his prices.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I suppose that this is horse-shoe iron? I do not know what it is. I asked what it was and he told me, the figures are \$3.33, they are \$3.80 with \$3.33 off.

Q. You have no knowledge as to the causes which have led to this state of things?—I have no knowledge as to what makes it cheaper. The only thing I fancy, which so affects prices, is the greater demand for it.

Q. You have no particular knowledge as to the present prices of woollens and cottons?—No, but I have heard that the prices of woollen goods are about the same as they were before the Tariff was introduced; but I believe that cottons are a little dearer—I now refer to fancy goods; but the prices of cotton bags are not changed, I know this because I used a good many bags. There is in fact no difference in the price of bags. I have heard them say in the store, that fine cotton goods are a little higher in price; but Canadian tweeds and things of that sort are, I think, about the same in price.

Q. Do you find any difference in the number of men who are unemployed at the present time, when compared with the year 1878?—Oh yes; I think that the great number of beggars which were around in our neighbourhood in the year 1877, were pretty nearly the means of driving me out of the council, we had such a quantity of them.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where did they come from?—I think that they came from the Old Country. They were men, I believe, who came out here expecting to be able to get work in our manufactories, but did not get it—at least, that is what they told me. I used to ask them where they came from and that would be their answer. I would give them a quarter to get rid of them, but we have nothing of that sort now. Every farmer had an experience of this kind of nuisance in the year 1877. I think that we were more troubled with these people in 1877 than we were at any other time.

Q. Is there as much emigration from your part of the country at the present time as was formerly the case?—I could not say that there is; but I know that people are going off to Manitoba pretty fast just now.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are you posted in the prices of agricultural implements, which are sold in your part of the country, such as mowers and reapers?—I am not what you might call thoroughly posted as to the prices of these articles; but I know that we have a fair there every year, and I have asked the prices, and have been informed that reapers and mowers are now sold at lower prices than they have been sold for two or three years. In fact, the farmers themselves tell me so, they say that they are buying reapers and mowers for very much less than has been the case during the last three or four years.

Q. I suppose that the same remark applies to the prices of ploughs and waggons?—I cannot say as to prices of ploughs; but I think that waggons have remained at about the same figure. You can get a good waggon now, with a good spring seat, for \$80. We have no plough makers in our section of the country that do much in plough making. I think that most of the ploughs which are used in this neighbourhood come up from Oshawa.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You can get a good waggon now for \$80?—Yes. At least, so they tell me.

Q. For what price could you get a good waggon ten years ago?—I do not know.

Q. You could get a splendid waggon for \$75 ten years ago?—Perhaps.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. But waggons were then low and wood plentiful, was not this the case?—What makes me say that a good waggon can be got for \$80 is, that a man in my place was trying to sell one, and I heard him ask for it \$80. It was a good waggon with a spring seat and other improvements.

At this point the examination of this witness was closed.

OTTAWA, 5th April, 1882.

The Select Committee appointed to enquire into the operation of the Tariff on the agricultural interests of the Dominion, met at ten o'clock this morning. Dr. Orton, M.P., in the chair.

Senator DONALD MACINNES appeared before the Committee and was examined as follows;

*By the Chairman* :—

Q. Mr. MacInnes, you have been engaged for a long time in the dry goods business, have you not?—Yes I have.

Q. Are you still in any way engaged in that business?—No. I am at the present time interested in manufacturing enterprises.

Q. Are you engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods?—I am interested in the manufacture of both cotton and woollen goods. I am also interested in the manufacture of iron, the production of pig iron.

Q. Can you give the Committee any idea as to the present price of woollen goods? We will commence with woollens?—Yes, I can do so. You will understand that I have been out of business for some time; that is to say, I have not been engaged in the active work of distributing goods for some time past, and consequently I am not as familiar with the prices of goods as I used to be, and would still have been had I continued in that business. But I can give to the Committee reliable information as to the present prices of goods as compared with the prices which have ruled for some years past.

Q. Of course the subject of our enquiry is to ascertain whether these articles have gone up or decreased in price in consequence of the existence of the present Tariff? We want to find out what relation the Tariff has had to prices as far as this may be possible; that is the object of our enquiry. And I will just ask you whether the ordinary woollen goods are dearer than they were before this Tariff came into force?—I can give you information on these points.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk)* :—

Q. You are a manufacturer in this country I understand?—Yes, and I shall answer in that sense. I shall not allude, of course, to any foreign goods.

*By the Chairman* :—

Q. Have these articles to which I referred been dearer, or have they been cheaper since the year 1879, when the present Tariff was introduced?—Well, from all the information which I have been able to get since you gave me notice that I was going to be examined here before this Committee, I have come to the conclusion that these goods are rather cheaper and better than they were prior to the year 1878.

Q. What does that statement include?—I am speaking of woollen goods generally,—all woollen goods of Canadian manufacture.

Q. To what influences do you attribute the decrease in price, and the improvement in quality? What is the cause which has led to this state of things? Perhaps you can give us something like a comparative statement, exposing present and former prices?—I can give you something of that sort I think. Do you wish me, however, to answer the question which you put to me just now—immediately?

Q. I will defer it.—Very well, of course, the Committee will understand that the price of raw material must, more or less,—or at all events ought, more or less— affect the price of the manufactured article, and in order to be able to give the Committee information as to the relative prices of wool prior to the year 1878, and since then, I got a statement which will show this. Here is a list of the wools which are most largely used by Canadian manufacturers. I will hand this list to you:

Wool.	1876 to 1878.	1879 to 1881.	
	Before N. P.	Since N. P.	
	cts.	cts.	
Rio.....	17½.	20.	per lb.
Cape.....	17½	20½	“

Wool.	1876 to 1878.	1879 to 1881.	
	Before N.P. cts.	Since N.P. cts.	
*Canada Fleece.....	26	25½	per lb.
“ Pulled.....	26½	29½	“
Monte Video.....	17½	19½	“
Goods, (say).....	72	71	per yard.

Rio wool which is a class of wool that was used pretty largely from the year 1876, to the year 1878, averaged during that period 17½ cents a lb. in price, and since then it has averaged 20 cents a lb. Cape wool averaged 17½ cents a lb. prior to the year 1878, and 20½ cents a lb. since. Canadian fleece wool averaged 26 cents a lb. prior to 1878, and 25½ cents a lb. since. You will observe that this wool has slightly fallen in price on the average Canadian fleece wool. I may say, however, by way of explanation, it is not used very largely by Canadian manufacturers at the present time, except for the making of blankets. It is too long for their general purposes.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. It is used in the making of carpets I understand?—Well, yes. For the lower classes of these goods it is used. Yes, but the carpet manufacturing industry is not a large one in Canada so far. It is, however, a growing industry, and I am satisfied that it will grow into considerable proportions under the present Tariff.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You are now referring entirely to the long combing wool?—I am speaking of what I call Canadian fleece wool. It is sheared, that is, it is taken off from the backs of the sheep; but the Canadian wool which is mostly used by Canadian manufacturers for the making of tweeds—coarse tweeds—is pulled wool. The price of pulled wool was 26½ cents a lb. on the average prior to the year 1878, and it has averaged in price 29½ cents a lb. since that year showing a rise of 3½ cents a lb. Monte Video wool averaged in price 17½ cents a pound prior to 1878, and it is now 19½ cents a lb. I now come to the prices of the goods which are manufactured from wool. Of course, one cannot give an exact statement, but say that goods were 72 cents a yard prior to the year 1878, then they have been 71 cents a yard since that year, then there is a note placed at the bottom of the statement, which I hold in my hands—which states that Canadian fleece wool is not now suitable for our Canadian manufacturers, being too long in the staple, and in consequence being only adapted for common purposes. I will hand this statement in for the use of the Committee.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where is your field of operations, Mr. MacInnes. Where do you sell your goods?—My own individual interests are more largely in Cornwall than in any other place. I am connected in that town with a woollen mill, also with a cotton mill. I am also interested in the manufacture of iron. I am connected with a company called the Steel Company of Canada, which is established at Londonderry, in the Province of Nova Scotia. This is the only company which produces pig iron in the Dominion of Canada.

Q. What effect has the duty upon the price of wool?—Upon wool?

Q. Does the existence of the duty enhance the price at all of our wool—of Canadian growth?—The effect of the duty has been to advance pulled wool.

Q. Is not the price of wool as low at the present time as it has been for years?—No, Sir. That is not the case with regard to that class of wool. The price of this class of wool, of which I have been speaking, and which is most largely used by Canadian manufacturers—I am referring to pulled wool—is given to me as being at the present time, 29½ cents a lb.

\*Canada fleece wool is not now suitable for our Canadian manufacturers, being too long in staple, and adapted only for combing purposes.

Q. What kind of wool is that? Is it Southdown?—No; it is wool that is pulled off from sheep skins.

Q. That is, however, a small quantity compared with the growth of Canadian wool, in this country?—I have the prices of both here, but I fancy that a very large quantity of pulled wool is placed on the market. I am not prepared, however, to say how much. I have not the exact information which would enable me to state what the volume of pulled wool is; but I am inclined to believe, that it is placed on the market in very large quantities—at all events in considerable quantities, and the product is increasing for the reason that it is more suitable for making Canadian coarse threads, than is the case with Canadian fleece wool.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Are you aware, Mr. MacInnes, whether Southdown wool, of course this a short wool, and different kinds of down wools, and Oxfords, are largely used in the manufacture of tweeds?—Yes; I dare say that these wools are largely used in making what we call medium tweeds, and medium flannels.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. On the wool which you principally use in manufacturing goods, Mr. MacInnes, there is no duty at all, is there? The wool, which you use for manufacturing purposes is imported, is it not?—Well, I am not very clear on that point. I am not positive whether we pay any duty on the wool which we use, or not; but I think that it is free.

Q. Well, then, instead of enhancing the price of wool, the Tariff cannot affect the price at all. If there is no duty on the articles which you use—on your raw material?—Of course, if there is no duty the Tariff cannot affect the price, but the way in which the price is mostly affected, is by the increased demand for wool, which the operation of the Tariff creates.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. But the duty on woollen goods coming into the country would have a tendency to affect the price, would it not?—Yes, of course; that also would be an element which would give us an advance in the price of wool, because if we make more goods here, and there is a greater consumption—a greater demand for these goods, this must affect the price of wool by stimulating the demand.

Q. That is what I thought was the case?—And this will be seen to be the case on an examination of the statement which has been placed in my hands by one of the manufacturers, who is largely engaged in the making of these goods. You will see in this table that pulled wool brings a very good price. I remember the time in Canada when pulled wool did not bring so high a price as did fleece wool. There was always a difference in price, and a considerable difference, as against pulled wool; but you see this state of things has been changed, owing to the demand for pulled wool to be used in the manufacture of tweed goods.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have you any idea, Mr. MacInnes, what amount of duty you paid on wool during last year?—No; I cannot tell you anything about that.

Q. Have you, as a matter of fact, paid any duty on the wool which you used in manufacturing last year?—No, I cannot say. I am not engaged in the active management of any of the Departments in the woollen mill—I am engaged actively in the management of the cotton mill; but if there is a duty imposed on any of the wools which we use in manufacturing, of course we must pay that duty.

*Mr. Trow:—*I am not aware that any duty has been paid on wool, and consequently the Tariff cannot enhance the price of wool.

*Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*There has been a little paid in the shape of duty.

*Mr. Trow:—*How much?

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. I cannot say how much; but there has been a duty levied, and some money has been collected, since this last fiscal year began. A duty of 3 cents a pound has been imposed on some wools?—If the Committee wish me to get any information

with reference to that subject, I will be very glad to get it for them, and I will learn whether we pay any duty or not; I will give you the facts, whatever they may be.

*By the Chairman :—*

Perhaps, Mr. MacInnes, it would be as well for you to do so, in order that you may be able to place before us the exact facts.—I will make a note of it.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Then, Mr. MacInnes, I understand you to say this—that since the year 1878, the price of the Canadian wool which you use in the manufacture of Canadian tweeds, has advanced 3 cents a lb.—The advance has been a little more; they have advanced  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents a lb.

Q. And you further state that the price of the tweeds, which you manufacture from these wools, has decreased 1 cent a yard?—Yes, that is the statement which I make.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. I do not clearly understand; are you now referring to the price of our wool?—Yes, that is the case.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What quantity of Southdown wool is now used in this country for manufacturing purposes? Will you make inquiry into that branch of the subject, and communicate the facts to the Committee?—You mean on Canadian Southdown wools?

Q. Yes. And will you also inquire whether Canadian Southdown wool would replace, to any extent, the foreign wools, which, at the present time, are imported for manufacturing purposes?—I will do so with pleasure.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Can you tell us, whether blankets have increased in price or not since the present Tariff was introduced?—Yes, I have obtained information with reference to that matter. You will understand that pulled wool is the wool which is the most suitable of the wools, which are produced in Canada, for the use of our manufacturers at the present time, and that this grade of wool has advanced  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents a lb.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What kind of wool, are you speaking about?—Pulled, Sir; pulled wool.

Q. Does that kind of wool make up into as good material, as other kinds of wool do?—Oh yes, Sir. It does so, when it is washed clean. It then makes up into capital goods.

Q. That sort of wool is prepared from slaughtered sheep, is it not principally?—Oh yes; it is taken from the skins of sheep, after they are slaughtered of course.

Q. And it is also taken from all those sheep which die of foot-rot, and all those kinds of diseases?—Oh yes; it is taken from pelts.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. It is taken mostly from the skins of slaughtered sheep, and it is brought into the market by butchers?—Yes; that agrees with the statement with which the Cornwall people have furnished me. At this mill in Cornwall, we make both blankets and tweeds, we make the coarser and medium tweeds, and also white blankets and grey blankets as well. We have succeeded in turning out a very beautiful blanket there now. In my opinion it is superior to any blanket that is imported.

Q. Are those blankets of which you speak made from Canadian wool?—They are mostly made out of Canadian wool, I think, but on this point I am not quite sure. I believe that the blankets which we manufacture at Cornwall are made mainly from Canadian fleece wool. This is a long wool, and it is consequently fit for blankets, but not for tweeds.

Q. It is suitable for blankets and carpets, I expect?—For the making of carpets you want a very choice low grade of wool. You do not require a fine wool. Blankets are as low in price at the present time, as they were at any time previous to the introduction of this Tariff, if we take the average price of these blankets during the time we made them previous to the preparation of this Tariff, say from the year 1869 to the year 1874; but then we ceased to make blankets for some time. As com-

pared with the average price of blankets during the last three years, 1879, 1880, and 1881, the price is lower than it was during the former period by fully 20 per cent.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Blankets are now cheaper than they formerly were?—Yes, they are.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. And they are 20 per cent. cheaper?—Yes, that is the fact.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. They are 20 per cent. cheaper in price than they formerly were, and at the same time they are better in quality?—Yes, and they are a better blanket—oh, ever so much better.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Have we been importing these blankets? I mean before the introduction of the Tariff?—Oh, yes; we have done so, and we import them yet to some extent.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What was the cause which led to your ceasing to make blankets after the year 1874 began?—We ceased doing so because the making of blankets did not then pay.

Q. Was this due to foreign competition?—Yes. We ceased making them because they did not pay, the imported blankets displaced those of our manufacture.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Blankets are not imported so largely at the present time I presume; of course you supply the market now?—Oh, the importation of blankets is nothing like what it was; not one blanket is brought into this country to ten blankets which were imported before this Tariff was introduced.

Q. And at the same time you have reduced the price of blankets 20 per cent. ?—Yes, we have. Not one in ten is imported to what was formerly the case, and those which are brought now into Canada are mostly of the lower class of goods.

Q. I suppose that your market for blankets having increased, you are enabled to manufacture them more cheaply?—Oh yes; that is the great principle in manufacturing. Any one who is engaged in manufacturing, will understand that the great thing is to get a continued run upon one class of goods.

Q. I understand what you mean.—In that way you get the most profit out of your machinery. The profit is not measured in the ordinary mercantile fashion, the manufacturers' profit is not measured as is the merchants' profit; the manufacturers' profit is measured by the production of his machinery—the larger your production is, the more cheaply you can make your goods.

Q. That is what I understand?—Yes, that is the fact.

Q. And it is in this way that you account for selling your blankets cheaper than you did before this Tariff was introduced?—Oh, yes; and I may say that the same statement applies to every class of goods which is manufactured in this country.

Q. I understand?—Yes. From the year 1875 to the year 1879, we made no blankets, and in consequence of this fact we have no data as to prices for these three years. During the past year, I may say the wages of operatives increased in some instances as much as 30 per cent. Of course this is a very large advance—30 per cent. I do not think, however, that many operatives have got as big an advance as that; but I have no hesitation in stating to the Committee that the wages of the operatives have increased in all branches of manufacture in Canada, since this Tariff has been introduced. The wages of cotton operatives have been raised as well as the wages of woollen operatives.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have wages generally increased 30 per cent. ?—I think that this figure only applies to weavers. In other departments the increase has not been quite as much, but the wages of all operatives have increased more or less; I would not say 30 per cent. in all cases, but they have been increased to some extent. I think that to say 30 per cent. would be rather overstating the case; and I always prefer to understate.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. I would only say that the wages of operatives generally have increased?—I always prefer to under state the facts.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. If you know the figures of the increases which have been given to operatives, you had better put them in?—I have the information merely in a letter which I have received, and it says in some instances they have been so increased.

Q. The wages have been to advance to extra men, I suppose?—It may be something or other like that.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Perhaps such an advance is given to exceptional classes of operatives. For instance, they say that the dyer is one of the most important operatives, it is hard to get good dyers; and consequently they always command good wages?—Then I am also asked for information with reference to flannels. Flannels have been made largely in Canada for a good many years.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Whose evidence are you reading, Mr. MacInnes?—I am not reading any evidence. This letter, I received from the agents of the Cornwall Manufacturing Company in Montreal; they are also agents for a number of other mills as well. They are agents for the Cornwall Manufacturing Company, which makes blankets and flannels; and they are also agents for mills which make flannels exclusively. Besides this, they are agents for mills which make tweeds exclusively, various qualities of coarse tweeds and fine tweeds.

Q. Do you think it necessary to take evidence of outsiders in that state?—As I have stated at the commencement of my evidence here, not being at the present time actively engaged in the distribution of goods, as I used to be, I was not prepared to come and give any definite prices to the Committee. I therefore wrote for this information; and it can be depended upon as entirely reliable.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You are interested in these mills, Mr. MacInnes, are you not?—Yes; I am interested in the mills at Cornwall.

Q. And these are your own agents who have written you this letter and supplied certain information?—I am a director of the company and they are our agents. Oh, yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I think that the Committee may depend upon any information which we may obtain from Mr. MacInnes as being very reliable?—I will give the Committee only such information as is perfectly reliable; you may depend upon that. I was making a statement, I think, with regard to flannels. There is a class of flannels which are consumed very largely by the people of this country; and a most useful class of flannels they are. I refer to the grey flannels. They were first made at Chambly, and were produced in very large quantities. The Chambly mills were very successful indeed in placing them on the market; and they have been supplying the country with grey flannels a great many years past. Another mill for this purpose has, however, been started; and what I wished to know from my agents was this: Whether the price of these flannels had increased since the Tariff came into operation; whether the price of these articles were higher now than they were before. The information which I have received goes to show that the prices of these flannels are as low as ever they were. He excepts, however, one year, when the Chambly mills undertook to drive the other manufacturers out of the market; that is, to prevent them from continuing in this branch of manufacture, by cutting prices so low that they could not afford to make them. But in this the Chambly mills did not succeed; and consequently there is one year, in the course of which I have mentioned, these flannels were a little lower than they are to-day.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. What year was that? Could you mention the year?—I can get the particular year for the Committee, but it is not mentioned here. It is a year which is well known, however, in the trade. Then there is a class of goods which are largely worn by the *habitants*, with regard to which I would like to say a few words. They are called *étouffes*—that is, Canadian cloth. There are, a miller colour, a light coloured

*étouffe*, and various sorts of cadet colours and darker colours. These goods are largely worn by the people of Canada. They are made entirely from our own wools. The agent tells me that the price of these goods has not advanced, and says, "When we inform you that you can get *étouffe* from 42½ to 45 cents a yard, weighing from 14 to 15 ounces, that will prove that these goods have not been advanced in price by the Tariff." You can buy these goods, you see, for from 42½ to 45 cents per yard.

Q. They are not advanced in price?—No; they are not.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Then the imposition of the Tariff has had no effect in increasing the price?—No, Sir. It has not increased the price of woollen goods.

Q. Then, why should these duties be imposed?—Well, the agent has furnished me an answer here to that query. Of course I have answered that question before, but I will answer it again. "Seeing that no advance has taken place in prices, it may well be asked, where is the benefit to manufacturers? and our answer to this is simply, that the mills are all kept fully employed, and are turning out more goods, and the Tariff is so evenly balanced, that if the manufacturers were to increase the price, they would, in our opinion, lose sale by importers moving their attention to foreign goods."

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

We can understand that a man who sells 1,000 pairs of blankets where he had formerly only sold 500 pairs, can offer to make them with a smaller profit, and yet, at the same time, make more money?—The thing is simply this, Sir: You see that the National Policy has enlarged the market, and it has displaced the foreign goods which used to come into the country in large quantities, to keep our mills more or less idle, and we ourselves are now supplying our own consumers with these goods, and therefore the market for our operations is larger.

Q. Undoubtedly, that is the result of the National Policy?—That is the whole thing. No manufacturer can live, and in this connection it does not matter what price you give him—unless he can sell his goods as fast as he makes them.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Supposing that the manufacturer did enhance the price of his goods equal to the increase in the duty, which was put on to give him Protection, could he not still sell his goods.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. No, because in that event the imported goods would come in?—It would not do to advance goods equal to the increase in the protecting duty, as a rule, and I will tell you why:—As a rule the importer prefers to import the goods he sells, inasmuch as he can make a little better profit out of them than he can make upon the domestic article. We find, and I am telling you this as a manufacturer, that unless we sell a similar class of goods to those which the importer has been in the habit of supplying to his customers, under the prices at which the imported article can be imported at, the foreign article will get the preference, owing to the pecuniary reason which I have mentioned.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Supposing that you were to sell your goods at an advance in price equal to one-half the increase in the duty, then you could still afford to sell them cheaper than similar goods could be imported for, could you not?—Well?

Q. But if you sell your goods cheaper than you did prior to the imposition of the duties which were to protect you, I cannot understand that?—We are simply giving you the facts, Sir. This is the effect of the Tariff, and the reason we give for this state of things is, that we are making more of these goods and can consequently afford to sell them cheaper.

Q. Yes?—We get a larger run upon any one article than we did before. I remember when I was manufacturing, and when we were first manufacturing at Cornwall, that at that time there was a very great depression in trade in the United States, and you will understand, too, that the American manufacturer has great advantages over the Canadian manufacturer. The one—viz: the American, is an

old industry which has existed for fifty years or more ; they have therefore at their command all the experience which they have accumulated during that period, and they have also, which is one of the most important elements in aiding the successful development of manufacturing industries, plenty of well trained labour, and having a larger ; their mills are larger market, and therefore they can afford to produce of any one article a larger quantity than a smaller market can justify. Well, you can easily see, that under circumstances of this kind, the competition between them and the Canadian manufacturer was a very unequal one. Now, I was going to tell you that when we began to manufacture at Cornwall first, we found that we made a certain quantity of goods, and that they did not go off. This was because they were supplanted by Americans, or by imported goods. Then what had we to do ? When that class of goods which we were making accumulated, we simply had to change the machinery on to something else which we thought would command a sale. This meant all increased cost, for under such circumstances the goods cost us more to make. Every change in the process of manufacturing, which the manufacturer makes in his mill, necessitates an increased cost to be incurred in the production of his goods. Now, there are mills in the United States which have been running for years and years upon just the same class of goods, and making nothing else besides these particular goods, which is an immense advantage, tending to the cheapening of the cost of production.

Q. You now have reference to cotton mills ?—Yes.

Q. They have a great advantage over you in the way of raw material, have they not? Cannot they produce this article much cheaper in consequence of the advantage? Have they not a decided advantage over you in the shape of cheaper raw material?—They have not much advantage over us in this particular. I doubt that I could not answer the question to which I have made a reply in any other way. There are some questions which you cannot answer by a single yes or no.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. If woollen goods were not manufactured in Canada would not the farmers of Canada pay higher prices for the woollen goods which would then have to be imported, and if our woollen mills were shut down, would they not have to pay more for their goods than they are doing now?—This applies to both woollen and cotton goods of course.

*By Mr. Wallace, (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. The existence of Canadian manufacturers is an advantage?—My opinion is this, that with the existence of manufacturers in Canada the farmer is getting his goods cheaper now than he would if these manufactories did not exist.

Q. Had you a large manufacturing establishment in the city of Hamilton?—No, I had not.

Q. What was the value of the stock which you had in the cotton mills a few years ago?—It had more or less value.

Q. Had you any establishment in the city of Hamilton?—I had a wholesale warehouse there.

Q. It was not a cotton manufacturing establishment?—No, Sir, no.

Q. What was the value of, what was the quotations for your stock in the cotton manufactory some time since?—Cotton stocks, a few years ago, were almost valueless, and the reason why they were valueless I have already given.

Q. And what have they rated at now?—We could not sell our goods a few years ago, but things are better now and the stock is worth more.

Q. Are you increasing your business in connection with your cotton mills very much?—We are, Sir. I am building a very considerable addition to the premises at the present moment.

Q. I think that you have told us something with reference to wages?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You said that wages had increased 20 per cent.?—No, I did not state that, Sir; but I will state now what I believe to be the facts. I prefer to understate than to overstate. I may state that wages have increased not less than 10 per cent. all round in this particular mill.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. You are now referring to the cotton mill, are you not?—No, I am alluding to the woollen mill, Sir.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What number of men have you employed in that mill?—The agent says that he does not know the number; he also states, however, that we employ thirty or more hands than we did before, and he informs me that the wages which are paid in this woollen mill, have been increased 10 per cent.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you interested in the manufacture of cotton Mr. MacInnes?—Yes, I am.

Q. Will you be kind enough to give to the Committee a statement similar to that which you have placed before the Committee, with reference to the woollen mill. I think that it would be just as well for you to make a statement with reference to the prices of cotton goods without being questioned in detail, in order to obtain this information. Have the cotton goods increased, or have they decreased in price under the operation of the present Tariff?—I feel perfectly safe in saying that cotton goods have not increased in price since this Tariff is introduced, taking always the relative prices of the raw material into consideration.

Q. Can you give us any idea of the cost of the raw material?—My opinion is—I have no objection to give you my opinion—that prices will continue to decrease, and my reasons for that opinion are these: In the first place, the manufacturer of cotton can produce cheaper. We have a larger number of trained operatives than we had, and the internal competition will also affect the prices of these goods very much, as cotton mills are being erected in various parts of the country, some of which are coming into operation immediately. In order to show you that, and give you an idea as to the effect of the internal competition on the price of goods, I may state that the duty—the specific duty on grey cottons entering the United States, is 5 cents per square yard, and yet these goods are sold in the United States market as from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 4 cents a yard. You can buy these goods for a price per yard which is less than the duty per square yard; this, of course, as must be evident to any one, is due to the effect of the internal competition on prices.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you know the number of cotton mills that are now in existence in the Dominion?—I will first see what the number of them is:—There is Dundas, one; and Meriton, two; and Brautford, three; and Cornwall, two; Coaticooke, one; and Hochelaga, one; and Montreal, one; and Kingston, one, &c. I suppose, that there will be at least a dozen large establishments in Canada of this kind.

Q. Do you know how many of these have been established since the present Tariff came into operation?—Probably about one-half of them have been established since this Tariff came into operation. If it is germane to the question, I may also state that the older mills have in addition been doubled in size since the present Tariff was introduced, at least this has been the case with most of them.

Q. That means that we have about four times the capacity in cotton mills that we had before this Tariff came into effect,—if we include with the new mills, which have been erected, the doubling of the capacity of the old mills?—We have increased the capacity of our mills from thirty looms to about 500 looms, I think; and we are further adding more looms.

Q. Do you know of any more mills which are about to be started? I am now referring to cotton mills?—I hear of a good many which are being commenced.

Q. Well, would these mills be started, were it not for the existence of this Tariff, in your opinion?—I do not think that they would be otherwise projected.

Q. Without the Tariff we would not have any of these mills of which you are speaking?—I do not think that we would.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Now, Mr. MacInnes, you state that the price of the raw material has a great deal to do with the selling price of cotton goods: Can you give us any idea as to the comparative prices of this raw material previous to the Tariff?—I do not think

that I can give you that information, but I can get it for you, for that matter. I may state to the Committee that there is one class of cotton which is always quoted, and by which all other qualities are graded. It is called middling upwards, so whenever you see the quotation of cotton, it is generally understood to be middling upwards. This is about the class of cotton which is mostly used in Canada I refer to middling upwards. There are some qualities of cotton which are of a finer class, and some qualities besides which are of a lower class; but the average cotton that is used in our mill is middling upwards, I think; and if you get the middling upwards cotton, of course, you can judge of the price of the other qualities. I do not think, that I have it here, but I can get it for the information of the Committee. I have it for all years. I believe that you want the prices of cotton for a number of years past.

Q. Yes, and the prices which were given prior to the introduction of the present Tariff?—I can give it to you for as many years as you like.

Q. You will be so good as to get the prices which were paid during the four years previous to the introduction of the present Tariff?—All right, I will do so. I may tell the Committee that we get our raw material about as cheaply as they get it in the great manufacturing centres in the Northern States. The cotton which we use is mostly Texas cotton, Memphis cotton and Western cotton; and the American mills which are in operation in the Northern States use the same cotton, and the freight which we have to pay is about the same as the freight which they have to pay.

Q. The cotton which you use for your manufacturing purposes is delivered at your mills for about the same price as it is delivered at the cotton mills which are found in the Northern States?—Yes, that is the case.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are you not of opinion that Americans can manufacture cotton more cheaply in such places as Lowell, where they have all establishments convenient to the raw material?—It is not more convenient to the raw material, the point we are discussing. It is to be bought in the South-West, and we can lay the cotton down at our mills at about the same price as they do in Lowell.

Q. You think you can manufacture as cheaply as those old establishments that have been in operation for fifty years?—I do not think we can just now—I have already stated that; but I think we can in time, because, you see, as I have stated already, it requires time. That is where they have the pull over us—experience and plenty of trade labour, which is a great point. In my opinion the time is coming when we will manufacture goods as cheaply as they can.

Q. But in the meantime you cannot?—No, not in the meantime.

Q. So we have to pay extra for our cottons. We do not manufacture cottons as cheaply as the Americans do?—If you take the prices there and the prices here, I have no hesitation in saying we do not.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I would like to ask you whether, in case we had no manufactories in Canada, would American cottons be obtained in Canada as cheaply as now?—I think the consumer is getting his cottons now cheaper than he would get them without the National Policy, and the time is coming when he will get them still cheaper.

Q. And you also state as a fact that the American manufacturer has no advantage over the Canadian manufacturer in regard to the raw material?—Not in the North, he has in the South. There are a good many manufacturers in the Southern States, in Columbia and Georgia. Of course, a manufacturer there has the pull over the Northern manufacturer as well as the Canadian manufacturer, but I have no hesitation in saying that we get our raw material as cheap as the manufacturers of Lowell, Lawrence, or any of the manufacturers of the North.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Could you give us a comparative statement of the relative prices of cotton goods in 1878 and 1881 or 1882, of both American and cotton goods?—I dare say I could, I will endeavour to obtain it. I can give you the comparative prices of some goods from memory. There is a class of goods which we make at our mills called

cotton checks. They are blue and white. They are used largely by farmers, I think, for shirts, and they are used I think for women and children's dresses. I select them because they are goods we have been making for a number of years and we do not vary the quality. They are always the same thing as near as we can make them. The price was, I think, 15 cents, and now they are 14 cents, but I cannot tell you how many years back they were 15 cents.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you find manufacturing cottons a profitable investment?—Yes, Sir.

Q. Very profitable is it?—It is profitable. Yes.

Q. Have you increased your capacity?—We have, Sir.

Q. A hundred-fold I presume?—No, I have stated the extent to which we have increased it.

Q. Is your company a stock company?—Yes.

Q. Can you inform the Committee what dividends you had declared for the past few years?—Yes 10 per cent. per annum.

Q. What proportion have you added to your capital?—Do you mean to what extent have we increased the capital since we have commenced operations?

Q. I mean what proportion of your profits do you put to capital account?—None, Sir.

Q. Well, how do you increase your capacity?—By running more stock. We have doubled our capital, but we have not charged any profits to capital account.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Prior to 1879 did cotton manufacturing pay?—No, Sir.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What dividend did you pay then?—None.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. How many hands do you employ in that mill?—We employ over 600.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. At present?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. At the Cornwall mill?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. How many did you employ before the Tariff was imposed?—About half of that number.

Q. About 300?—I think about that number. I have not the precise statement, but it is a large increase. It is about that. I may tell you what our wages are, I have no objection to do that. We pay our operators once a month. I was at the mill about a fortnight ago, and they were paying wages that day. They paid within a trifle of \$12,000. That is the wages to operatives alone. The committee will understand that is not the whole of our expenditure. We are all the time expending money for repairs

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are you posted in the prices of hardware?—No, I may say I am only connected with one class of iron manufactures, and that is the production of pig iron and bar iron and nail plates and car wheels. I am interested in a very large concern, at Londonderry, Nova Scotia, I was one of the original promoters. In fact it was through me the present company was formed.

Q. When was that company formed?—It was formed a good many years ago. I think about 1872 or 1873, but I am not exactly sure about that. We have been in operation about eight years. The company was formed, of course, a considerable time before the works went into operation. We have expended £400,000 sterling in cash there.

Q. How do the prices you now receive for these goods compare with the prices you received before the imposition of the Tariff?—None of these goods were produced in Canada until we made them, and the protection we have is very small comparatively speaking. We are the only company working blast furnaces. I am in favour of a duty \$3.50 a ton, but we only got \$2 a ton. I suppose the Government

felt if they gave us what was asked it would be looked upon as a monopoly, therefore the duty was made very low. I am of opinion it was too low. The duty if it had been a little larger would have had the effect of starting up other furnaces in other parts of the country. We have plenty of ore but it requires a large amount of capital to carry on the work. The people are loth to put money in this industry until they see it is prospering. All the duty we get on pig iron is \$2 a ton; the duty on bar iron I do not know it is 15 or 17½ per cent.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you give us any information as to what increase has taken place in reference to such iron and steel as would enter into the manufacture of farm implements?—We have been selling pig iron at very low prices.

Q. Do you manufacture steel?—No, we do not.

Q. Do you know the relative prices of bar iron?—No, I am not familiar with it. I think the price is very low.

Q. Are there any steel manufactures there?—We did make steel, but dropped it.

Q. Why?—We found that it did not answer to make many things at our works. The same thing applies in the manufacture of iron as in the manufacture of cotton. It does not do to multiply the product at any one mill. It is best to make largely of one thing. In that way you make the cheapest. We can make very good steel there; we have the right ores for it.

Q. But it requires a large additional capital?—Not very much to make cast steel. If you were to make steel rails, that would require a very large increase of capital. I may state, also, that at our works we consume in the neighbourhood of 100,000 tons of coal a year, and we employ a large number of men and pay them high wages.

Q. Have you increased your capacity since the new Tariff was imposed?—Yes, we have increased our product of pig iron, of bar iron, nail plates and car wheels very largely, and we are about to put another blast furnace in operation. There are two blast furnaces, but only one in blast. We are just about to put the other one in blast.

Q. Of course you have no comparative prices with you?—No, I have not. I may state that our bar iron, nail plates, and our pig iron, are preferred to imported iron; the manufacturers who use all these things tell us the quality is much better and much more satisfactory than the imported article.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Can you state whether the establishment of those works has had the effect of enhancing the price of farm products in that locality?—No doubt that is one of the benefits which local manufactures always confer on the farmer. It enables him to grow more of the coarser products of the farm, which are expensive to export, such as potatoes and other vegetables. Of course it creates a large market for those things, that would not otherwise exist. That is a very important benefit which these home industries confer upon the farmer and upon everybody.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Six hundred men would eat a good many chickens?—Yes.

W. P. HUDSON, Roslin, Hastings, testified as follows :—

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What business are you engaged in?—Carriage manufacturing.

Q. Are you engaged in any other manufacture?—I sell agricultural implements.

Q. Has the general cost of agricultural implements increased or decreased under the present Tariff?—They have decreased as a rule, under the present Tariff.

Q. Is the quality as good?—The quality is fully as good, if not better.

Q. Can you give us any information in detail. Take your own business for instance. How much cheaper are the waggon sold to farmers under the present Tariff?—About 10 per cent. cheaper than four or five years ago.

Q. How do you account for that?—The sales are greater and a great many of the articles I use in making them are cheaper than they were a few years ago.

Wages have gone up a little, but still the demand is so much greater, and the money more ready, that we can sell them at a little less than a few years ago.

Q. There is not so much risk in giving credit?—No; nor so much credit. I know this year my trade has gone up one half greater than what it was four years ago.

Q. I suppose that will apply to all your trade?—Yes; to all carriages, waggons, harness, &c.

Q. Are you engaged in manufacturing ploughs?—No.

Q. Do you sell ploughs?—No; I sell reapers, mowers and horse rakes.

Q. Are reapers as cheap?—Yes; they are cheaper.

Q. How do you account for that?—I do not exactly know, but I know that last year I sold them at a lower rate than what they had been selling for previously.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You do not manufacture any?—No.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Reapers, mowers and horse-rakes all cheaper?—Yes; all cheaper. The reaper we sold five years ago sells \$5 cheaper to-day.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. The same description?—Yes; the same description, but improved. I have, however, only acted as agent for the goods for the last three years.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. That is with regard to reapers. Can you give me the proportion with regard to mowers?—The proportion is something the same as regards reapers.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. All decreased 10 per cent.?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you know anything about the weight of reapers and mowers?—There are various kinds. The one-horse reaper is very light and would weigh about 600 lbs. Others weigh from 700 to 800 lbs.

Q. How does that weight compare with the weight of five years ago. That is a great deal lighter than five years ago.

Q. One third?—Fully that.

Q. Would not that more than account for the reduction you speak of?—But they are improvements to what they were.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. They are easier running, are they not?—Yes.

Q. Have you been engaged in farming?—No.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I wish to ask you with regard to the prices of raw material used in manufacturing waggons. What is the difference in the price of the iron used?—The price of iron has advanced a little. Still, it will be down during the coming season. Last year it was very low.

Q. Was it as low as at any time previous to the present Tariff?—Yes; I bought it lower last year than at any time before the Tariff, about 5 cents a 100 lbs.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. How long have you been in business?—About fifteen or sixteen years.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Iron you say is reduced in price?—Yes; it was last year, but it has gone up a little at the present time. Woollen goods for trimmings I buy cheaper now than I did some years ago. Hardware trimmings and wood work I buy of home manufacture now instead of sending for them to a foreign market.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are the woollen goods you speak of, of home manufacture?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Did you come into close competition with American carriages and wagons?—Yes, there used to be quite a number of American carriages shipped over, but none

have come in since the Tariff. I used to buy all my stock in the American market; now I buy it in Canada, at as low a rate, if not lower, and just as good an article.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. There is a better demand for your goods?—Yes, and there are more cash sales. When I left home, we were a long way behind with our orders. Orders are coming in every day.

Q. Do you ship any wagons to Manitoba?—No, but some parties moving there from our section of the country have taken wagons with them. My trade is principally with the County of Prince Edward and my own county.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What do you sell a good wagon for?—From \$65 to \$75. \$70 is about the average price I sell them at, taking one with another. I have fourteen orders for lumber wagons in now; they run about that price.

Q. Are you engaged in horse-shoeing?—Yes.

Q. Is there any advance in the cost of shoeing horses now compared with previous years?—No.

Q. What are horse-shoe nails worth? Have they increased in price?—Yes, they are a little in advance of what they were last fall.

Q. Have they increased since 1878?—No, I buy nails just as cheap now, if not cheaper, than before.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are they of Canadian manufacture?—Yes.

Q. Are they as good as American manufacture?—I like them better; I give them the preference.

Q. You used to buy American nails?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. It really does not cost the farmer any more to get his horses shod now than before?—No.

Q. And your profits are as good?—Just as good.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What is the duty on carriages?—It is 30 per cent. on manufactured carriages.

Q. Do you not take advantage of that duty and put that amount to the price, or a large portion of it?—No, I do not; I do not require it.

Q. You make sufficient profit without it?—The competition that exists will not allow me to do that.

Q. Do you find as ready a market as before?—Yes, more so.

Q. Are the farmers in as prosperous a condition as they were formerly? Are they not leaving your part, a good many of them?—No, very few have left.

Q. Are many going to Manitoba from your part?—A few labouring men have gone; but very few have sold out their farms, except some who had rough farms and wanted to go away.

Q. Has farming property increased in value in your county?—No, I think it is about the same in our county now as it was four, five or six years ago. I have loaned considerable money there, acting as the agent for a company in Toronto.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you give us some idea of the amount of money borrowed in that neighbourhood?—There is not as much borrowed as there was three or four years ago.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What is the rate of interest? What were you lending money for three years ago?—Eight and nine per cent.

Q. What are you getting now?—Six and a-half and seven per cent.

Q. Farmers are not borrowing so much now?—No; more are paying off mortgages now, and others are renewing at a less rate of interest.

Q. Property has not risen in value in your county?—Where property is improving all the time, it would, of course, increase in value; but I do not suppose a larger price would be realized for farms if they were sold now. The emigration to Manitoba has a tendency to keep the price down.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Can you sell a farm as readily now as you could a few years ago?—Well, I do not see much change. There never were many changing hands; once in a while a person would sell out. Property is just about the same value now, except where it is improved.

Q. The real estate has not depreciated in value of late years in your locality?—No, it has not.

The Committee now adjourned.

OTTAWA, 13th April, 1882.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into the influence of the Tariff on the agricultural interests of the Dominion, met at 10 o'clock this morning, Mr. Orton in the chair.

WILLIAM DAWSON, of Vittoria, Ont., was examined as follows:

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you resided for a long time in the County of Norfolk, Mr. Dawson?—I have resided in the County of Norfolk for the space of 32 years.

Q. In what industry are you engaged, Mr. Dawson?—I am engaged in farming and in dairying.

Q. Are you engaged in any other business?—Well, I am not at the present time; but I was at one time engaged in the lumbering business, but I have not, however, been in the lumbering for several years now.

Q. I suppose that we will go over the regular questions: in the first place, Mr. Dawson, do you think that it would be in the interest of the farmers of Canada to admit American agricultural produce free of duty?—I do not think that this would be in their interest.

Q. Why do you think that this would not be in their interest?—Because I think that if their produce came into Canada free of duty, this would be injurious to the sale of our own.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Suppose, however, that we had a very large surplus? would any harm result from the admission of American produce free of duty, if we had a surplus of agricultural productions? What effect could it have under such circumstances?—Well, if we had a very large surplus, their agricultural produce would not be very apt to come in.

Q. Supposing that American produce takes this channel to the ocean? if it takes this route to the Old Country market, what injurious effect would this have on the prices of our produce?—Well, it would depend on what this produce was going to be used for.

Q. If we had millions of bushels of American corn passing through our territory, what effect would this have, if we had a surplus going to the same market on the price of our produce?—I am not aware what effect it would have, regarded in that light - if it was not consumed in this country.

Q. It could not be consumed in Canada if we had a surplus?—That could not very well be the case.

Q. Would it not be to our interest to encourage foreign trade to pass through the country, in order to get a carrying trade?—It would be in the interest of the carrying trade to get freights.

*By the Chairman :—*

I would like to ask you one question: Do you think that if there was not a duty imposed on this article, a considerable portion of the American corn, which passes through our country, and which was not consumed in the American market, would be sold in this country?—I think that this would be the result if there was no duty on American corn.

Q. And do you think that this would be injurious to the Canadian farmer?—I think that the effect of this policy would be injurious to the Canadian farmer.

Q. Are you aware what has been the effect of the imposition of a duty on American corn and other coarse grains?—It has enhanced the value of our corn, and has given us a better market at home. In our section of the country, we can grow all the corn we want and more besides; we produce a surplus of corn. In fact, many farmers think that the duty is not sufficient, and that instead of the present figure, the duty should be 15 cents a bushel; this is the feeling of a great many.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you sell much corn Mr. Dawson?—I do not sell much, I generally feed most of the corn which I grow.

Q. But you do not feed all of it?—I do not feed all of it.

Q. Where do you find a market for the corn you sell?—A great deal of our corn is ground into meal and shipped to the Lower Provinces.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the quantity of corn that is raised and the acreage of ground which is devoted to corn been increased in your section of the country since the imposition of that duty on American corn?—Yes, that is the case.

Q. Can you give us any particulars in this connection?—I think that the production of corn since the imposition of the duty has increased from 25 to 50 per cent.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What is the increased acreage and in what district has this taken place? Have you reference to any particular district?—I have first reference to the County of Norfolk generally. I think, however, that the same thing is true of the Counties Lincoln and Haldimand. I say so only from what I have heard, and not from personal knowledge.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you tell us how the feeding properties of Canadian corn compare with those of American corn?—Well I think that our Indian corn is considered better for fattening purposes than American corn, but I could not give a decided answer on that point because I have never fed a great deal of American corn for fattening purposes. I have fed it, however, having used it for teams and such like purposes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are you engaged extensively in farming?—I am not very extensively, I farm about 400 acres.

Q. Indeed! What quantity of corn do you raise on your farm?—I generally devote from twenty to thirty acres of land to this purpose.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Is corn a profitable crop to grow?—I think that with us the corn crop is the most profitable which is grown. It is good for feeding purposes. It makes good feed for stock, and we use a good deal of the stalks, with a sprinkling of meal as well.

Q. What number of bushels per acre, of corn, do you raise on the average?—We have raised 75 bushels to the acre. I might say that we get from 60 to 100 bushels of corn, in the ear, per acre.

Q. That is in the ear?—Yes; it might be over that, but this would be about the average yield per acre.

Q. How many bushels of shelled corn do you get per acre?—It takes about two bushels of corn in the ear to make one bushel of shelled corn.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. That would give you from 30 to 50 bushels of shelled corn to the acre?—Yes, that would be the result.

Q. How does a crop of corn affect the soil? Is it very exhaustive?—I do not think that it is exhaustive. I think that it is a very good thing for the soil, provided that you take care of it in the right way. It is a good thing to clean out blue spear grass, which is very apt to spread rapidly in the soil, which is to be found in our county. A good crop of corn, with careful handling, improves the soil, and leaves it in a good position for seeding.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What do you sow after corn, Mr. Dawson?—We sow oats after corn, and seed it down.

Q. It cleans the land, owing to the fact that it is continually worked, I presume?—Yes, that is the case.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. And you think that it makes a very valuable rotation crop?—Yes, I do.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What is the price of corn just at the present time?—It is worth 65 cents a bushel. The duty which was placed on American corn has increased the price of it with us, and it has also increased the acreage, which is devoted to its culture.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. The effect of the duty has been to increase the growth of Canadian corn?—Yes, I think so.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Does the corn which you raise compare favorably in quality with American corn?—Yes, I think so.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you had any experience of American corn coming into your section of the country, and injuring the Canadian market when there was no duty on this article? I am now referring to the home, not to the foreign market?—The importation of American corn did injure the Canadian market in former years. In fact, it injured it so much that a good many farmers in our neighbourhood were going to quit raising it, had not the duty been put on. And a great many farmers think that the duty ought to be 15 cents a bushel, instead of what it is.

Q. They were going to quit growing corn if the duty had not been imposed?—Yes. If a little more duty was put on it they would grow all they can of it. Still they do not grumble so much under the existing circumstances. We have a better market and a better demand for all the corn we have. Formerly the corn used to lay in our cribs and we could not get rid of it. It lay in the cribs because the American corn came in and was sold at so low a price that it did not pay our farmers to sell at the figure which was given.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. The raising of Indian corn is confined to very few counties in Canada is it not?—I do not think that it extends over a great many counties.

Q. So the production of corn is a little monopoly, so far as you are individually concerned?—I do not think that it is a monopoly.

Q. But it is a monopoly in your section of the country?—I think that there are several counties in the Province of Ontario where probably they raise a good deal more corn than we do. It is probably grown through the Niagara district and all up through the western district. They raise better corn than we do in the counties of Lincoln and Welland and in other counties.

Q. Can you give us any idea of what you know yourself of the different counties in the Province of Ontario where corn is grown?—Well, I could not do that. I am not in a position to answer that question fully.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I think that corn is grown more or less in every county in the Province of Ontario?—It is grown in a great many counties.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. What influence had the importation of American corn on the price of the oats which you raised?—I think that the imposition of the duty on American corn has increased the price of our oats from 5 cents to 10 cents a bushel.

Q. The stoppage of the importation of American corn has had that effect on the price of your oats?—Yes, that is the case.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Suppose that the duty was taken off American corn just now, would the effect of it be to cheapen oats in your neighborhood?—I do not think that would have exactly that effect at the present time.

Q. Then oats are higher in price just now?—Yes.

Q. And corn would not compete with oats at the present time?—The price of corn is high in Chicago at the present time.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are not oats even higher in the United States than they are here, at the present time?—Yes; I think that that is the case.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Have you known of oats being imported into your section of the country from the United States?—Well, oats were brought into our section from the States before the duty was imposed. Oats were then crowded in, and the country was filled up with them.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You say that corn is higher in price in Chicago just now; oats are higher in price too there, are they not?—They are not higher in price there than they are here.

Q. Suppose that the duty were taken off American oats, would it pay to import them into Canada from the United States just now? Could they sell them cheaper than Canadian oats, if this were done?—I do not know that they would do so at the present time.

Q. Well, then, it follows from this that the duty on American oats is not a benefit to the Canadian farmer just now?—It may not be a benefit to them just now; but it has been to them a great benefit.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. For what purpose were American oats imported into Canada a few years ago? Was it to be ground up into meal?—I do not think that this was the case. I think that this was done more for the purpose of feeding them than for any other object.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I believe that you have had no experience in handling oats imported from the United States, yourself?—I have not, for the purpose of grinding them up into meal.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you bought American oats for feeding purposes?—Yes, I have.

Q. You used American oats when you were engaged in the lumbering business?—Yes; We then bought American corn and oats.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose that you were in the position of all the rest of us; you had two or three unfavorable seasons; Western corn was shipped in, and it paid many to buy it?—I bought it when I was in the lumbering business.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. But you did not buy American oats and corn, as a farmer, but when lumbering. Do you think that a man who is farming and buys feed with which to feed his stock, is a good farmer?—No, I do not.

Q. Do you think that it pays a farmer to keep stock, if he cannot raise enough feed for them?—It would never pay me to feed stock, if I did not raise my own feed.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Suppose that a farmer could exchange one commodity for another and benefit by the exchange, would not this be a wise thing to do?—Well, I do not know on what ground, that would be advisable.

Q. Suppose that a farmer could exchange barley for corn or oats, would it not be a wise thing for him to do it, the exchange being to his advantage?—Of course, barley, if it be of good quality, is worth more for malting purposes than it is for feed.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. You do not grow barley for feeding purposes?—Barley, when it is of inferior quality, is sometimes good only for feed, and very often under such cir-

circumstances it is used for this purpose. It is a very peculiar grain to handle. If it is the least bit spoiled, it is almost worthless for any purpose unless it is used for feed.

Q. You never, then, sow barley with the idea of using it for food?—No; but still we often have to use it for that purpose. I know that during one season, I had a lot of barley spoiled, and I had to buy stock in order that I might use it all up for feeding purposes. I could not get rid of it in any other way.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. I suppose, on the other hand, that it does not pay you to grow barley continuously? You want to raise as large a variety of crops on the farm as is possible?—Yes; and barley is not a very profitable crop for us to raise in our section of the country.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You then do not raise much barley?—We do not raise very much of it; that is to say, we do not make a staple production of it at all.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What is the nature of the soil up there in your neighbourhood?—The nature of the soil is light; it is a sandy loam.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you grow much rye in your section of the country?—A great deal of rye is raised in our section of the country.

Q. Has the duty which has been placed on coarse grains coming into Canada from the United States affected the price of rye at all?—I think that it has had such an effect. It has increased the price of rye wonderfully, and has been a great help to farmers.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Where do you send the rye which you raise, or is it consumed at home?—We send the most of it to Toronto.

Q. Then you do not know really where it is consumed?—I cannot say from my personal knowledge. I believe that some of it was sent out of the country last year.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Some of it was sent to Germany last year?—I have heard so.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. This was the case, not only last year, but the year before, was it not?—More was sent to Germany last year than was the case previously, of course. Some rye was sent to Germany during the closing part of the previous season, but during last season a good deal of rye was sent to Germany.

Q. I suppose that you do not raise rye in any considerable quantity?—A good deal of rye is grown in our section of the country.

Q. Have you raised it as a substitute for fall wheat after fall wheat began to fail?—It has been raised a good deal as a substitute when fall wheat was bad with the midge, and was almost going to be failure. A good deal of rye was then grown as a substitute for fall wheat, but besides this a good deal of rye is raised with us for the purposes of seeding. You can seed better with a rye crop than with any other grain.

Q. You can seed better with rye that you can with fall wheat?—Yes; that is our experience.

Q. How do you account for this Mr. Dawson?—I account for it in this way. We sow clover and timothy in the fall of the year, and about the end of the month of August; in the latter part of August we can sow them and rye together. The rye comes up and takes the clover through the winter. Clover and timothy both catch in the soil and do better.

Q. The rye gives them more shelter?—Yes, you cannot sow wheat as early as you can rye; and consequently clover and timothy with wheat do not get the same protection as they do when they are sown with rye.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you aware of the fact, that until within the last few years, until within the last two or three years, the greater part of our rye was consumed in Canada?—Well, I think that this was the case. Still I have raised considerable rye during the last several years, but it was nevertheless almost worthless for the purpose of sale. I could not obtain for it more than 40 or 45 cents a bushel; and I had to feed it up to get any proper degree of benefit from my crop. Of course, I mixed it with oats and bran, and used it in this way; it makes very good feed. But since the duty was put on American corn, there has been no trouble in selling it for from 60 to 65 cents a bushel; and during last year we got from 75 to 80, and even 85 cents a bushel for it.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do you think that it has gone up in price owing to the imposition of the duties which are in question?—I do not think that the imposition these duties has put up the price of rye to quite as high a figure as it commands at the present time; but I think that these duties have increased its price.

Q. What has caused the advance in the price of rye?—I think that the demand from Germany has put up the price to its present figure.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I will now ask you what effect has been produced on the price of wheat and flour by the imposition of the duties which have been placed on these articles coming into Canada from the United States?—Well, that is a question which I am not able to answer in a practical sense, any further than to state what millers have told me on this subject. They tell me that the imposition of these duties has been a great benefit to them in connection with their milling interests. Before the duty was put on American wheat, the millers in our section of the country could not sell much of our own wheat at home; but since the imposition of this duty, they have been able to sell all their flour in the Lower Provinces.

Q. Have you yourself noticed the effect which the imposition of this duty has had on different kinds of wheat? Do you know whether it has brought certain kinds of wheat more into demand amongst our millers?—Well, I think that the duty on American wheat has brought a good class of wheat more into demand amongst us.

Q. What has been the effect of the duties which are imposed on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard, on these articles in Canada?—There has been a marked improvement in the demand for these articles in Canada since these duties were imposed, and the prices of them have been increased.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Where do you send live hogs from your section of the country. To what market do they go?—We generally send them to the City of Hamilton. I sold a great many of them in Hamilton during last season, I also sold some of them in Ingersoll.

Q. I suppose that some live hogs are sent to the City of Montreal?—No, I have sent none to Montreal for my part.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the increased duties which have been imposed under the present Tariff, on horses and other live stock, improved the market for horses in the Canadian home market—especially in the Province of Manitoba and in the North-West Territories?—I think that this has been the effect of these duties with regard to a special class of horses; but, on the other hand, as far as the very fine and the fancy class of horses is concerned, I think that they are worth more for the purpose of being sent into the Eastern market.

Q. Do you now refer to the United States market?—Yes; but with regard to the general class of useful working horses, I think that the chances are in favour of sending them to the North-West. There has been a marked improvement in the demand from that market, since the imposition of the duties has kept horses from coming in there from the other side.

Q. Was this class of horses rather a drug in the market previous to the opening of the North-West market?—This was rather the case with that class of horses; but of course, the best market for fancy horses has been, and still is, in the West; this class has never been a drug in the market, we have always had a ready sale for them.

Q. Do you think that if the duties were removed from this class of horses, they would be supplied for the North-West market, to a large extent, from the United States?—Yes; I think that this would be the result which would follow a removal of these duties.

Q. Do you find it, as a rule, a profitable thing to breed horses?—Yes, I have found it to be the case.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What class of horses do you mostly breed?—Horses, which are adapted for general carriage purposes.

Q. To be used for driving?—Yes.

Q. Where do you find a market for this class of horses?—The market for the best fancy horses has been in the East; still, at the same time, farmers, as a general rule, make up their minds, in our section of the country, that it is more profitable to breed a heavier class of horses; horses with more draught, for which there has been a more active demand during the last two years than has been the case with the finer class of horses, unless I may except extra fine horses.

Q. Do you think that the breeding of horses compares favourably with the breeding of horned cattle and sheep as far as profits are concerned?—Well, I think for my part, that more profit is obtained from the breeding of a good class of cattle than is secured from the breeding of horses.

Q. There is too great risk of incurring loss from blemish, in the breeding of horses, is there not?—There is great risk. You may breed a great many horses and at the same time, only get a few that will give you a profit.

Q. Do the farmers in your section of the country as a rule breed thoroughbreds, or fast horses, or simply good driving horses?—Well, we breed from thoroughbreds, when we wish to raise driving horses, if we can find them.

Q. In that case you meet with too many failures?—Yes, we meet with a good many.

Q. And then another difficulty is to get a good market for that particular class of horses?—Yes; that is one of the difficulties that is experienced.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Can the Canadian farmer raise all the grain that he requires for the fattening of his stock?—He can do so in our own section of the country, at all events.

Q. Would it pay the Canadian farmer better to import American corn than to raise the feed he needs for his stock?—I never found it to pay me to buy American corn to feed to stock; that is to be used for fattening purposes.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you raise many turnips, Mr. Dawson?—We do not raise a great many of them. We devote to turnips three or four acres every year.

Q. Do you feed much stock on your own farm?—We do not fatten a very great deal of stock. We generally feed stock for other purposes. We fatten a few cattle, however, every season, but not a great many; we generally keep from twenty-five to thirty cows—probably thirty.

Q. Do you sell the corn which you raise?—No, I do not.

Q. Would it not pay you better to feed the corn which you raise than to sell it?—We do feed it.

Q. I understood you to say that you did not feed much stock?—I said that I did not fatten much stock; but we feed a few cows. We have a number of dairy cows, and we feed them.

Q. How do you feed your corn to cows? Do you give it to them in the grain?—No; we feed some of it in the grain, but not a very great deal of it. We generally

grind the corn up into meal, and spread it on their feed during the winter season. I have been feeding to our cattle about a ton of stalks every eight or ten days during all this winter.

Q. Is the dairy business carried on to a large extent in your neighborhood?—It is not at present carried on to a very great extent, but it is increasing its proportions rapidly.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Perhaps it would be as well to ask Mr. Dawson now for a few particulars with reference to the dairy business. You state that you are engaged in the dairy business? What amount of cheese do you manufacture?—We manufactured 100 tons of cheese during last season.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Did you manufacture this yourself?—Yes.

Q. How many cows have you?—I do not know exactly how many cows we had.

Q. You have a factory?—Yes, I had thirty cows of my own during last season.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you give us any idea of the profit which you derive from these cows? What profit did each cow afford?—Well, during last season my cows averaged me about \$40 a piece during the factory season, and, of course, I made something additional out of them during the balance of the year.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Over how many months does the factory season extend? Does it comprise five months?—It includes about six and a-half months.

Q. And during this time you made from each cow the sum of \$40?—This was just what I realized out of the cheese, which was made out of their milk. In addition we had the butter, and what we got for it.

Q. You did not get any butter from them, did you?—We make butter from their milk before and after the factory season commences and ends.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose that you keep one milking each week for household use?—We keep the milk which we get on Saturday nights for home use.

Q. I know that this is the custom; this is kept for the current supply of butter?—Still all farmers who are interested in the dairying business do not do so. Some parties who send milk to the factory, do not keep any of it. They get their butter made before the season commences, and they save their Saturday night's milk.

Q. What do they do with the milk which they get on Saturday night?—They keep it until Monday morning in a cool place. They use ice, and in this way keep the milk cool until the following Monday morning. They think that it is more profitable for them to sell their milk, even if they have to buy their butter.

Q. They look at it in this light?—Yes, that is their feeling on the matter.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What other profit do you get out of the milk, which you obtain from your cows, besides the profit that you derive from cheese and the making of butter?—Well, during these last two years I have kept an account as to my profits from this source of income, and I think that during the year before last, my cows brought me in about \$52 or \$53 a piece, taking the whole year through. Last year, however, my income from my cows was under \$50. It was, I should say, probably about \$47 each. In fact, last year was a very poor season for pasturage, and dairy cows were not so profitable as was the case during the previous year. Besides, the price of cheese was not as good, but at the same time the price of it was not much below the price which it commanded during the previous year.

Q. Do you raise much stock from your cows for the purpose of making cheese?—I raise some grade stock; I raise five or six thoroughbreds every year.

Q. Out of thirty cows?—I keep a few more for this purpose. I do not milk them at all.

Q. As a rule you do not raise any calves from the cows which you use for dairy purposes?—We generally raise two or three, just for the purpose of being grown for use as dairy cows.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you sow much corn broadcast for feeding purposes, to be used in the green state?—Well, we have not sown a great deal of it with this object in view; but we always raise some of it to be so used. We give up a few acres to this purpose.

Q. Would it not be a benefit to have a few acres sown broadcast with corn, in the event of a dry season being experienced?—It is then a great advantage. It would have been a great advantage last season. A dry season destroys the clover, and we then find a great deal of difficulty in keeping our stock through the season in proper condition. In fact I was obliged to cut a good deal of whole corn to be used for feeding purposes during last season.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think that the cheese industry has been benefited by the protection which has been afforded it, or has the effect been otherwise?—I cannot say that it has been particularly benefited under the present Tariff.

Q. You were not engaged in the cheese industry before the time, when the duty was imposed on American cheese?—No, I was not.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is not the duty on cheese the same now that it was previous to the year 1873?—I do not know, I am sure, whether that is the case or not.

Q. You could not have dealt very extensively in the article of cheese, not to know that?—We never paid much attention to the American market as we never send any cheese into the United States. The cheese which we ship we send directly home to Great Britain.

Q. There is no alteration whatever in the duty which is imposed on cheese?—I cannot speak positively on that point.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Still, are you aware of the fact that before the duty was placed on American cheese, large quantities of American cheese were consumed in Canada?—I am aware that this was the case.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are you alluding to American cheese?—Before our own factories were started large quantities of American cheese were used in Canada.

Q. How long was this ago?—It was twenty-five to twenty-eight years ago. I remember getting cheese from the other side when I was first engaged in lumbering; I got it for from 5 to 6 cents a pound from Buffalo.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. And really the cheese industry in this country commenced when the duty was imposed?—The cheese industry here is a good deal on the same footing as the cheese industry on the other side. Take the Little Falls and Utica markets for instance. They are on the same basis as our markets here. The cheese all goes to the same market—Liverpool, Glasgow and London. They have the same outlet there that we have, and we have the same as they have.

Q. Do you think, Mr. Dawson, that if the duty was removed from cheese coming into this country there might not be occasion when the market was down in the Old Country and when we would be flooded with importation of American cheese, that that importation would be detrimental to the Canadian market?—No; I think the cheese interest is so strong now, making, as we do, a better article here and quite as much in proportion, that it would not affect us in that way. The only danger we have to apprehend is their shipping their cheese in here and branding it as Canadian cheese.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. And injure the reputation of Canadian cheese?—Our Canadian cheese has a higher reputation than theirs, and it is better. They endeavour to pass off a good many brands of cheese as Canadian cheese.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose when it gets to England the brand is the only thing they judge by?—The brand is what they judge by.

Q. They can guess. A good deal of our cheese is shipped through New York in bond?

Q. A good deal of our cheese goes that way, does it not?—A certain amount goes that way. A good deal shipped by the Great Western goes that way. What is shipped by the Grand Trunk goes.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. It is branded at the factory, is it not?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose the shippers put on it whatever brand they please?—The shippers generally have a brand of their own. We shipped a good deal of our own cheese last season, and we put the factory brand on the cheese. The same brand was used by parties who bought cheese and shipped it. They asked us to brand it. I made arrangements with a party as I came down here to ship cheese to Glasgow. The members of the Glasgow firm with whom I made the arrangements say that they sell a great deal of Canadian cheese. They find a better sale for it than American cheese, as their customers would rather have it. I think the danger of Americans shipping their cheese through Canada and using a Canadian brand is the one to be apprehended.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. They would then ship it to England *via* Montreal. They would hardly ship it to Canada to brand it, and then re-ship it to New York?—No.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you find any difference in the price of cheese cloth since the imposition of the present Tariff?—I think it is from one-eighth to one-quarter of a cent higher than it was.

Q. Do you think that increase is in consequence of the Tariff?—I do not think it is in consequence of the Tariff. I think it is in consequence of the higher price of the raw material. Raw cottons in the south are higher than they were by some 2 or 3 cents a lb.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You pay more for cheese cloth now than formerly?—I think it is owing to the raw material being higher.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Where is it manufactured?—In the United States mostly, but they are getting some manufactured here this year, I think. I have received a circular, for the first time, offering cloth of home manufacture for sale.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you know where they manufacture it here?—I think it is in Cornwall.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has the market for poultry, vegetables, eggs, butter, &c., improved in your neighbourhood in consequence of the effect of the present Tariff?—I could not speak definitely upon that point.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Where do you find a market for that class of articles?—A good deal of our butter goes home.

Q. Do any vegetables go to the United States now?—They are generally consumed here.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Are they shipping any butter to Manitoba from your section?—Yes, they are.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Would the Canadian farmer be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, in your opinion?—I do not think he would now. I used to think he would be greatly benefited by it, but I think that the markets that have been opened up since the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated are just as beneficial to us as would be the markets that would be opened up by it.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Would it not affect the price of our barley if we had Reciprocity?—It would raise the price of our barley, but we would probably lose as much on something else.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What markets have been opened up since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty? Where are they?—I mean that if their corn, oats, &c., came in free, it would do no more damage than the benefit we should derive from our barley.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Of course, you refer to the fact that our home market has increased?—Yes; I believe that our home market is the market that we should have.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do we consume more than we formerly did?—I think we do.

Q. Are there many leaving your locality now?—I think there are.

Q. Are there many coming in to fill their place?—Yes, there are a good many coming in to fill them. I believe that every bushel of corn we consume at home, and every pound of butter and cheese we consume at home, is a benefit. The home market, in my opinion, is the best market. For what cheese and butter we sell on the local market, we realize better prices than if we shipped it to the Old Country. I believe it is the same with every barrel of flour the miller sells. He realizes more for it on the home market than if he shipped it abroad.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. In 1878 the Americans had the home market, had they not?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you mean to say you get better prices for cheese from local dealers than from shippers? Do they give you more per car load than shippers?—They do not often buy large quantities; they buy smaller quantities.

Q. The wholesale price is rather lower than the retail, is it not?—The price for large quantities is always lower than that of small quantities.

Q. The local market would not be sufficient for you. You would still have to ship your surplus?—Yes, we would still have to ship the surplus to England and Scotland.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are we, do you think, in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, under the present Tariff, than under the late Tariff?—I should think we were.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Why?—Because they had everything they wanted before, and they have not now. They had the advantage of our markets before, and they have not now.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. On what particular item would it be to their advantage to get our market for farm produce?—I do not know that it would be an advantage at the present time, but there has been a time when it would.

Q. On what items of farm produce would it be to the advantage of the American producer to have our market here?—Well, it would be an advantage on corn, oats and most of the coarse grains. Before the imposition of the present Tariff, they generally filled Canada with the coarser kinds of flour, which took the place of flour now ground in our own mills.

Q. Would there be any advantage to-day?—I do not know that there would. The corn crop was a complete failure in the Western States last season.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What is the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool. Have you any knowledge of that?—I could not give you any decided answer in regard to that.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you raise any sheep?—Not a great many of them.

Q. What do you get for your wool?—Wool has been very low this two years.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What class?—Southdown.

Q. Is not the price of that high?—I got 20 cents for mine last season.

Q. That is lower than you got formerly for it?—Yes.

Q. Did it not come down to a very low point in 1878?—Yes; it was low then.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has it been lower since that time?—I do not think it has. I think it was lower then than it is now.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Then it has raised a little in price since 1878?—Yes. I do not exactly remember what the price was in 1878. I know, however, what I have sold wool for every year, though I do not deal very largely in it now. I know wool has been cheap for five or six years.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What kind of wool is the duty imposed upon? Is it on all kinds?—I think not.

Q. You do not know what particular kind—coarse or fine?—I think Cape wool comes in free.

Q. The class of wool raised here is not subject to duty when imported?—That is long wool?

Q. Yes.—I cannot answer that question.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Have you noticed whether the cost of farming implements have increased or decreased in price?—They have decreased.

Q. Is the quality as good?—I think it is better.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. How long a period do you take in your comparison?—The reapers and mowers, they are 25 per cent. less than they were four years ago. During the last three years there has been a decrease.

*By Mr. Bechard:—*

Q. Could you not three years ago buy them cheaper than you could for the five years previous?—No, I do not think we could.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Is not the article of iron cheaper than it was formerly?—I am not posted in regard to the prices of the raw materials of iron goods.

Q. You buy nails sometimes, do you not?—Yes.

Q. Are they cheaper?—Yes.

Q. How much, 25 per cent?—I think they are \$1 a 100 lbs. cheaper.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Have woollens, cottons, and hardware, in common use among farmers, increased in price?—I think not.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Cottons are not increased in price; did I understand you to say?—I do not think they are. Some kinds of cottons are from  $\frac{1}{4}$  c. to  $\frac{1}{2}$  c. dearer, but I think I can buy cottons as cheap, or nearly as cheap, as I could three years ago.

Q. Can you buy a suit of clothes as cheaply as you could five years ago?—Yes.

Q. And as good?—Yes, as good and better.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you get hardware as cheaply?—Yes.

Q. Do you think the present Tariff has given diversity of employment and encouragement to our various industrial classes?—I think it has.

Q. Has it retarded emigration to the United States?—Yes, by furnishing employment for people here.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What employments has it created in your locality?—There is not very much manufacturing done in our locality, but there is a good deal more employment given to farm hands than there was.

Q. What has created this demand for farm hands?—The increased prosperity and the additional confidence of capitalists.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you think that the people leaving the country creates a scarcity of labour?—I do not know that it does. I do not know that there are fewer hands than there have been. I am only speaking for our own locality.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Then your locality has not lost many people, who have left for Manitoba and the United States?—There never has been many going to the United States. Within the past few years a few have gone to Manitoba.

Q. But every young man going West reduces the volume of labour?—But there are others coming in who fill their places, and we do not see the depreciation. Our assessment roll seems to be always increasing, instead of decreasing.

Q. Is your population increased in the rural districts under the last Census?—Yes.

Q. How much?—I do not remember the exact amount. It is not a very large increase, but it is an increase. Our townships have all increased. We have had some lands settled in our vicinity, which were not occupied before.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has this changed condition of things induced any Canadians to return from the United States?—Yes, there are a few who have returned.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What were they?—Farm labourers.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What part of the United States had they mostly gone to?—Michigan. A good many go from amongst us in the winter and return in the spring.

Q. That class only go for the winter wages?—Yes. Several parties living in our locality are engaged lumbering in Michigan in the winter and they come back in the spring.

Q. Of course that class does not leave you permanently?—No, but I had reference to parties who had left permanently when I spoke about those who had returned.

Q. The reason I asked was that I wanted to know what portion of the States has been the most attractive to Canadians?—Very few have left us that have not gone to Michigan.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Were those who went to the United States permanently farmers?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Did they sell their farms before they left?—Yes.

Q. Did they purchase property on their return?—Yes, I think they have done so.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Is there not an increased tendency to invest in good farm property in your section of the country?—I cannot say that real estate has increased a good deal. It might have done so in some instances. Really good farms I think are fully up to the mark. It is only the poorer classes of farms that have been sold by persons going to the North-West, and they have been trying to force sales.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would they sell at reduced prices?—Yes, some of them would.

Q. How much has land depreciated in value during the last four years?—I do not think it has depreciated in value in any particular, that is taking the good class of land.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. You think land has rather increased in price?—Yes, good land.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you had any experience in fruit growing?—I have never grown a great deal of fruit.

Q. Is it much grown in your section of the country?—There is a good deal.

Q. Are you aware what effect the increased duty has had on the fruit industry?—I have heard those engaged in it say the Tariff has been a great advantage to them. The Americans formerly controlled our markets and we could not sell our own fruit at all.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What class of fruit have you reference to?—Apples:

Q. Winter apples?—Fall apples.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Is the fruit industry increasing in your section of the country?—It is.

Q. Do you attribute that to the encouragement given by the Tariff?—I believe it is to a certain extent, though I do not go heavily into fruit dealing myself. But there are a great many farmers who devote their whole attention to fruit.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What class of fruit do they raise chiefly?—They go into apples and peaches as a general rule.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. Have not some fruit canning establishments grown up in that neighbourhood?—I should think there have—two or three—two in Simcoe and one in Delhi. They are talking about putting up one in Vittoria this summer.

Q. Have not these establishments given you a better market for fruit?—It enables growers to sell all they have.

Q. These establishments were established directly after the adoption of the Tariff?—Yes, they were.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you know that as a matter of fact?—Yes.

Q. Where do they find a market for their surplus. Do you know where they sell their canned fruit?—I know the proprietors of the establishment at Delhi sell their fruit at Toronto.

Q. Is it consumed in Toronto?—I do not know, it is sold to the wholesale dealer in Toronto, they might sell it out again.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. A good deal of canned fruit goes to Manitoba, does it not?—A good deal of dried fruits have gone to Manitoba.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. But I was asking you about canned fruit. You really do not know where it is consumed?—It is sold in Toronto where they sell it again. I do not know where it is consumed, I suppose they send it out to different parts of the country.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you not think Manitoba and the North-West will offer a very large market for fruit of every description?—There is no doubt, there is going to be a large demand for fruit in that portion of the country for years to come, where they cannot grow it themselves.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Have you ever been in that country?—No.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What is the price of winter apples per barrel?—Last year they were worth about \$1.50 a barrel.

Q. Did that include the barrel?—Yes, that includes the barrel.

Q. Were apples imported from the United States previous to the imposition of the duty?—Yes, before the duty was imposed.

Q. Much?—Not much; of course our home market is Hamilton and Toronto.

Q. What description of American fruit had you to compete with?—Fall apples and peaches. Peaches particularly. The peach interest is a very important one in our section of the country, and a good many farmers are turning their attention to it, and making more money out of peaches now that they have the home market than out of corn.

Q. Do they come to perfection with you?—Oh, yes.

OTTAWA, 18th April, 1882.

The Committee met.

Mr. D. A. BEADLE, of St. Catharino's, is called and examined

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What business are you engaged in?—I am a nursery man. I grow fruit trees.

Q. Are you also engaged in the sale of fruit to any extent?—Not to any extent. My business as a nursery man and my position as Secretary of the Fruit Growers Association, make me conversant with the operations of fruit growers; but personally I am not largely interested in growing fruit for market.

Q. Is there a great deal of fruit grown in your section of country?—It is a very favourable section for fruit growing. We can grow apples, pears, peaches, in fact all the fruits of the temperate zone, in our section of country.

Q. What district is that?—It was formerly known as the old Niagara District; but the country for growing these fruits extends from the Niagara River to the Detroit River, and all south of the Great Western Railway. Then again to some extent, along the shores of Lake Huron they can grow the peach to an unlimited extent. Pears, apples and other fruits grow very freely.

Q. Apples, I suppose, grow well in any part of Ontario?—Yes; but when we get as far north as this locality, a selection has to be made from among the varieties in order to get those which are the more hardy. There are some varieties which will grow free where I reside, but will not thrive here. A selection for this locality has to be made of the more hardy sorts, and when you determine what varieties can grow here, those varieties will grow in greater perfection than in our district. I have seen the Alexandria, Red Astrachan, Fameuse, and some other varieties I could name, grow better in this part of the Province than in our part.

Q. Can you give us any idea as to grapes?—Grapes of the American varieties grow well in the section of country of which I first spoke—between the Niagara and Detroit Rivers, and very many varieties grow finely here. I was astonished at one of our Provincial Fairs here, at the fine quality and ripeness of some grapes shown by Mr. Graham, who lives at New Edinburgh, near Ottawa.

*By Mr. Wallace (Norfolk):—*

Q. Were they grown in the open air?—Yes, they were grown in the open air. I went to see them growing where they were produced. Before I saw them I had no idea that grapes could be ripened here so thoroughly as they were.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you consider fruit growing in Ontario a very important industry?—Yes; and it is becoming more and more so every year, as the people are ascertaining that they can make more out of fruit than out of any other product.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Where do the people of your district find the market for their fruit?—The fruit is largely sent to Toronto and Montreal. Some goes to England, and, besides, there is a pretty large home consumption in our small towns.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Can you give us any idea of the effect of the Tariff on the fruit industry? Has it been beneficial or otherwise?—I should say it has increased the planting of trees. I think it has not been in operation long enough to have any material result as yet, because it takes a little time to get trees into bearing. But I can say that the enquiry for grape vines, peach trees, and certain lines of apple trees has been materially increased within the last two years.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What lines of apples?—Winter apples. The demand for summer and fall apples is about the same. They rely upon the winter apples for a crop of marketable fruit.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has fruit been imported into this country from the United States or elsewhere?—It has been imported in former years. I cannot tell just how much has been imported during the last four years, but I know that in former years the importation of fruit from the United States was considerable.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. In what season of the year?—All seasons. I know that to our St. Catharine's market the American used to bring peaches and autumn fruits—not much winter fruit though. The winter fruit was usually shipped to Montreal and Toronto.

Q. It would all be early fruit?—Early fruit was brought into Toronto to some extent—particularly peaches. I suppose it is a moot question whether a tomato is a fruit or a vegetable, but at all events it was an important item in the imports from the United States.

Q. Can we raise peaches of a quality equal to the American peaches?—We can beat them: We can grow peaches of a finer quality than we usually get from the United States. I am satisfied that the farther north we can grow the fruit the higher its quality. Of course there are limits beyond which we cannot grow, but where it can be successfully grown, the northern limit of that successful growth will give the higher quality of fruit, both as regards richness and flavour. Now we are growing varieties of the peach in this country by raising them from the stone and making selections of the best, which are of a good quality for our climate. I received some specimens from a gentleman in Collingwood, a year ago last fall—of our raising—and I was astonished at the fine quality and size.

Q. Had he any quantity of them?—No; they were a new variety; seedlings he had raised in his own garden.

Q. I should think Collingwood would not have a climate suited to the raising of peaches successfully?—I do not know that. I am inclined to think we will yet obtain varieties which will grow very successfully in Collingwood. Judging from my own experiments on Southern trees—planting in St. Catharines trees which would at first barely stand the climate, ripening their seeds, and then sowing those seeds and securing specimens which are hardy and will stand the climate—judging from those experiments, I expect we will be able to obtain the same result at Collingwood regarding peaches—probably not to a very great extent, because when you leave the lake shore the influence of the water will be lost, and trees may succumb to the cold. But where the temperature is moderated by the influence of the water, there the trees will thrive and produce their fruit.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose the real trouble has been not so much that the climate does not mature the fruit, but that the cold of winter destroys the tree?—The cold destroys the fruit buds. The peach tree will survive an intense degree of cold, but the blow buds are killed. The cold kills the flower or the embryo fruit.

Q. Do you think the Canadian varieties will be more hardy in that respect?—Yes. I may mention in illustration of my meaning, that a gentleman selected some seedling peaches from a city nursery, and planted them out to see what they would be. Amongst them was a variety which he thought good enough, and from that variety he raised peach trees. In every season that the peaches were killed by cold, all the blossoms suffered except those of that variety. Except that the crop was not quite so abundant as usual, the result of the second growth was good. I give that as an illustration of what I mean.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you know what the duties were previous to 1878 in reference to fruit from the United States?—My impression is that there was no duty previous to 1878, but my memory, with reference to duties and duties, is not very clear. You will remember, though, that during the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty there was no duty on fruit; and previous to 1878, if there was a duty at all, it was merely a nominal one.

Q. The duty is a considerable one now?—Yes.

Q. Has the effect of that been to prevent fruit from the United States from coming in to any extent and competing with ours?—I don't know whether it can be said to have prevented fruit from coming in; but it has given such an opportunity to the Canadian cultivator that we find the cultivation of fruit trees, grape vines and small fruits, such as berries, very much stimulated under the Tariff. In fact, the Canadian cultivator feels himself encouraged to grow fruit.

Q. Have you any canning establishments in your section of the country?—There is one in Grimshy that has been in operation for one or two years. There are several drying and desiccating establishments which have been put up within the

last two years. There is one at St. Catharines. There is one being put, if it is not already put up, at Fonthill. There are some in the County of Oxford, near Ingersoll, and more further West, which I have heard of, but cannot mention just now.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose the desiccation process is a new one?—Yes; it was suggested five or six years ago. Mr. Alden, I think, was the first to suggest that mode of curing fruit. He has a patent contrivance, furnace, trays, &c., for drying. Other modifications of the drying process are being brought up, but the principles are the same of drying by hot air instead of by the sun.

Q. As quickly as possible I suppose?—As quickly as possible and free from dust, and where no flies can get at the fruit. It is a much superior mode to the other, and the fruit is of a finer quality.

*By the Chairman—*

Q. Has the market for the Canadian grown fruit improved, and are prices more remunerative through the operation of the Tariff?—Fruit growers tell me that it has. They have a good market for their fruit, and their prices are such that they are encouraged to go on and enlarge their plantations.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What kind of fruit have you reference to?—To all kinds without distinction.

Q. Has the price of apples increased?—I do not know that the price is materially affected, yet growers feel themselves sufficiently shielded from the influx of American fruit, and sufficient protection is placed upon their industry to encourage them to grow more largely for our own market and for the freight market.

Q. Can you call to mind the price of apples in 1880?—I do not recall the price. Not dealing in apples I am not familiar with the prices as they range.

Q. How can you state then that the price has increased?—I do not say so. I say I think it has not materially increased.

Q. Has it increased at all?—Last year the price increased; but I cannot say that it was owing to the operation of the tariff. I should say it was more owing to the lessened crop.

Q. Do you know that in 1880 the price of apples was very low? In the County of Oxford, at Norwich, I was offered apples for nothing?—I may say I have hardly known a time when good apples did not bring \$1 a barrel with us.

Q. I could get them for nothing in Oxford in 1880?—There must have been something wrong. Either the quality of the fruit was not good, or people did not make it known that they had the apples to dispose of.

Q. Do you know the price of apples this last fall?—Good winter apples at the close of the season were worth \$1.50 per barrel, without the barrel. At the opening of the season pears were bringing about \$1 a barrel.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. There are two ways of increasing the price of an article. If you increase the demand that will have the effect of increasing the price of the article?—Most certainly.

Q. And shutting out the American fruit increases the demand for the Canadian fruit?—Yes; and I should say that the tendency is to enhance the price.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. But what is the object of shutting out American fruit if we have a surplus we do not know what to do with?—I do not think we have a surplus.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you any knowledge of the capabilities of the North-West for fruit growing?—Yes; I have to some extent. I have investigated the capacity of that country for growing fruit with a view to seeing if I could find an opening there for my line of business.

Q. And the result?—The result is that I have ascertained that a very few varieties of apples succeed there, and that we will have to get the very hardest varieties that can be found for that country. Varieties of apple which grow well here and used to be supposed to be hardy enough for a severe climate do not succeed there. The Alexandria and Red Astrachan, which were supposed to be very hardy and would

stand in any part of Ontario, will not stand the climate of Manitoba. We have to get trees still more hardy than these.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Where do you expect to get them from?—To some extent we will be able to get them from Northern Russia. I have imported about a 100 different varieties that I am testing to see what quality of fruit they produce and whether they will be worth propagating, that out of those we will find some which will stand the climate of Manitoba. I also know of two apples here which will stand the climate of Manitoba, I refer to the Duchess of Oldenberg and the Wealthy, the former a Russian variety, and the latter a variety which originated in Minnesota, those two may stand the climate of Manitoba. Others have been tried, the Alexandria, the Red Astrachan and the Fameuse, but they will not stand the climate.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What will be the effect of the introduction of the new variety from Northern Russia to try here? Will those varieties be more hardy after growing here for a few years?—No; growing here will not make them more hardy, but as they have endured so severe a climate in Northern Russia, we hope they will stand the climate of north-western Canada.

Q. Then the climate has no effect on the tree?—No, Sir. Well, if it does, it does not in our lifetime.

Q. Will crabs stand the climate?—They will.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you attribute the failure to grow fruit in the North-West to the climate exclusively?—Yes.

Q. Are you not aware that there is something in the soil which makes the country unsuitable for fruit growing?—I am not aware that there is anything of the sort in the soil. If anything the soil stimulates to a too rapid growth.

Q. I refer to alkali?—There may be places where the alkali is so strong that fruit trees will not grow; but there are places where they will grow well.

Q. They have not grown hitherto?—I beg your pardon. I have planted some trees that have grown.

Q. Where?—In Manitoba.

Q. What portion?—Some near Emerson, and some near Portage la Prairie.

Q. On what farm in Portage la Prairie?—I cannot recollect the name, but there are several farms upon which they have been planted.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. How many years have they stood?—That was the trouble; the winter killed them. I have reference simply to the summer growth.

Q. Then I suppose that above the snow line they perish in winter?—Yes; and the snow line is frequently a very low one.

Q. Is it the winter frost that is the trouble?—We are hardly able to answer that question yet. I think the winds have largely to do with it. Possibly towards the close of winter the sun comes out strong and sets the sap in motion. Then there comes some of those frost laden winds sweeping across the country, freezing the sap suddenly, producing rupture of the cells and causing the bark to discolour and peel off the tree.

Q. In that case a timber shelter will be necessary?—Yes; and when the time arrives that they have shelter bolts of forest timber in that country they will be able to grow fruit there.

Q. How far north on the American side does the fruit belt extend?—I cannot say that I know. They are trying it in Dakota, with what success I do not know.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. They raise fruit very successfully in Minnesota?—Yes; in some parts of Minnesota. There are some parts of Minnesota though where the two varieties I have named are the only ones that will stand the weather. If you get into the middle of Minnesota you can increase the number a little and when you get in the southern part of the State you can increase it still more.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. The climate of Northern Minnesota must be as severe and changeable as that of Manitoba?—I suppose it is very similar. In fact we infer results in Manitoba lately from what we know of Minnesota. Experiments have been carried on for but a short time in Manitoba, while they made much longer in Minnesota.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. I suppose you consider that the North-West must eventually afford a very large market for the fruit of Ontario?—Yes; as that country settles—for the next ten to fifty years—they will have to rely upon the fruit growing regions of Canada for their apples. They will not be able to grow them themselves within that period.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do not you think a hardy variety will succeed there?—I say hardy varieties will succeed, but it will be a matter of experiment; and many failures will be made in the attempt to select them. I know enough of the history of fruit growing to know that they will have to experiment a great deal, and the result will be that for the greater part of the next fifty years they will have to rely upon the Eastern part of the country for their food.

Q. In all new settlements you find backwardness in the matter of cultivating fruit. Poorer settlers have so much to do in other directions that they cannot cultivate fruit?—Yes; that will have some effect there, perhaps; but I am of the opinion that the class of settlers who go in there will be a class who will want fruit, having been used to it in Ontario and other parts of the world from which they come.

Q. They raise wild plum there very successfully?—Yes, but I pity the man who has to rely on the wild plum for his fruit.

Q. The wild plum is better than a good many of our best varieties?—I have not been up there to eat them, and I cannot contradict you on that point. I was going to say though that I can revert back to my childhood, and recall the time when I thought forest grapes were good, but I do not now.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think the effect of the Tariff is so to stimulate the growth of all kinds of fruit trees in this country, as to prepare us better for the new markets in the North-West, as they open up?—Yes, Sir.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you think the Tariff alone accounts for that, or is it not that the people, as the country gets older, are in better circumstances, and are better able to pay attention to fruit, and the more demand there is?—There are always many elements which go to make up a result, and I look upon the items you have mentioned as having had their share in bringing about the result. At the same time I think the Tariff has had its influence. I have noticed this: Let there be a large supply of fruit in any one season in our large cities, so that the price gets within the reach of the people of moderate means; they purchase largely of this fruit, and when another year comes round they think they cannot do without it. The fruit becomes a necessity and they will strain a point, even though the price is higher, in order to get it. So that all these elements go to make up this result.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. With regard to your immediate industry, the nursery business, what has been the effect?—The duty on fruit trees for the last two or three years has been 20 per cent. Lately Parliament has increased the duty in a measure—perhaps on the whole it is an increase. I cannot tell you what the result of that will be; there has not been time to judge of that yet. But the previous increase of the duty to 20 per cent. enabled us to cope better with our American neighbours. They have been in the habit over there, in my line of business, when they have a surplus of anything, of running it off in this Province. They send their salesmen over here, or those who are mere brokers in the business came over here and took orders and filled them with the cheapest stock they could get. Since the 20 per cent. duty has been placed on fruit trees many of these brokers have come to me, and have wanted to buy their trees from me. I

asked them why they wanted to buy of me. They said they had been in the habit of buying in Rochester, Geneva, and so on; but that they found the 20 per cent duty rather in their way. As a rule these men do not buy of me. In fact I have my own salesman, and then I do not fancy the reputation of many of these men, so I will not deal with them.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. These are the men who used to buy the cheapest possible stock, and sell it to those who were least acquainted with fruit?—Yes; and what was a very bad feature of the business was this: They would go through a section of country where our best Canadian nurseries were known, and finding that the trees of these nurseries had a good reputation there, they would represent themselves as selling for these nurseries. Many people would buy the trees believing that they were getting the very best from good nurseries; then when the trees were found to be of a bad quality we got the benefit of the bad reputation.

Q. That class of fraud it is very difficult to put a stop to?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are you engaged extensively in the nursery business?—I am.

Q. Has the duty had the effect of increasing your prices?—No; I have not increased the price of my trees at all.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. But it has increased the demand?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Then it has put these fraudulent parties out of the market?—Yes; and so far as that is concerned it is a great blessing to the Province. Certainly it is a comfort to me to know that the parties who represent themselves falsely as selling my stock have been stopped.

Q. I suppose you will not have the same trouble from inferior nurseries here?—No. There may be some such nurseries, but the country is not so very large, but that the reputation of each nursery is pretty well established.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What variety of plum is best suited for the country?—There is a section in which any variety will prosper. All varieties will thrive in Canada.

Q. The plum crop has been a failure of late has it not?—Not to my knowledge. Are you referring to the curculio, the little insect which troubles the plum? It need not be a failure, because of that insect, if people will only attend to it. A neighbour of mine came to me one day grumbling about the plum trees. He had forty or fifty, and he could not, he said, get any plums. I said "It is because you are too lazy." He did not like that, and he said "Why do you say I am lazy; I got up in the morning early and attend to them." I said if you will only go and catch the curculio you will save your plum crop. My calling him lazy so disturbed him that he concluded he would try it. He went off and tried it. In the autumn I went to see his plum trees and they were all right. I said "You went after the curculio then"; and he replied "Yes, you annoyed me so much that I thought I would try to catch them." I asked him what it cost him to catch these curculio, and he said on the whole about \$5. He had 50 bushels of plums. So the idea that the plum crop will fail because of those insects should be exploded. Our society offered so much per head for the curculio in order to encourage people to catch them. Those who did catch them got the prize, and in addition the prize of a good crop.

Q. How do you prevent the black knot?—We cannot prevent it; the only cure we know of is to cut it out as soon as it appears.

Q. And cut the tree down?—No; just cut out the black rust as soon as it appears. It is not so abundant as it was in former years. It is one of those diseases which comes and goes. When you see it first—it comes like a little green excrecence—you should cut it out, and if you do that you will not see it again for five years. But let it go on and perfect itself, and you will see more and more of it next year and the following year, until at last your orchard will be spread over with it and your trees killed. I can show you plum orchards which have been in existence for

the last twenty years. There has been more or less black knot in them, but they stand all right because they have been properly treated as soon as the disease appeared. You would not say the entire human race was in danger of dying out, simply because diphtheria comes and a few of us die from it.

Q. What is the extent of your nursery?—About fifty acres are covered with trees. Trees, like other crops, cannot be grown on the same ground for a number of years. We have to grow something else for a few years.

Q. What is the nature of the soil?—Sandy loam.

Q. Are those trees adapted for clay land?—Yes; but they make better roots in loamy soil than they do in clay. I have tried that. On the loamy soil there are stronger and better roots and the trees are more likely to live.

Q. Is there much of a demand for currant bushes just now?—No; they have not been a failure. There has been an insect preying upon the currant bush, we have killed it off with hellebore as fast as it has appeared.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How do you apply it?—I either put it in some water and sprinkle it on the bush, or use it dry in the morning when the dew is on. As a matter of economy we sprinkle it on.

Q. Has it no effect on the tree?—No; it is perfectly harmless.

Q. Do you raise gooseberries successfully?—The American varieties we do.

Q. Have you the Houghton kind?—Yes.

Q. Are they hardy?—Yes.

Q. And not subject to mildew?—They are immense croppers, and not subject to mildew; but they are of small size. We have another variety of American gooseberries, the Downings, larger and almost a heavier cropper. It is a greenish-yellow gooseberry.

*By Mr. Wallace (Norfolk) :—*

Q. Is it a better gooseberry than the Houghton?—We think it is better; it is larger and looks better.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. How do you prevent mildew with gooseberries?—It does not come with those varieties. I never saw a Houghton or a Downing mildew in my life.

Q. I have.—You must live in an unfortunate locality. I have never seen them mildew in my place. All the English varieties mildew with me; they are very subject to mildew on my soil.

Q. They do better in a heavy loam?—Yes, and near the water. I find that if grown near the lake shore, the moisture rising from the water of the lake impregnates the atmosphere and they are less subject to mildew.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. That is the natural condition in which they grow at home?—It seems so. In Nova Scotia near the sea shore and within twenty miles of the sea shore they grow as freely as they do in England and never mildew; but as you get further inland again they mildew. We hope some of these days to succeed in getting gooseberries as large as the European gooseberry from our natives.

Q. I believe the larger the American gooseberry the poorer the quality. It seems as though you give up the flavour as you increase the size?—That may be true. But we are just in the infancy of gooseberry culture, and I do not despair in seeing American gooseberries that will be good in quality and respectable in size.

Q. I suppose you expect to get a cross between the European and American gooseberry?—Yes. Some of our experimenters are trying in that direction, but we do not know what the result will be.

Q. What kind of American fruits come into your market to compete with our fruit? Where has been the sharpest competition?—In apples and peaches.

Q. What class of apples?—Mostly winter apples. The competition has not been so much in our immediate market as in our larger markets, such as Toronto and other points to which we both ship.

Q. How do you account for their sending so much fruit into our market while there is such a good market in England?—Now you have touched it. The Americans found a convenient inlet at Montreal, so they shipped there, and Montreal buyers dealt in their fruit. But since the duty has been put on our own poor people have that market left to them.

Q. Still the duty would not affect through trade because fruit for the European market could be sent through in bond?—I do not know how that has been; but they have usually sent the fruit to Montreal, and it has been bought by people speculating there in fruit, and sent through by them to England or other places.

Q. The competition in summer fruits has not been so keen?—No.

Q. The reason I ask is because the Americans have the advantage of us in climate and all fruit. Men know that their fruit brings the most money. I suppose that perhaps they ship their early fruits to us for the purpose of taking the first price in the market?—They have done so, but they have to send it by express and from pretty far south to make a very material difference. Take strawberries for instance. When they first came to our market from Southern Illinois, Ohio or Pennsylvania they bring 25 cents a quart; that lasts only a few days, and then the strawberries from New York State begin to come in and the price falls. The very moment our own fruit comes in all that stops.

Q. Our own fruit puts the American fruit clear out of the market?—Yes; and the effect of the duty upon these fruits has been to stimulate our own people to supply the demand. They now see that there is something for them to do. They have come to realize that there is something in their business more than there was before the Tariff came in force.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. The climate will prevent them from competing with the Americans in early fruit?—With very early fruit we cannot compete, but our early fruits come in so close upon theirs that their season here is very brief.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How is it with inferior grades of fruit later in the season; do they attempt to ship their surplus of them here?—Yes, to some extent.

Q. I suppose there is a tendency to send second-class peaches over here rather than first-class?—Yes; their first-class fruit will find a sale in their own markets. It is their second-class fruit that after a certain time they send here. But as our people get educated the difference between second and first-class fruit will have a tendency to lessen the amount that will be shipped here. When our own people raise first-class fruit and put it into the market, second-class fruit will have to stand aside.

**MR. EDWARD MOIR, of the Cornwall Woolen Mills, examined:**

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You are a manufacturer?—Yes; of woollen goods.

Q. And of cotton combined, or do you confine yourself to woollens?—I confine myself to woollens.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that industry?—About twenty-three years.

Q. In Cornwall?—No, not all the time in Cornwall. I have been nearly six years there.

Q. What is the capacity of your works now?—Well, there are different ways of estimating the capacity. The fairer way would be to give the number of hands employed. We employ in the neighbourhood of 225, if I recollect aright.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What capital have you invested?—The capital stock of the company is \$285,000.

Q. What amount of wages do you pay out monthly or weekly?—We pay out the year in the neighbourhood of \$60,000. That would be \$5,000 a month.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you increased the number of your hands since the inauguration of the present policy?—Yes; to some extent.

Q. To what extent?—About 10 per cent.; and we will make an increase of about another 10 per cent. this summer.

Q. Do you think the operation of the Tariff has assisted your business in any way?—Yes; very materially.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What has it kept out? How does it assist you?—We find a readier sale for goods now than we did a number of years ago.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. From which you infer that the Tariff has benefited you?—Yes.

Q. Do you know of any specific point in which you have been benefited, or in which you have been relieved of outside competition?—Well, we have been enabled to go into the manufacture of a line in which we were engaged at one time, but which we dropped. I refer to the manufacture of blankets. We are working half our mill upon blankets, the other half on men's woollen goods.

*By Mr. Wallace (Norfolk):—*

Q. Tweeds?—Yes; men's wear.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. When did you drop the manufacture of blankets?—In the early part of 1874, if I am not mistaken. I was not with the company at that time. I was in Peterborough in business for myself.

Q. Since the present Tariff has been imposed you have recommenced the manufacture of blankets?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Was it in consequence of the importation of American blankets that you had to stop making them?—No; English blankets.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. At what time did you re-commence making blankets?—After the new Tariff came in.

Q. About what date would that be?—Immediately following the change.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you supply the Canadian market as cheaply as the manufacturers of Great Britain and the United States can?—In point of quality we give better value. Even under the old Tariff, in point of quality we gave better value. The English goods, as a rule, are not made in point of value equal to ours because they have facilities which we do not possess for making up a class of cheap goods.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is yours a stock company or not?—A stock company.

Q. What is your half-yearly dividend to stock-holders?—We have not been paying dividends lately.

Q. Did you add to your business out of profits then?—No. Our former blanket experience was so disastrous that it prevented the payment of dividends for some years.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. And the improvement in business has not enabled you to recover from that?—Oh yes; we are fully employed now. We are somewhat disappointed in prices though. In fact, in tweeds we never have sold more goods cheaper than we are selling them now.

Q. Taking into consideration the cost of raw material, how does your profit on the goods compare with that of former years? I should like no better times than to have 1870, 1871 and 1872 back again. We had certainly a much larger margin of profit then than now.

Q. Between the prices we paid for the goods and the cost to you of raw material and wages?—Yes. It is only by a very much larger output that we can make any money at all.

Q. Then the advantage of the Tariff has not been so much the giving to you of a better profit as the shutting out of others and the giving to you of a larger field?—Yes; the giving to us of a larger field for our manufactures.

What wool do you use?—We use a great deal of Canadian wool.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Has the Tariff increased the price of wool?—No, Sir.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do you use Canadian wool for blankets mainly?—Yes.

Q. Canada long wool?—No; Canada short wool.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Pulled wool?—Pulled wool.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You do not use the long wool?—No; our machinery is not adapted to it.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has there been any change in the custom with regard to the use of wools? Long wool goods are not used now; they are not so fashionable.

Q. They are not even used in the United States?—No. I have a great amount of Canadian fleece wool which we cannot work. It cost 26 cents, and I would be very glad to run it out at 24 cents, because it is not profitable to make it up.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What class of goods do you make out of that wool?—We bought that for the purpose of getting the shorter close-grained fleeces out of it, such as Down fleeces or crosses between them and Leicesters.

Q. I suppose the nearer wool approximates to clothing wool, that is what you want?—Yes.

Q. Do you not want combing wool at all?—No, we do not.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I understand from you that for Southdown and wool of that class, there is a demand?—Yes; there is such a demand that England is being searched to-day for Down wool, and it cannot be got in any quantity.

Q. Being searched by Canadian manufacturers?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. On what class of wool is the duty placed?—On Leicesters.

Q. And we have a surplus of that?—Yes. And not only that, but there is a two year's crop in England and Scotland which cannot be sold.

Q. Then there is no revenue derived from that duty?—I have not looked into that. All I can say is that we never paid any.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You really do not pay any duty on any wool?—No. We do not import any wool that is subject to duty. We do not import any of the kind that is grown in the country.

Q. Then what you wish us to understand is this: that the class of goods made from long wool has gone out of fashion?—Yes.

Q. In the United States, in England and in Canada?—Yes.

Q. And therefore long wool is not in demand?—It is not in demand. The working of that long wool, for the class of goods it was used for, required a special class of machinery. Some of the Committee may have noticed that the Pacific Mills, of Lowell, Mass., are in a desperate condition. They employ 6,000 or 7,000 operatives. They have been very successful, and they paid dividends as high as 20 per cent, until last year. And now that this class of wool has gone out of date, they are running at a loss, and the question—their men are now on strike—which they had to consider was whether they would go to an expenditure, running into millions, to take out this particular class of machinery and put in machinery to work the short, fine wool, or reduce their expenditure to such a minimum as to enable them to force the long-wooled goods on the market. They considered it would be better to cheapen their goods, and thus encourage people to buy them, than to increase their expenditure by putting in new machinery. The operatives thought otherwise, and they struck.

Q. What class of wool did they use?—They used largely Leicester wool. They bought largely in England. I know their buyer, Mr. Walworth, has bought as much as 3,000,000 lbs. in England at one time. They made all those classes of goods in which Leicester wools went into use.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Did you at any time use our long Leicester wools?—Yes, and we use them now, but not as a matter of choice. We use them in a way that is not profitable, and because it is difficult to import wools that will just suit our purpose. We have to fall back upon these, although we would prefer not to.

Q. That partially increases the consumption of those wools?—No doubt. In confirmation of what I was saying, and to show you the direction the consumption of wool has been taking from 1875 upwards, I will give you our stock prices of fleece and pulled wools during that period. Of course the farmers would not get these prices as the cost of buying, of freight, &c., are added.

	Fleece Wools.	Pulled Wools.
Stock price in 1875.....	32½ cents.	33 cents.
“ “ 1876.....	27½ “	25 “
“ “ 1877.....	25 “	28 “
“ “ 1878.....	25 “	26 “
“ “ 1879.....	24 “	27 “
“ “ 1880.....	30 “	31½ “
“ “ 1881.....	25½ “	30¼ “

This shows how that the demand for long wools is gradually getting less, and the demand for shorter wools is getting greater. It also shows the average price from 1875 to 1878, of Canadian fleece wool, was 26 cents, and that the average price from 1878 to 1881 has been 25½ cents, while the average price of pulled wool for the first-mentioned period of four years was 26½ cents, and for the last four years 29¼ cents. These are exactly our stock prices at the end of the same period last year.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Is the demand for Southdown wool likely to be large in this country?—It is already increasing, and must increase. The prices of lambs or combing wools have undergone very great fluctuations in my time, and will continue to do so, so long as they are dependent upon fashion.

Q. You think there will be a steady market for Southdown wool?—Yes.

Q. Do you think it will gradually increase?—As a partial answer to that question, I may point out that the pure Southdown wool would be worth—that is in the clean state, as we use it—in the neighbourhood of 50 cents a lb. From that to 45 cents is the greatest variation.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you know anything about the yield from the different varieties?—I cannot say that I know anything about that.

Q. How do you account for the farmers being so partial to the Leicester?—It appears to me that they get a larger carcass from the Leicester. I do not know the average weight of the different Down yields, but the Southdown grows a closer, finer wool than the Shropshire or Oxford.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Are Shropshires and Oxfords clothing wools?—Yes; their wool is of a coarser texture, and I imagine they produce a little larger carcass. There is no doubt in my mind that farmers have erred, and are continuing in the mistake of paying too much attention to an enormous carcass. Clothing-wool-sheep, though they give less mutton, should I think pay far better, owing to the higher price to be obtained for their wool.

Q. But aside from that there is the question of the quality of the flesh?—Yes.

Q. Heretofore there has been a want of discrimination on the part of buyers in not paying more for the finer quality of mutton than for the coarser, so that the farmers are not altogether to blame?—Yes.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. I suppose the great demand for our long wools in the United States has also had some effect?—Yes. As it is to-day the long wools, as a matter of fact, do not go into consumption further than that people who are compelled to use them, use them for the want of something else.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Are our long wools used for carpeting?—Yes; but that brings our wool again into competition with the cheaper East Indian wools.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. The nearer the wool approaches hair the more it goes into carpets?—Yes.

Q. And we do not want to own wool that will be suitable for carpets?—No.

Q. Supposing our farmers produced Oxford and Shropshire Downs and crosses from these, would they be reasonably valuable in your line of business?—Yes, and we would be glad to get them.

Q. The reason I ask is because there is a tendency this last year to cross with these classes of Downs rather than with Southdowns?—Yes.

Q. The first Southdown cross is a successful one, but the second and third crosses are failures?—Yes.

Q. And I think they ought to make these others very successfully?—Yes. Speaking as a user of wool, I would say my way of going about it would be to use a full blooded Southdown buck or Leicester ewes, and to then follow that up on the other Downs. We would get a desirable wool in that way.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Pure Southdown wool is more valuable than any other kind?—Yes, and the consumption it getting larger every year.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Is it more valuable than Merino?—Of course, it does not go into the same class of goods as the Merino. The wool of the Southdown goes into the medium class of goods, such as Cheviots and Scotch made goods. The Merino wools except in the finer qualities are not used.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you use any Merino?—Yes.

Q. On what class of goods do you use them?—On fine cashmeres and tweeds.

Q. Suppose you were going to manufacture a class of goods to compete with Scotch tweeds here—of course we know that they are higher finished than our tweeds?—Only some of them.

Q. You refer to the higher priced ones. What class of wool would you use to compete with Scotch tweeds?—Clothing wools; foreign wools; and for something of the particular classes, the Southdown wools are very desirable. We have been buying them.

Q. I suppose it takes a middling fine grade of wool to make a nice class of goods?—Yes. I have reason to know, meeting with wool dealers, that it would be impossible to buy 20,000 lbs. of Down wool to-day. It cannot be got in England.

Q. The local demand there uses it up?—The demand from the United States, and from Canada, and their own demand has been so great on the Down wool that it is practically out of the market.

Q. Do you use Cape wools?—Yes, we use Cape wools.

Q. How are the prices?—They average higher this four years than before. The average price from 1875 to 1878 for Monte Video and Buenos Ayres was 17½ cents; the average price for the last four years has been 20 cents. For Cape wools from 1875 to 1878, inclusive, the average price was 17½ cents; while for the last four years our prices averaged 20½ cents.

Q. Then they are higher?—Yes.

Q. Are there any other foreign grades that you import?—Australian wools are imported, but they do not enter largely into consumption here for the reason that many of them are combing wools, or of sufficient length to comb, and they go into the finer description of worsted goods.

Q. They partake then of the Leicester class?—Crossbreds do, but the fine, full-blooded Merino's wool is now got at such a length, and the machinery for combing purposes has been perfected to such a degree that they can comb it and make fine worsted goods with it.

Q. I suppose that description would also apply to the first-class American Merinos bred in Vermont?—No; they are not first-class combing wools; the staple is not long enough. Some of the Australian wools cannot be combed, and those that come to the country come into competition again with Cape, Monte Video and Buenos Ayrean wools.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are the prices you give on board ship or at the mill?—At the mill.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Including freight and commission?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Wool when delivered to you in this condition is not very clean?—Some of it shrinks very much.

Q. How does it compare with the Southdown you get here?—It is higher.

Q. I mean, will a pound of imported wool go as far as a pound of Southdown wool, in the condition in which you receive them both?—In figuring the price of wool we do not go by the prices in the condition in which we get it. The prices are all based on the wool cleaned and scoured.

Q. The prices you gave though are not the cleaned and scoured prices?—No; the prices as we get the wool.

Q. How much wool will it take if the wool imported to make in the condition in which it is imported, a pound of thoroughly cleansed wool?—Sometimes it takes three pounds.

Q. The reason I ask you that is this: Cape wools and these foreign wools appear to be very cheap, while the fact is they are really dearer than ours?—Certainly; sometimes they run as high as 70 per cent. shrinkage. Cape wools may be said to shrink from 65 to 67½ per cent.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. How much will Canadian wool shrink?—Fleece washes from 15 to 20 per cent.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What is the shrinkage of pulled wool?—Pulled wools have been washed and the shrinkage on the average does not vary much from washed wool. About from 15 to 25 per cent. Unwashed will sometimes shrink as much as from 20 to 40 per cent.

Q. Cape wools are not washed?—No; they have scouring places at the Cape; but, as a matter of fact, it is only in Europe that these scoured wools are used. We prefer buying them in the grease, because they do not wash that wool, and the wool they do not wash they mat.

Q. Is there a large shrinkage in Merino wools?—Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Are tweeds as low in price as they were in 1877?—Except in one year. In my experience I never sold goods so cheap as to-day, except one year.

Q. How about blankets?—I cannot say much about blankets, because it is only within the last three years that I have had anything to do with them. I know, though, that they are sold relatively cheaper to-day than in 1873 or 1874. From looking at the company's books for those years I know that.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You do not think the effect of the Tariff has been to increase the price of blankets or tweeds to the consumer?—On the contrary, I, for one, am very much disappointed about the prices.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. It has increased the demand; and there is where your profits are?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. But it has not increased the price?—No. We could have taken a little more of it with good grace. We have increased the value of the stuff with practically the same machinery by fully 25 per cent. by being able to push it.

Q. You have increased the quantity you manufacture?—Yes; by being able to push it to its utmost capacity.

Q. Is the quality as good?—Yes. The tweed business in Canada has within the last ten years made immense progress. In fact I can go to Montreal and lay goods down beside the best imported goods, and it would trouble even a manufacturer to distinguish between the two.

Q. I suppose the more you manufacture the more likely you are to improve the quality?—Yes.

Q. And cheapen the cost?—Yes. I may say the woollen question is going to be a serious one for the farmer this coming season. I would not to-day, no matter how much money I had to invest—and wool has always been considered a good property on the average—put in long wool at 18 or 20 cents, because long wool is not wanted. It would be better for the farmer to grow, in the long run, a class of wool that is always in demand, than one that is continually fluctuating.

Q. You do not think the Tariff has had the effect of reducing the price of long wool?—Oh, no. If people were buying these goods in England, it would be worse for the farmer now, so far as wool is concerned.

Q. There are certain portions of the long wool you use in the manufacture of pulled wool?—Yes; we run over the fleeces and take out the shorter and finer of the long fleeces.

Q. You think the effect of the Tariff has been to benefit rather than to injure the wool market?—Undoubtedly. If people wore English, instead of Canadian made goods now, I believe our long wool would be selling this season at from 15 to 18 cents a pound.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. It is plain there must be an extraordinary readjustment before the farmer can get any direct benefit from the increased Tariff, because you say the only benefit he gets is because of the home demand?—Since the Tariff went into operation we have bought double the quantity and used double the quantity of Canadian wool that we bought and used before.

Q. Because it was cheap?—No, not that; but because it was suitable for use in the kind of goods we are able to make under the Tariff. If we were not making blankets we could not use Canada wool.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. There is a kind of shoddy goods in your line, made in England?—Yes; we cannot afford to attempt to use the quantity of shoddy they use in England, and for three reasons: First, merchants would not stand it; second, our machinery is not adapted to the manufacture of that particular class of goods. The third reason is that the excessive wages we pay here, for which they pay so little in the Old Country, would not admit of it, and wipe the incidental Protection completely out. The making of shoddy requires a special line of machinery, and besides the further such goods are sent away from the place, at which they are manufactured the less complaint there is about them.

Q. Do you think it a benefit to the Canadian consumer to shut out shoddy?—Is it not more economical to buy good goods?—There is one thing about the stuff which comes from England, it comes in a dry condition, and whenever it is washed, that is the end of it. The shutting out of shoddy is certainly a benefit to the consuming population. Another point in connection with our business is this, the increase of wages has been very marked.

Q. What has been the percentage of increase?—Since the Tariff went on—and it is especially the case with us, in a small community—the increase of manufacturing industries has made such a drain upon the industrial population that it is difficult for us to keep together as many hands as we want. The result is that in some

departments in our mill we have had to increase wages by as much as 30 per cent. ; and the average increase has not been less than from 15 to 20 per cent.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. That is partially due to a great many parties leaving?—Some have left, but it is because there is more work for those who are here.

Mr. THOMAS TWEED, of the Stormont Cotton Company, examined.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. How long have you been engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods?—About ten years ; about seven years in Cornwall.

Q. What is the extent of your mill?—This year we have employed about 225 hands ; we are now making our capacity three times as large.

Q. How many more hands do you expect to employ?—We expect to employ by September or October about 700.

Q. Do you find the demand for your goods increasing?—The demand is very good and has been very good.

Q. Ready sales?—Yes, very ready.

Q. Where do you sell the chief part of your goods?—All over Canada—the Maritime Provinces, Toronto—all parts of Canada in fact.

Q. You do not export?—We do not export at all.

Q. Can you provide cotton goods as cheaply as the people obtained them under the former Tariff?—Yes, Sir.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You have not increased the price any since the Tariff?—No. We get about the same price as we got before the Tariff was put on.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the cost of raw material increased?—It has increased during the last two or three years. We are paying more to-day for our cotton than we paid last year or the year before.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Can you give us the quotations?—This year what we are paying twelve for we got last year for eleven, and the year before for ten.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Is the business paying then?—Yes.

Q. How do you account for the industry paying when you pay more for your raw material?—We find a ready sale for our goods. We are not compelled to keep goods on hand and consequently save interest. We can drive right ahead knowing that we have a market for our goods. We have confidence that we can sell all we manufacture.

Q. What class of goods do you manufacture?—Grey cottos, tickings, denims, apron checks, and shirtings.

Q. I suppose the larger the quantity you produce in any one line the cheaper you produce?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How many hours do you work the machinery?—Ten hours a day. The first five days of the week we run a little longer in order to let the hands out a little earlier on Saturday to do whatever they have to do. They make sixty hours a week and a half a holiday on Saturdays, they prefer that to working the same length of time every day.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the cotton manufacturers of the United States, where the raw material is produced, any advantage over you?—They have the advantage of the freights. Of course, the further south you go, the less you have to pay for your cotton on account of the freights.

Q. How does the cost of the raw material compare with the cost of the cotton manufactured in the Eastern States?—There is not very much difference. We get rates very little in advance of the rates to the cotton manufacturers in Lowell and the manufacturing centres of the Eastern States—probably a quarter of a cent.

Q. Taking it altogether you can compete tolerably well with the cotton manufacturers of the United States?—Yes, the way the Tariff is now.

Q. And you are really supplying the market as cheaply as before the duties were imposed?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Can you give us quotations of the selling price of a few leading goods?—Yes. We are getting now about 28½ cents per lb. for grey goods, or about the same as for the last three or four years. Cotton would cost about 10 cents per lb. more ten years ago, and—

Q. I am only speaking of the last three or four years?—Well, then, there is no change to speak of. I think the prices are just about the same as they have been for the last three or four years.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Is Mr. MacInnes connected with the mill? He spoke of one particular kind of shirting they used to sell for 17 cents which they sell for 15 now?—That is the Canada Cotton Company, and I do not know about their prices.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. If the cotton mills were closed, would the farmers and the public generally buy as cheaply as now?—I think they would have to pay just as much.

Q. Don't you think they would have to pay more?—As much, anyway. The Canadian competition would not be here, and we would be left to the mercy of the other markets. I think, under those circumstances, perhaps they would have to pay more.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How does the import trade affect you?—The import of cotton goods?

Q. Yes. How does it influence you in fixing your prices?—I do not think there are many of the classes of goods we are making coming into the country.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. How does the quality of your article compare with the imported article of the same class?—I think the Canadian article is much superior. The English goods are certainly very much filled with dressing. If you take a heavy piece of English goods, weighing as much as the Canadian goods of the same class, you will find the value is not there. Of late years the English manufacturers have been using China clay, and with the aid of that clay they make a heavy and apparently expensive class of goods, but the weight of cotton is not there, nor is the wear.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose the goods are sold by weight?—Yes.

Q. And the more china clay they put in the better it pays?—Yes. China clay costs 1 cent per lb., and the cotton 12 cents; consequently the more clay they put in the better does it pay the manufacturer.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the English manufacturers had to use more filling because of the competition everywhere?—Yes. English manufacturers will never refuse an order. If they cannot get it at one price they take it at another, and according to the prices, so they fill their goods.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. But the general feeling regarding English goods is that they are the best of manufactured goods; they have the best appliances there?—They are no doubt well up in their business. Probably they are at the head of the cotton manufacturers of the world.

Q. But that system of filling would not answer long. It would injure the manufacturers reputation?—I cannot answer as to that.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. As a matter of fact it has damaged their business?—It has, I think.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. If the duties were not imposed our cotton goods would be a shade cheaper to the purchasers, would they not?—I could not say as to that. It depends upon the

quantity of goods brought into the market, and the circumstances under which they are introduced.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Have the prices increased on account of the duty?—No, they have not increased on account of the duty.

Q. And they are not higher than they were four years ago?—No, Sir.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. And the quality of the goods the Canadian consumer obtains is superior to that of the goods he purchased before?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You have not been able to use an extra quantity of china clay?—We do not use that at all, Sir.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Would you be able to run your mill at Cornwall if you had not the Tariff?—I do not think it would be in operation if it were not for the Tariff.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What is the amount of wages you pay out?—\$4,000 a month, or \$50,000 in round numbers a year. We are making our capacity three times greater, and will therefore be paying three times the amount in wages.

Q. About \$12,000 a month?—We shall pay more than \$12,000, because we are going into the manufacture of a class of goods, in which we will have to pay higher wages. So I expect our wages will be more than three times that amount.

Q. You will have to pay for skilled labour?—Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Do you pay your hands more than before?—About 10 per cent.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are there many cotton mills?—Quite a number now.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. About what time did you increase the wages?—It is a steady increase; we are all the time raising them.

Q. I see in some places they are asking from 10 to 15 per cent. increase?—I don't think they generally get what they ask.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you know the number of new mills started since the inauguration of the Tariff?—I have known several to be enlarged; several new ones have been established, and several are in course of erection.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you give us any idea of the number?—The Hochelaga mills have been doubled.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What is their capacity?—Their capacity now is about 13 or 1,400 hands.

Q. What was it in 1878?—About 500. They have more than doubled. They have made two additions, and they have almost made the capacity three times what it was in 1878.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How soon do you expect to be able to fill the demand of the home market?—Of course, the emigration into the country will affect our market a great deal, and it depends largely upon that. I think there is no fear just at present, that we will not have a ready demand for our goods.

Q. The emigration of our own people from here to the North-West will not give you a larger market?—Of course, the more prosperous the country is, the larger the purchasing power. If times are prosperous people can buy more goods.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Mention the names of some other enlarged mills?—The Valleyfield mills are doubling their capacity.

Q. What was their capacity?—It is about 600 hands at present. They are doubling their capacity now, and manufacturing fine shirtings, bleached cottons, &c.

Q. Have they increased their prices any?—I could not say as to white cottons what they are charging.

Q. Can you name some other mills?—There is a cotton mill at Kingston, 250 hands. It is just starting now. There is another one at Brantford, I cannot say how many looms they have there. There is one at Hamilton, about 300 hands, and there is another one at Hamilton with about forty or fifty hands.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Then there are the Dundas Mills?—Well, the Dundas Mills were running a long time before the Tariff came into operation.

Q. Do you know whether they were running in 1878?—I think they have been running right through. They have been running for ten years without cessation.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you know of any other mills?—The Coaticoke Mills with about 250 hands. They have been started about a year and a-half. Then there is a mill starting now in St. Stephen, N.B., with about 500 hands. There is the Merchants Cotton Company of Montreal, starting with about 500 hands. At St. Henry, just on the western suburb, there is a new mill started by Mr. Hudon. I saw them excavating for the foundation the other day. It will employ 350 or 400 hands. Then there is a mill at Windsor, N.S., I do not know its capacity though.

Q. It is just starting?—Yes. It is just going on. Then there is a mill at Moncton, I cannot tell you the size of it; and I think Mr. Parks of New Brunswick is enlarging the capacity of his works very much. The Canada Cotton Company are enlarging and putting in 500 looms extra that is doubling their capacity. I cannot think of any other mills just now; but these are in addition to the mills already in operation.

Q. Is your Company a joint stock company?—Yes.

Q. What dividend have you declared?—Ten per cent.

Q. And were you paying any in 1878?—Our mills were not in operation in 1878.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. When did you declare a 10 per cent. dividend? Last year?—Yes.

Q. Did you add to the plant?—We are now making our capacity three times as large.

Q. That is all being done out of profits, is it not?—No; out of capital. It is increasing the capital.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. The reports that you make 25 or 30 per cent. are not true then?—No.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. The effect of the establishment of cotton mills in Canada has been to give the people a better class of cotton goods on the whole?—Quite as good a class as they have been using and quiet as cheap.

Q. Are you aware whether foreign cotton goods of an inferior quality were coming into Canada before the Tariff?—All sorts of cheap stuff were coming in, some of them not fit for anything at all—some of the cheaper grades.

Q. Do you think the Tariff has had the effect of shutting out these inferior qualities of cotton?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Parties ceased to use these cheap goods?—The fact is the good goods at the cheap price forced these other goods out of the market altogether.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. The goods previously imported were of very little value, and the money spent in purchasing them was so much money thrown away: is that not so?—In a great many instances. Some of the cotton goods brought into this market were really not fit for anything.

Q. Could you give us any idea of the amount of goods manufactured in Canada since the Tariff came in?—I could, but it would take some time to get up a statement of that sort.

Q. It is very large?—Very largely in excess of what it was before.

Q. The money that was sent abroad for those goods is now retained in our own country?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. I suppose you find Manitoba a good market?—Yes, and it is getting to be larger every year. It is the same with the British Columbia market.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you ship cotton goods to British Columbia?—Yes. We do not ship direct ourselves; but, of course, we know where they go. Sometimes we get shipping instructions to ship to Winnipeg or to British Columbia. We thus know where they go, although we sell through our agents.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. You make more cash sales now than previously?—Of course, our goods are sold by a commission merchant. We give them to him at a price, and he is responsible for all the sales. The mill loses nothing; still, I fancy, there is no danger of loss.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. How many hands are employed in the different mills in Cornwall?—I should say, including the new paper mill, there will be employed about 2,300.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What number of them are men and boys?—About 33 per cent.  
The Committee adjourned.

OTTAWA, 19th April, 1882.

The Committee met: Mr. JAMES SPEIGHT called and examined.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. You are engaged in the manufacture of waggons?—Yes.

Q. In what part of the Province?—Markham.

Q. How long have you been in the business?—Since 1880.

Q. In Canada?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You make waggons a speciality?—Yes; waggons, spring boards, platform and democat waggons.

Q. Everything connected with running gear?—Yes; everything in that particular branch.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. How many hands do you employ?—From fifty to seventy-five; fifty now.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Where do you get your market for your waggons chiefly?—At present about two-thirds of our output is for Manitoba.

Q. In former years where did you have your market?—In Ontario.

Q. How long is it since the Manitoba market opened up?—We commenced to sell in Manitoba, I think, in 1878. Our factory was destroyed by fire in 1877, and it was in 1878 that we commenced to sell in the Manitoba market.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What number of waggons do you ship to Manitoba during the year?—We ship to-day a hundred a week—two car loads—if we get them ready in time.

Q. Double waggons?—All classes, double waggons, buck-boards, platform and three spring waggons.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Where is your nearest railway shipping point?—Right in the village. We have the Midland Railway running right through the village.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Does it pay you as well to send waggons to Manitoba as to sell them in Ontario?—That question requires a little consideration. I would say yes, in this way; we get cash or its equivalent in Manitoba, and the home trade is on credit.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you ship them to be sold on commission in Manitoba?—No; we sell to dealers.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. It is practically a wholesale trade?—Yes; consequently the profits are less in detail; but they are better in the aggregate on account of there being no loss.

Q. Exactly; you get cash on good paper?—Yes.

Q. Do you ship to one man?—We have but one agent in Manitoba—Mr. Keller. We are now shipping to the North-West Mounted Police, to the Indian Department, and to the contractor of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you manufacture waggons now as cheap as before the Tariff came into operation?—Well, so far as the home trade is concerned we can manufacture them more cheaply. Our output is three or four times what it was previously, owing to the enormously increased demand. We can consequently manufacture cheaper. You see, in every first-class factory you are compelled to have a certain number of first-class men. We pay from \$2 to \$4 a day for our best men. Then in addition to these we employ an inferior class of men to cut and run through planers and that sort of thing. Consequently we can manufacture much cheaper. We have to pay more for our iron, coal, paints, oils, etc., on account of the increase in the duty. Nevertheless, a large increase in the manufactured product enables us to manufacture cheaper than before, on account of being able to use all our machinery at its fullest capacity, and to employ more of the cheaper class of labour in the different departments.

Q. You say all the material that enters into manufacture is dearer than it was. Is iron dearer?—Yes, Sir.

Q. Can you give us any idea of the increased cost of iron?—We are paying more for iron than we paid before. We paid for iron in 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881 about \$1.75 per 100 lbs., or \$35 per ton. We are paying for the same quality of iron \$2.25 per 100 lbs. to-day. Of course that is not due to the duty entirely. It is owing to the rise and fall in the price of the manufactured product. The increase of the duty from 10 per cent. to 17½ per cent., adds that much to the cost of the iron.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Iron has advanced in price?—Oh, yes; all the world over, as well as Canada.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have waggons become higher in price during the past two years?—We are selling 10 per cent. cheaper in Ontario than we did under the 17½ per cent. Tariff, and we are selling in Manitoba about 20 per cent. less. The waggons we get \$90 for in Manitoba, under the 17½ per cent. Tariff, we are now selling in Manitoba for \$75 net cash.

Q. What does that include?—Everything complete; the complete waggon in every respect.

Q. Spring seat?—Yes, Sir. Everything complete for \$75.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. These are your wholesale rates?—No, sir; that is the retail price there. We do not get so good a figure as that ourselves. We would get rich if we did.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Have you a large market in Manitoba for your waggons?—Yes, Sir; and we cannot fill the bill.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What freight do you pay on those waggons?—We pay \$275 a car and from that to \$300. We have paid as high as \$305.

Q. Are the freight rates any lower than formerly?—They are about the same. The Grand Trunk and Great Western railways, though, are now charging by the 100 lbs. Heretofore they would allow us to put twelve tons in each car, and they would quote rates from Chicago right through to Winnipeg. Now they will not quote you a rate further than to Chicago, and they charge you 30 cents a 100 lbs. to Chicago.

Q. They do not allow you to put so much in a car, do they?—We can put in as much as we like; but they charge by the 100 lbs.

Q. That means a higher rate?—Considerably higher.

Q. That increase is only from here to Chicago?—The real increase is only from here to Chicago, because the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway always charged by the 100 lbs. If we put 1,200 lbs. in a car, rated for 1,000, they charge us for the overplus.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. How many waggons do you ship in a car?—Ordinarily from twenty-eight to thirty. It depends upon the size of the waggon. Some cars are loaded with thirty-two, and some thirty-five.

Q. Then it costs about \$10 a waggon for shipping?—About \$10.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you manufacture any other article besides waggons and carriages?—No; we run a specialty on waggons, and what you might call my stage waggons for the North-West, besides Democrats, spring-waggons and buckboards.

Q. You do not manufacture any agricultural implements?—No; I am in a position to know something about that business though. I am practically agent for the Indian Department at the present time, in buying all kinds of implements for that Department.

Q. Can you give any idea of the cost of agricultural implements at the present time, or compared with the cost previous to the Tariff?—Of course, I cannot say anything as to the prices quoted by manufacturers to wholesale agents in the past, but I may say that seeders which sell for \$90 retail, I am offered by the Masson Manufacturing Company for \$55 wholesale, for the Indian Department under Treaty No. 7. I can give you an idea of the quantity of stuff the Department is now ordering.

Q. When you mention \$90, is that the retail price?—Yes; the retail price today is \$90; and they offer them for \$55. We are buying breaking ploughs, seeders, hoes, drills, waggons, potato diggers, thrashing machines, &c. We have ninety-five set of harrows, fourteen set of seeders and drills combined, horse hoes, turnip drills and waggons, and that sort of thing to be sent to the Indian Department *via* Bismarck and to Winnipeg. Of course, buying these implements give me a chance to know how prices are running in other manufacturing lines besides my own.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you the contract with the Government for these supplies?—No, I act as agent for Mr. Baker, who contracts with the Indian Department.

Q. He is an American at Fort Benton?—Yes, Sir, and within the boundary of Dakota.

Q. You have no knowledge as to whether these implements are as cheap now as they were before?—If anything they are cheaper. Our goods and the products of other manufacturing establishments, bear as regards price about the same relation. We are paying more for our materials; but we are selling them at a lower price.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. How are wages? Do you pay more?—We have been compelled to raise our wages from 12½ to 25 cents a day. Men we were paying \$1.75 to, we are now paying \$2. We cannot help it; we do not like it, but we have to do it. We do not want strikes.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Have many of the mechanical classes left your locality?—No, Sir, we are importing them, instead of having them leave us.

Q. Have they been leaving?—No, Sir.

Q. You have been able to keep up the local demand?—Yes.

Q. And have always had work for them?—Yes. We always made it a point to keep our men employed. We keep the factory running at a loss rather than discharge our men.

Q. You manufacture for stock rather than discharge your men?—Yes; rather than let them and their wives suffer; rather than lose good men.

Q. In that way you keep your men for a good many years?—Yes. We make it a point to keep as many married men as possible. They are steeper than single men, and more than that, they always give a good vote for the Reeve at the municipal election.

Q. Has your agricultural population the Manitoba fever?—To some extent. In Markham though, we can claim to have the garden of the Dominion as regards the quality of the land.

Q. The farming land around there is first class?—Yes. Our lands are worth from \$60 to \$90 an acre.

Q. But the trouble is to find employment for your young men as they grow up?—Well our surplus population instead of going to the United States goes to Manitoba.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Have you any knowledge of what kind of a market there is in the United States for horses and cattle?—Yes. The demand for horses in the Manitoba market has been simply immense, though at the present time I think it is somewhat overstocked. My agent in Manitoba informed me the last time I saw him that there were about a thousand horses in Winnipeg being boarded, waiting for sale.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Almost all from Ontario?—Yes.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. It is rather early in the season perhaps for them?—Yes. It may be to-day that there is not a horse in Winnipeg to be bought at a fair rate.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You need to produce a better class of horses around Markham than the shippers have been taking to Manitoba?—The choicest horses I have seen for many years I have loaded on the cars for Manitoba.

Q. A better class of horses for farm work?—Yes; a mixture of Clydesdale and general stock—what we call general purpose horses. We do not use the Percheron or French breed in our locality. Our horses are chiefly from Clydesdale stock. Our people do not go in for fast stock. We are a quiet and steady stock there.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. It does not pay to take up a poor horse?—No. The price of freight is just the same whether a horse is poor or good. It does not pay to take a poor horse out to Manitoba. You can get any quantity of scrubs in Manitoba on the plains—native horses of their own production, something like Canadian horses. I have seen them in droves in the plains of Manitoba.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Are meat stuffs sent to any extent from Ontario to Manitoba?—Oh yes, in large quantities; but some of it has been condemned and thrown away as unfit for food.

Q. In consequence of being spoiled on the road?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. It has been a bad winter for shipping meat?—Yes. It is a difficult matter, in fact it is almost an impossibility to get good meat into Manitoba unless it is grown there. The fresh beef used in Manitoba comes from Montana and Texas. The live cattle arrive early in the spring and are driven in from those territories at the rate of about fifteen miles a day, and are fed on the road. They get them in first class condition, in the first place, but when they arrive they are like a man who has been working hard all the time, perfectly solid and hard.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. It takes the tenderness out of the meat?—Yes. You have seen a steak cut from pretty low down, and you have seen a lot of sinew all round it. Montana and Texas beef is a good deal like that.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Will Manitoba afford Ontario farmers an increasing market for meal stuffs?—It may afford a market for a time, but not for long.

Q. Is there any difficulty in shipping cattle from Ontario to Winnipeg?—No further than paying the cartage on them; that is all.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Have they been shipping any live stock from your section of the country to Manitoba?—Yes, for breeding purposes.

Q. More for butchering purposes? No. A couple of friends of mine have a large stock farm near Rock Lake, and they have been shipping pretty freely of both sheep and cattle to stock it.

Q. Is butter shipped out there?—I could not say as to that. There is one thing I would like to say in addition to what I have said regarding our factory. It may seem queer that notwithstanding that we pay more for our raw material, we sell the manufactured product cheaper. But the enormously increased output enables us to manufacture so much cheaper and to make a less profit. For instance: it would pay us better to sell a thousand waggons and get only \$5 profit on each than to sell only a hundred and to get as much as \$20 profit on each.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Was the Manitoba market taken to any extent by the Americans previous to the Tariff?—We were the only parties who shipped to Manitoba under the 17½ per cent. Tariff; but just as soon as the policy of Protection came in, Canadian manufacturers ran into that market pretty freely.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Has the Tariff prevented the American manufacturer of waggons from going in?—There are plenty of manufacturers to-day who are each selling more implements in Manitoba than the entire sales of the American people in that Province. On the day the National Policy came into effect, there were 217 carloads of manufactured implements stopped right on the border, which meant half a million dollars. These were replaced by Canadian implements, and the money was kept here. I am just as strong a clear Grit, Mr. Chairman, as you are, but I want you to understand that I am a Protectionist. That is the difference between you and I.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. These people shipped their agricultural implements just one day too late to get them in?—Yes. You may ship a carload of implements to-day, and expect to get them through in two weeks, and they may be six weeks on the road. It takes six weeks now to get a carload of goods from Toronto to Winnipeg.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Did you find American competition affect you in any way previous to the Tariff?—Not in my business. I understand in the western part of Canada that the plough manufacturers were seriously interfered with by the Oliver Chilled Plough Co. of Maine.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. The Cincinnati buggy manufacturers sent over and sold a good many buggies round our way?—They are doing that to-day. Though you think the Tariff is high enough, as far as carriages are concerned, I do not think it is. We have to pay 20 or 25 per cent. on anything we import for carriages. For instance, I have to put in a tender to-day for a first-class quality of hickory lumber. I cannot get any in Ontario, and I have to pay 25 per cent. duty on it. It leaves it pretty fine. These snide shops manufacture an enormous quantity of inferior goods, and they bring them over here at \$25 or \$30 a piece. They are not worth half the money they are sold for, but the purchaser buys them, because they look well, and are sold cheaply. He thinks he is getting a bargain; but he is victimized, and is simply robbed out of his money. If these dealers make \$1 or \$2 out of a buggy, they think they are doing well, but the purchaser is robbed. I think there should be a specific duty on these things, to keep them out altogether. We in Canada are making a quality considered as good an article as is made in the world.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. But a man after buying one of those will not be a customer again?—Well, a man does not want to be cheated more than once in a thing of that kind.

Q. I suppose the agents change their locality, and operate elsewhere?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What was the date of your first shipment to Manitoba?—I cannot say that, but I think it would be sometime in 1878.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. There was a very limited market there at that time?—None at all, Sir.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. It was after September 17th?—No; we did a trade on 17½ per cent.

Q. But the Tariff did not come on till April, 1879?—Yes; but we had made our contracts, and we did a successful business under 17½ per cent. We were doing in the waggon business, in our particular line, fully as well, in some respects as we are doing now, because the competition in Ontario is so keen. I claim to make a first-class article. In fact the Government have paid us the compliment of making our waggons the Government standard of waggons, for the Government. But the competition in Ontario is so keen that our dealers have to take a good deal less for the waggons. It pays a dealer though, because men will come in and buy fifteen, twenty or thirty in a day, and if he clears \$3 or \$4 he makes a good thing.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose that almost every country blacksmith manufactures a good ordinary waggon?—I saw plenty of them at Emerson, Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, say two years ago. Men would send them out there, and sell them for less than the cost of production. They were made by country waggon makers and blacksmiths, and were not fit for the market at all, clumsy things suited for the rural sections of Ontario. They sent them out there, and they had to take what they could get for them; \$25 for sending them out there, 25 per cent. for dealers profits; take that off a \$50 waggon, and the manufacturers only get about two-thirds the cost.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Did you see any of Snide baker's waggons there?—Yes, they have the biggest waggon manufacturing establishment on the continent.

Q. Were they any use out there?—No, Sir. The only waggons we had to compete against were the Whitewater waggons.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are there any American waggons sent into the North-West now?—No; a few.

Q. Not near so many as before the Tariff?—Why, the trade was monopolized by the Americans prior to the introduction of the protective policy. I was the only Canadian dealer, as I said before, who entered into competition with the Americans prior to the policy of Protection being inaugurated.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are the Americans shipping reapers and mowers?—Yes; but more particularly self-binding machines. Our people have not as yet thoroughly developed that machine. It is a very complicated one, and requires an immense amount of care in producing it. I have seen on the farms of Manitoba, Minnesota and Dakota, any quantity of them going round one after the other binding and sending the sheaves off. But ours do not work so successfully as the American machine. It requires a good deal of time, care and attention to get up one of their machines, and to work it successfully. I do not think they will ever amount to much here. I do not think the farms in Ontario are large enough for it to pay to use them, but they will in Manitoba.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do they use wire or cord chiefly in binding?—They use both.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Where are they made chiefly?—Most of the machines that come into competition with us are made in Wisconsin.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Does not Watson, of Ayr, make them ?—There are two or three firms which claim to make them—the Toronto Reaper and Mower Company make them ; but I do not fancy any of them are a great success.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. There is nothing to prevent their making them here ?—No ; it is simply a question of time.

Q. And I suppose if the Canadian manufacturers have a good market for them they will improve the quality ?—Of course. In my opinion they will have to be built specially for the Manitoba trade.

Q. And the larger the market the better will be the chance to make them ?—Yes. If there is a large market it pays the manufacturer to expend time and money to perfect his machine.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are there any manufacturing establishments already in Manitoba ?—Not many ; and there never will be.

Q. Why ?—Because there is nothing there to manufacture with ; no wood.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Is it impossible to get the raw material ?—It will never pay to take the raw product in the shape of lumber and iron there. Besides wages are higher than they are here. We can carry just as much of finished product in a car as we can of raw material, and the waste in the raw material would have to be paid for just as if it was finished material.

Q. So that Ontario will have to supply that market ?—I fancy if the protective policy is maintained, it will make Ontario a great industrial and manufacturing place for the next hundred years, if not for longer.

Q. I suppose wages will be reduced as the country fills up ?—Of course the prices are enormously inflated at present. I understand they pay \$7 a day to bricklayers and \$4 a day to carpenters. But they will have to pay high wages, because the time during which these men can be employed is comparatively short. To a bricklayer \$7 a day is no better than \$3.50 a day to a carpenter, because a carpenter can work all the year round.

Q. How will the manufacturer be at St. Paul as compared with the manufacturer at Winnipeg, in the matter of material, &c. ?—In the manufacture of sashes doors and blinds we cannot compete with them at all. An ordinary four-panel door they sell at Minneapolis at 80 cents free on board the cars: When I was in, Winnipeg—we ran saw mills ourselves and made up our choicer quality of pine lumber into sashes, doors and blinds, so I have some interest in the business—I compared the prices and found we could not touch them at all in Ontario, because the output in Minneapolis is so immense and the machinery is got up in such first class style. In fact there is no hand labour in it at all, and if they can get 10 or 15 cents profit on a door, and sell them by the thousand, it pays them very well.

Q. The machinery is perfect ?—Why, they just plane the wood and run it through with wonderful rapidity. It is marvellous.

Q. I suppose their raw material is cheaper than ours ?—It is about as cheap as it is in Ottawa. There is nothing to prevent a manufacturer settling down in Ottawa and competing with Minneapolis dealers.

Q. Except the increased freight ?—That would have to be put against the duty.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Would the freight on a load of sashes, doors and blinds from here cover the duty ?—The duty will protect the manufacturer here.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Under the duty can a manufacturer send from here to Manitoba ?—Yes, and compete successfully with Minneapolis. At present they are getting a large stock of their goods from Minneapolis. One and a-quarter inch doors sell there. Such doors as are used in Ontario are considered too large ; but of course the manufacturer going into that market would have to cut his coat, &c., so to speak, and build

accordingly. If I was out of business I would like to come down to Ottawa and start a business of that kind.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Would it not be better to start it on the shore of Lake Huron?—Well, the nearer you get to the market the better; Ottawa, of course, has great facilities for cutting lumber.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would not Prince Arthur's Landing be a good place?—If you can get lumber there in sufficient quantities, it would be a first class locality; but if you went into a business of that kind, you must calculate that you will have to use the production of half-a-dozen saw mills.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I should think Rat Portage would be a better point?—Well, the further you get from civilization the worse it is for you. I would not get out of the boundary of civilization if I was going to start a factory.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You would have a difficulty in getting men?—Yes; and workmen prefer to live in large towns or cities.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. There is a tendency to centralize these concerns more and more in large cities?—Yes.

Q. I see Toronto is getting the agricultural implement trade largely?—No doubt of it. I think the people of Toronto have been a little slow in that direction. Hamilton has, for its size, three or four times the number of manufacturing industries that Toronto has. But Toronto is making up a little. I understand Mr. Abell is moving there. The Waggon Manufacturing Company have left Newcastle for Toronto, and there are there or four others.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you think the settlers of Manitoba are forced to pay an extra sum for self binders and sashes and doors and windows in consequence of the duty? I understood you to say that we could not compete with the American manufacturers there in these particular articles?—I said that the manufacturing of self binders is comparatively an undeveloped industry at the present time.

Q. And that we cannot compete with the Americans in the manufacture of doors and sashes?—I do not think we can at the figures at which they put them. Of course I do not by any means fancy that the Manitoba farmer pays the duty wholly; because I find they say to me in the United States if I go to buy machinery there—and I have been compelled to do so time and time again: "Mr. Speight, we know you have 20 per cent. duty to pay; we will give you 25 per cent. off." I can buy machinery in the United States at a price from 25 to 50 per cent. cheaper than they will sell it for to their own people. I have done it time and time again.

Q. They do not get sufficient trade at home; otherwise they would not sell at a reduced figure?—No. They take circumstances into consideration. If a dealer comes to them and says he wants so-and-so, and is likely to come again, and he says he has so-and-so to contend with, they meet him.

Mr. JOHN R. CRAIG, of Brampton, examined.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You have been associated for some time with the agricultural interest of Ontario, more or less?—Yes; my whole life has been devoted to the breeding, buying and selling of live stock, cattle, sheep, &c.

Q. Did you not act at one time in an official capacity in connection with the Ontario Agricultural Association?—Yes. I was Secretary to the Agricultural and Arts Association of Ontario from 1871 until I resigned in 1881.

Q. Can you give us some idea as to where the chief markets for cattle are? We will take the different varieties—fat cattle first?—For fat cattle the chief market is and has been England—the British market.

Q. That is of late years?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. For our best qualities?—Yes; all our fat cattle find a good market and a ready demand in England.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Is our home market a large one for fat cattle?—The home market is nothing like adequate to consume the produce of the country.

Q. What proportion do you think it takes of the stock reared in the country?—I have thought that matter over, but I cannot go into details. I can only give a very crude calculation. Our whole population for the whole Dominion would not be much greater than the population of the City of London and its suburbs. We can strike very near our consumption by what they purchase there, and they take, according to their monthly reports of live cattle, about 6,000 head a week.

Q. Six thousand head?—Yes; 6,000 head per week of horned cattle.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. That would be about equal to 10,000 of our cattle, taking the difference of the quality into account?—Well, they certainly are very good cattle there.

Q. They are better than ours?—Oh, yes.

Q. And that would be equal to about 10,000 of our cattle slaughtered in Canada?—I am hardly prepared to admit that there is that difference. There is a great difference, but I should not like to put ours at 40 per cent. less in value than theirs. They get a good many small cattle of nice quality, such as the Welch breeds.

Q. Would they be equal to 8,000 of ours?—Yes; that would be nearer. Again, there is another thing to be considered; I have come to the conclusion that they are greater beef-eaters there than we are here.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. And so about 6,000 head per week of horned cattle there would be equal to 8,000 head per week here?—Yes.

Q. You consider that a good basis to calculate upon?—Yes; that is about as near as I can get it.

Q. That would be about 300,000 a year in round numbers?—Yes.

Q. Of course, if it was 8,000 a week here it would be equal to 400,000?—Yes. I was going to say I do not know that I should not qualify the statement, because I have not given it enough consideration to entitle it to be worth much; but that is as near as I can get at it.

Q. Have you any idea of the quantity of cattle we export to Great Britain?—Last year we sent to England 54,220 head of cattle. That is the official return.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Does that return include the number of cattle shipped through Boston?—No; they are counted as American exports of cattle.

Q. Do you know the percentage shipped from Boston?—There were 7,600 shipped from Boston last year. There were that many crossed the line, and I presume they would all go to England. I would say 7,600, in addition to the 54,000, went out of the country,

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are any American cattle shipped at our Eastern ports?—No; none.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. In round numbers, then, one-seventh of the total consumption of Canada is sent to Great Britain?—No, not to Great Britain; I only mentioned London.

Q. I thought you stated that 54,000 head were shipped to England?—Yes.

Q. That would be about one-seventh of the total number of cattle consumed in Canada, then?—Yes; if my calculation is correct.

Q. Is there a market in Manitoba and the North-West for fat cattle?—I understand there is; but I do not know that of my own knowledge. I made an error in the number of cattle I gave as having been sent to the United States. The number I gave was for a-half year—7,600 up to June; in addition to that, 6,200 were sent up to January, that would make 13,800 altogether. During the winter months, and even now, we get much cheaper rates from Boston than from Montreal. We can ship for

60 shillings per head from Boston, while we have to pay £4, and even as high as £5, from Montreal. On the other hand, we lose what we gain in freight when we ship by Boston, because we have to slaughter at the point of debarkation.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What difference does it make in the price realized when you have to slaughter the cattle on their arrival?—That has been closely calculated. I have been at Liverpool and at Deptford and have enquired into it. By the slaughter of the cattle immediately they land, the butchers consider there is a loss of £2 10s. to £3 per head. The advantage to us in getting free ports, where we can send our cattle to inland places, is from £2 10s. to £3.

Q. It depends a great deal upon the season of the year, whether you lose so much or not, does it not? It is when there is a great deal of slaughtered meat in the market that there is such a difference?—Well, that is the average. Take Manchester. That city has a population as dense as that of London. You could not send your cattle there if they came from Boston, they have to be slaughtered; but if they came from Montreal or Quebec you could re-ship. Taking the average that is worth £2 10s. to £3.

Q. Therefore you have to get the freight that much lower for shipping from Boston, instead of from Montreal and Quebec?—Yes; and the shippers make that concession in our favour.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You have no practical knowledge yourself of the market to be obtained in the North-West?—I know nothing but what is common rumor, but having been away for the last seven months I could not say anything of my own knowledge on the subject.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I suppose you are aware they have been buying a good many cattle to ship from Toronto to Manitoba?—Yes. My uncle is there now, and he says the demand is extensive.

Q. For beef?—Yes; and for store cows.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Is there a market in the North-West for finer bred cattle?—There is a demand there for them by persons going into the enterprise of raising. There is a good market there. I know of one company buying fifty cattle in England. Much of the demand is being met in England, the supply is not sufficient here.

Q. The opening up of the North-West will have the effect of stimulating the production of the finer grades of cattle in Ontario?—Yes. I think for the next years there will be five times the demand there is at present. I should not, perhaps, suggest a proportion, but at all events we cannot and will not be able to anything like supply the demand for young bulls. We have no conception of the demand.

Q. In reference to sheep, have you had much experience in the raising of sheep?—I have been breeding pure bred Cotswold sheep and other sheep for a great many years.

Q. What is your experience with reference to the profit of breeding the different varieties of sheep in the past and at present?—In the past the great demand was for long coarse woolled sheep; in fact, I might say it was the only sheep. The other was only accidental; and to get a customer for a good Southdown was an exception. Our principal demand was from the Western States, the Southern States, the State of Kentucky, and the Cotswold was the only sheep in demand.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Was that on account of the size of the carcass?—Yes; and it was a good commanding looking sheep, good to show, and having a great quantity of wool. That wool was then in demand, and it was worth more per pound than the wool of the finer breeds. That gave the sheep a great rise, but all that is changed now.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. There is not so great a demand now for the wool of the long woolled sheep as there used to be; how do you account for that?—A manufacturer would know more regarding the reason for that than I do.

Q. In reference to this class of wool, do you think that the Tariff has had any effect one way or the other. What is the difference as to the prices of that class of wool—not so much as they are affected by the Tariff on the wool itself as on the manufacture of woollen goods?—I would not be prepared to give any opinion upon that question, because I am not at all interested in manufacturing. I may volunteer the statement though, that we grow more wool than we can manufacture. That is obvious. Our market is not here for the wool.

Q. The tendency of an increase in the consumption of this class of wool in our own country would be, I imagine, to rather increase the price?—Of the finer wools?

Q. Of the long wool.—I have not quite caught your meaning.

Q. What I mean to say, is that the Tariff has not produced a depressing effect on the price of long wool if it is not used?—We produce more than we manufacture. Our market is abroad.

Q. Is there a market in the United States for it to any extent?—I am really going into that which I do not understand. I have had no experience in selling wool.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Have you exported any sheep to Liverpool?—Yes.

Q. What breeds averaged the best price?—My experience in England has been for several years, and the last visit was extended over seven months. I was particularly interested in observing the relative merits of our sheep and cattle, and was at all the ports, Liverpool, Glasgow and London, and compared them. It was surprising, I believed before going there that our sheep were not at all up to what was required for the market, but I was not at all prepared to see how deficient we were as regards the quality of our mutton sheep. So much is this the case, that in fact our sheep are becoming a bye word among leading butchers in the places I have mentioned. If a man says he has bought a lot of Canadian sheep it is enough to condemn him, Canadian sheep having become a bye word. What I say I say advisedly. I am sorry to have to make such a statement but it is a fact. Mr. Swan, who sells probably 5,000 sheep per annum, says I cannot put it too strong.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. How do you account for the inferior quality of our mutton?—There are two ways of accounting for it; one is we have not got the breed of sheep.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. The Southdown is the breed they want there for mutton?—Yes. We have gone too largely into the long woolled sheep, Cotswold sheep, they are a good sheep but not a mutton sheep.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is the flavor good?—The flavor is not good, and there is a large proportion of fat. When you go to the butcher's to buy that mutton, you pay largely for tallow and bone, and for a very small proportion of the real mutton you want to eat. There is one other very important reason why even justice is not done to our sheep there. It is this: I find you very rarely see a wether. You may examine a consignment of sheep from Canada and there will not be a wether in the entire lot. There are rams—fellows who have done their duty to their country, and very bad service, too; and ewes too, three and four years old, all of which have been doing duty. But you will not find a wether in the whole lot. I see in connection with this that we sent 337,000 sheep to the United States. As Mr. Trow knows, a great proportion of them are purchased by dealers who come round and gather up our splendid lambs in the fall of the year. That cuts off our supply for England; So you see the lambs go to New York—337,000 sheep altogether went to the United States—while our export last year to Great Britain was 72,000, and it consisted of the rubbish.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. In fact the old sheep go to England and the lambs to the United States?—That is it. And even supposing we did not sell to the United States, we have not a breed of sheep to command a good price in England. We cannot command it with the breeds of sheep and grades of mutton we have.

Q. Do you not think it would pay the farmers to keep their sheep until they are yearlings and then sell them for export?—Undoubtedly it would. It would be millions to the country if the farmers would do away with breeding in a promiscuous manner those coarse long-legged sheep. If they would get a Down sheep, a Southdown, a Shropshire Down and Hampshire Down; if these were used, and only these, for wool, they would get a good fleece; and for mutton, I think three half-pence, some say a penny, and some say as high as two pence, a pound more.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What do they do in England with their surplus Cotswolds and Leicesters? I suppose there must be a considerable proportion of them?—A great many Cotswolds are sold, but the principal market for these Cotswolds is America, and that is falling off. There are Cotswold sheep in the market, but they do not bring within two pence a pound of the Southdowns.

Q. How do the Southdowns compare in weight with the Cotswolds?—The Southdowns are not so heavy.

Q. Where would the difference be, taking the common run?—There may be a rather severe test; but I was at the Islington fat stock show of sheep and cattle, and the first prize for a pen of sheep was given to the pen of Southdowns bred by Lord Walsingham. I can bring you the exact weights, but I remember that these Southdown sheep weighed about 60 lbs. a carcass less than the heaviest Cotswold sheep exhibited.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. That is live weight?—Yes.

Q. What was the weight of these?—They weighed 300 lbs. They were too heavy. They were sold after the show was over, and they did not bring anything like a price in proportion to their looks. I think they were sold at just a common market price. They do not want fat mutton in England.

Q. Then they were one-fifth less in weight than the Cotswold?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What is the particular advantage in Southdowns? Is the meat more mixed and more fleshy?—Yes; it is better flavoured and of better quality.

Q. Yes, but if they lay the fat on as the Cotswolds do, there would be the same difficulty?—They lay it on in better proportions, and it is more mixed.

Q. Cheviots have not taken much in Canada for some reason?—I do not think they have been tried.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. How does the cost of raising the Southdowns and the Shropshire Downs compare with the cost of raising Leicesters and Cotswolds?—Shropshire Downs are a better sheep on sparse pasturage. Where grass is very luxuriant, and there is not much travelling to do Cotswolds do better. The same number of acres will raise more Southdown or Shropshire Down sheep than Cotswold sheep.

Q. How do they winter? Which requires the more care and feed during the winter?—Cotswold sheep require a great deal more care. They do not winter so well as the others.

Q. I have heard it said that three Southdowns can be wintered at the same cost as two Cotswolds? Is that correct?—That is an admitted proportion; it is admitted by Cotswold breeders.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. How do they compare for growing wool?—The Southdown does not grow so much wool as the Shropshire Down.

Q. I mean, as between the Southdown and the Cotswold?—The Cotswolds grow the larger proportion of wool in weight.

Q. One quarter more?—I think seven or eight lbs. is a good weight for a Cotswold flock. It depends upon how they are kept. A man might get a flock of nine lbs. with care, and another without care might get but six. A man with a good flock of Shropshires will get as much wool with good care, as a man who has Cots-

wolds and does not take care of them. You cannot state the exact proportion; but under the same treatment the Cotswolds will grow a great deal more wool than the Southdowns.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. How many pounds more on the average?—If a Southdown sheep will give you 4 lbs., under the same treatment a Cotswold will give you five or six.

Q. One quarter more?—About that.

Q. How do the prices of wool compare?—Just now the price for fine wool in England is much greater than for coarse wool.

Q. What is the proportion?—I could not give you the particulars; but I know there is a great demand for the fabrics made of the fine wool.

Q. The wools of the different Downs?—Yes.

Q. Is that not the case in Canada and the United States also?—I can only state what manufacturers have told me. They say they do not want any Cotswold fleeces, and they do not want wool even quite so fine as Southdown. They would rather have the cross of a Southdown ram with any common native ewe. Southdown seems to be too fine for them.

Q. Is there not a great deal of difference between the price of Southdown wool and long wool on the Canadian market?—I do not know, having been away.

Q. Upon the whole, which sheep would it be the most profitable for the Canadian farmer to raise for both mutton and wool?—I think, if the farmers were to come to the conclusion to do away with the long-wooled ram—not going to the expense of buying pure-bred ewes, but using the ewes they have—and to buy down rams; I will not give the preference to the Shropshire down, the Hampshire down, or the Southdown, because a man may have to consider the condition of his land and his pasturage; but taking his land at an average quality, I would say that by using Shropshire down rams he would get the right quality, and it would be millions of dollars to the advantage of the country.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How do Shropshire downs cross after the first cross?—I have had no experience with crossing after the first cross; but, by always using the pure-bred Shropshire ram, I understand, you get, after three crosses, sheep that are quite as good in appearance as the imported Shropshire downs.

Q. I believe they complain that, after crossing the Southdown, the first cross is satisfactory, but the second is very unreliable?—That has been the rule; but do not you think there is something in this: sometimes they do not get as good a ram as at first? Sometimes it is difficult to get a good Southdown ram, and they use on the second cross a ram with but a cross of Southdown in it.

Q. I have not tried it; but I have heard breeders say that?—I know a case where a man tried it and he told me it was a failure, but on inquiry I found he had used a second cross, the get of a Southdown ram, and he could not expect to succeed.

Q. Don't you think the trouble regarding our sheep has arisen from the fact that the prices for long wool were, until lately, likely to be much higher than the prices for fine wool, and that until recently mutton of all kinds sold at pretty much the one figure here? In fact don't you think there was no encouragement to farmers to breed the finer sheep?—That is a fact. There was no encouragement given to farmers to raise a nice quality of mutton, because when they brought it to market they were given the same price per pound for the poor mutton as for the better mutton.

Q. The taste of the consumers were not cultivated?—They did not seem to appreciate the better class of mutton.

Q. Of course, as soon as the farmers find it profitable to raise a better class of mutton they will raise it?—Yes. Another thing about Cotswold sheep is that you could not sell fine wool to the United States, and all our surplus has gone there. Canada always will be the place from which the United States will get Cotswold, Downs and other classes of sheep. They can't breed them over here.

Q. Their climate will not allow them to breed them?—Yes.

Q. It is like their barley; they have to come here for it?—Yes. After the first year the bloom is all gone. I have seen fine pastures in Kentucky where all the sheep have lost their bloom; and they have been obliged to come here for rams.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Under such circumstances the quality of the wool deteriorates?—Yes; and here it does too. We cannot get the same bloom on wool as the the wool we get from Leicester and Cotswolds as in England. We cannot get it; and we have to replenish from there.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose that is from climatic reasons?—Undoubtedly. I would like here to volunteer a remark made to me in Edinburgh by one of the leading salesmen, Mr. Thomas Swan. He said he thought it would be worth his while to come—or some one else to come—over to Canada and make a tour of the Provinces and try to impress upon the people the bad quality of our mutton and sheep. He said it would be a kindness to the people to do that as they do not know what they are losing. Our sheep are, as compared with the English, wretched.

Q. But there is no doubt we have made a great advance not so much in mutton as in beef. Undoubtedly our shippers send a higher grade of beef across than they did five years ago; and I have no doubt that raisers of sheep will follow suit. Of course we have to pay the penalty for a little while?—They, of course, will take our mutton and give us a better price for it; but it is looked upon as of a poor quality. Then Australia is in competition with us in sheep on the English market. I remember a ship coming in from Australia and landing 5,000 carcasses.

Q. Under the preserved process?—Yes; under the preserved process. Some body remarked to me that it would be sold at a low price; but I went to Speers & Ponds, the great restaurant people in London, and they had a carcass of Australian mutton hanging up there as a sample of the mutton they were serving to their guests. They had it labelled "Australian mutton," and a finer carcass of mutton you could not find. I have never seen the man so bold as to hang up a carcass of mutton and to declare it to be Canadian mutton.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Would it pay to breed young cattle and take them to London and feed them there?—We have been considering that. Here is a printed card I have from Lord Pollworth. His intention is to get a market here for young bulls; and he will buy a large quantity of store cattle—yearlings and two year olds—here and take them over and furbish them up and put them on the market.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. That is a trade that will not do for us? No; and I do not encourage that view of it. When the farmers send their store cattle over there to be fed they may as well shut up their farms; but I do not think that will happen.

The Committee adjourned.

OTTAWA, 23RD APRIL, 1882.

The Select Committee, appointed to inquire into the operation of the Tariff on the agricultural interests of Canada, met at eleven o'clock this morning, Mr. Orton in the chair.

ROBERT HAY, M.P., of Toronto, was examined.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. How long have you been engaged in the manufacture of furniture, Mr. Hay?—I have been so engaged for nearly half a century.

Q. Is the furniture which is in common use amongst the people as cheap to-day as it was before the National Policy was introduced?—I do not think that it is quite as cheap. We advanced the price of furniture generally, about January last, I think, 5 per cent. This was due to the advance in raw material; lumber in particular. I

do not know what has been done about prices since. Every spring we make up a new list of prices and new patterns, and there may have been some change of which I have no knowledge.

Q. And you consider then that the increase in price, which has taken place, is due entirely to the increased cost of new material?—Yes. I was speaking of what had happened up to January last.

Q. Have you had a larger market for your furniture since the National Policy was introduced?—Oh dear me! Yes. And we are given employment to a great many more people than we did before the National Policy was introduced.

Q. Can you manufacture more cheaply when you have a larger market for your productions than you can when your market is confined?—Of course, we can. You can afford to do so when the market is larger and the demand greater.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. About how many men do you employ, Mr. Hay?—I could not say.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Therefore, if it were not in consequence of the increased cost of raw material, you could really sell the furniture, which you manufacture, more cheaply under the National Policy than you did before it was introduced?—Of course; the increased cost of raw material and of labour has caused all the advance which has taken place. As to what has happened this spring, however, in this relation, I do not know. There has been an advance in wages as well; and this is a large item in the manufacture of furniture. If men's wages go up, manufacturers must of necessity advance the prices of the goods which they make. For some years under the National Policy—for two years at any rate, we did not advance our prices at all; and I think that during that period, some things were reduced in price. It has only been since there has been an advance in lumber and in wages, that people have been compelled to advance their prices.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. You have advanced the prices of your goods about 5 per cent.?—Yes; we advanced them about 5 per cent., about the month of January last.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you send much furniture to the North-West, Mr. Hay?—Yes, we have sent a good bit of furniture up there. I might mention to you that although it was stated in the House by Mr. Charlton, that our business paid us handsomely in the year, 1878 we lost \$18,000 of our capital during that very year.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. How much did you lose?—We lost \$18,000 of our capital and made nothing.

Q. Was that before the National Policy was introduced?—Yes. I was sorry that I was not in the House at the time that he made that statement. If I had been there, I certainly would have contradicted him, but I did not care to bother the House with the matter afterwards. I regretted the fact that I did not happen to be in the House at the time. If we had gone on with our business under the circumstances, which then existed, we would have lost all we had; and a great many other manufacturers would have been in the same position as ourselves.

Q. Is it not the fact, that this would not have had a favourable influence on the prices of furniture in Canada. If the manufacturers of furniture had been ruined, would this have given furniture at any cheaper rates to the people of this country?—No. I do not see how it could have such an effect. We were at that time working as cheaply as we possibly could work, and we were at the same time losing money.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. To how many hands do you give employment to, Mr. Hay?—I do not know I am sure at the present time.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. As a general rule, how many persons do you employ?—I could not say exactly how many we now employ. I carry on a business in the country which has no direct connection with the business which we conduct in the city. We do a great deal of work at the place which is situated in the country. We there do rough.

turning, and one thing and another, and manufacture hair. I suppose that we have from fifty to sixty men in our employ out there during the summer season, and about seventy men during the winter; while in the city of Toronto we must have at least, I should say, 300 persons and upwards in our employment, and we may have as many as 350.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. How many hands did you employ in the year 1878?—We did not employ so many persons—not nearly so many.

Q. How many persons did you have in your employment last year?—I could not say.

Q. Have you no idea as to the number of them?—No; but we certainly have a good many more people in our employ at the present time than we had then; but I never take account of these things.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. How much capital have you invested in the manufacture of furniture?—We have a good deal; too much so invested.

Q. Have you any idea as to the amount?—Oh, I suppose that we have as much as \$300,000 invested in the business.

Q. Is all this invested in the Toronto branch of the concern?—Yes, it is.

Q. What amount do you pay out in wages a week?—Per man?

Q. What amount do you pay out in wages?—I could not at this moment give you the amount which we so pay out accurately, but I could easily send up to the house and get a statement prepared which would give the amount exactly. We take stock on the 1st of December every year. I could send up and get the balance sheet, and give you accurate information on that point; but here, without the papers, I cannot remember all these things.

*By Mr Trow :—*

Q. Did you meet with much competition from American goods being sent into Canada previous to the introduction of the National Policy?—Oh, fearfully.

Q. You had such competition, had you?—It was fearful at one time.

Q. And what was the consequence of this competition? Were you compelled to reduce the price of the article which you manufactured?—The prices of our goods were reduced as much as it was possible for us to reduce them.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. The fact was that you could not sell the goods which you made?—No; we could not sell our goods under those circumstances. The American manufacturers sent in furniture in large quantities, and sold it for what it would fetch.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You have reference now to American goods?—Yes.

Q. Are any American goods brought into Canada to compete with your goods at the present time?—Oh, very few American goods are now brought into Canada.

Q. None come over, in fact, I suppose?—Oh, now and again a little is sent over; but very little. They cannot do it, in fact, at the present time, because prices of furniture are higher in the United States than they are here. If you go to a fashionable and a good house in the United States where they make good articles, you will find that their prices are much higher than ours. But if you go to an inferior place, you may get things cheaper when they are hard up.

Q. What class of goods was sent over into Canada from the United States, when this sort of thing was practiced, were the goods of inferior quality?—They were not always of inferior quality, sometimes they were of very good quality. I will tell you, it is this way with cabinet makers in particular, and I suppose that it is the same with every person in the manufacturing business; at certain seasons of the year they work to get rid of their surplus stock, and the American manufacturers at that particular season of the year especially, were in the habit of sending over their surplus stock, and of selling these goods for what they would fetch.

Q. What is the duty on such goods as you manufacture?—Then do you mean?

Q. Yes, and now?—It was at that time 13 or 17½ per cent.

Q. And what is the duty now on such goods?—The fact is that under the system which was pursued at that time, the American manufacturers did not pay any duty at all, they systematically under valued their goods. I have been sent for on several occasions to value goods, which had come in from the United States, but the Custom House officers did not pay attention to us on those days especially. A very large shipment of American furniture came in and we went down to see them. We priced the goods according to what they were worth to sell at and what they were according to the American price list,—which was certainly a very good criterion to go by, but Mr. Fraser said, “I thought that I would divide the difference between you.” He had no right to do that, and should have been dismissed.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. At how much less than their real value were these American goods entered? Were they entered for one-half of their real value?—Oh, they were sometimes entered at the most ridiculous prices.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where do you get your raw material, Mr. Hay?—We get our walnut lumber at the present time from the State of Indiana. We procure very little of it in Canada; I refer wholly to walnut lumber.

Q. Is it higher in price than was formerly the case?—Oh, dear me, yes. It has gone up fearfully in price. It is very scarce.

Q. Where do you get your trimmings from principally?—Oh, we get some of them in the United States.

Q. Do you get the greater portion of your trimmings from the United States?—We do not procure a very great deal of them there, but some things we do get in the United States. We get them principally from England and from France. The French excel all others in coverings.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Could any of these trimmings be manufactured in Canada?—Yes, all the fringes and gibs, and things of that kind, which we use, could be manufactured in Canada. There is a fringe maker in the city of Toronto, and he works as cheaply as we can get them for in the city of New York.

Q. Was this business established lately?—It has been established within a short time back.

Q. Has it been established since the National Policy came into force?—It was a small business before this policy was inaugurated, but it is a large business now.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Were these American goods to which you have referred, sold in Canada at a sacrifice?—They were sold at a sacrifice.

Q. And they were articles of a superior quality?—A great many of them were of good quality.

Q. And the purchaser in Canada reaped the benefit of the reduced price?—I do not know about that, I am sure; but he thought that he did, at all events. I, however, do not think that he did. If you drove, by your policy, all the manufacturers out of the country, I do not think that he would get much benefit from it in the end. You would have a poor country in a short time, under the influence of such a policy.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Would not goods be put up to higher prices, if our manufactories were shut down and our manufacturers driven out of the country? Would not prices be raised on consumers under such circumstances?—Certainly. Besides, the American manufacturers sold their goods much cheaper to Canadians than they did to those who bought them to sell in the United States. They always sold their goods from 15 to 20 per cent. cheaper to be sent to Canada, than if they were to remain at home.

Q. Suppose that the American manufacturers controlled our market, would not they raise the prices of the goods which they sold in this country?—Unquestionably they would do so.

Q. And the consumers of these articles would not get them as cheaply as they do at the same time?—No, they would not. It is the local competition that we have in this country which keeps the prices of goods down. This is a matter which is very soon regulated. If anyone thinks that he can make money by manufacturing furniture, he will soon have opposition.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. If you procured a market exclusively for your goods, owing to the duty which was imposed in your favor, is it not natural to suppose that you would increase the price of the articles which you manufacture?—Well.

Q. That is if you had a prohibitory duty, which prevented American goods coming into the country?—I do not think that this would be the result, because I am certain that, under such circumstances, local competition would soon bring prices right. I am quite confident of that.

Q. Have you more competition now than you had then? Have other establishments of that kind been established in Canada since the National Policy came into force?—Oh! a great many have since been established.

Q. Where are they?—They are to be found all over the country.

Q. Have they been established since the year 1878?—Yes, Sir; quite a number of them have been established.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. And old establishments are doing a much better business?—Yes, and a great many new ones have been established.

Q. Where do you find a market principally for the goods which you manufacture?—We find it in Toronto. Our principal market is in the city of Toronto, and in country towns in the Province of Ontario.

Q. And Manitoba, I suppose?—We sell a good deal in Manitoba.

Q. What kind do you send to Manitoba?—They are very extravagant in Manitoba; as they get rich nothing is so good for them. That is the case now.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you give us any idea of the amount you manufactured last year?—I have a very bad memory; I cannot say. It is a very large amount, however.

Q. You employ some 350 men?—Yes. We have an annual amount of debits to the extent of some \$80,000.

Q. That is, accounts standing out?—Yes. I will get you a statement of the amount we manufacture, and of the wages paid in 1878 and last year.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. To what extent have wages increased during the past three years?—There has not been any great advance until this year.

Q. What is it now?—We have had no strike at our place, and they have advanced a good deal.

Q. Ten per cent.?—I do not think it would amount to that all over.

Q. What would it amount to?—I could not say. Some men get more, some very little more.

Q. Can you not tell us the exact average?—If I was in Toronto I could.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I suppose you pay from 10 to 25 per cent more now than before?—Yes; that is as little as you could put it down at.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Has there been an increase of 10 per cent. all round?—I do not know that we could put it down at that. Some of our men's salaries have advanced very little, while with some first class men the advance has been very considerable.

Q. Do you use a good deal of pine timber?—Yes a good deal.

Q. Do you manufacture it yourself?—Yes.

Q. Where is your establishment?—Between Barry and Collingwood.

Q. Have you your own timber limits?—Yes, and they are almost exhausted, I am sorry to say.

Q. Is that class of limit more difficult to get now than before?—Yes, they have greatly advanced. You used to be able to get a mill run for \$3, you cannot get it now for \$10.

Q. You had, in 1878, prior to the adoption of the National Policy, the ordinary protection of 17½ per cent. Did you not find that sufficient?—It did not amount to anything because the law was not enforced. The Customs authorities undervalued the goods.

Q. If the law had been properly enforced would not a 17½ per cent. Tariff have been sufficient for your business?—If the Americans had acted fairly and sold their goods at the same price as they sold them at home it might. When a person went to them to buy goods they would say, "Are you from Canada," and immediately upon receiving a reply in the affirmative, they would say: "You will get the goods at 15 per cent. less."

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. They would not continue that for many years?—I do not know, they did it a long time. The great desire of the Americans was to crush out our manufactures.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. If the state of things which existed in 1878 had continued for a long time which existed previous to 1878, would furniture manufacturers have been obliged to close down do you think?—Yes, I am certain of it.

Q. And a large amount of capital would have sought investment in a foreign country?—Of course it would. They would be compelled to go and start business some where else, or go into some other business.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you attribute the loss of \$18,000 in your business in 1878 to selling goods at a sacrifice?—To some extent to bad debts.

Q. If you take bad debts into account in times of depression you might perhaps account for the whole amount. You might have been indiscreet enough to have sold the whole to one man?—We manufactured a great deal beyond our needs, because we did not like to discharge the men. We have now a stock in Toronto of \$105,000, and in 1878 we had double that amount in the building. It is very difficult to get good men, and we had to keep on manufacturing in order to retain them, and we were hoping for better times.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. There must be a large amount of capital invested in manufacturing in this country?—I do not think there is a great deal.

Q. Are there many other large furniture manufactories?—There is the Oshawa Cabinet Company, they have become disgusted with the business and closed out. The Bowmanville Company have failed once and the London factory has failed once.

Q. When did the Bowmanville Company fail?—I think it must be five or six years ago.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. Which was the one Miall was in?—That is the Oshawa Company.

Q. They failed too did they not?—No, but they have lost a good deal of their capital I believe. The Honorable John Bright, the great orator, had stock in that Company. The London concern failed and the Brantford concern. There has been very little money made in the manufacture of furniture, though the manufacturers are doing very well now.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You attribute your loss in 1878, to over production and the market being partly supplied by Americans?—Yes.

Q. But the trade is in a much better state now than then?—Decidedly so.

Q. How do you account for that?—The revival of trade generally.

Q. Do you not think it is also attributable to the good harvest?—It has had its share no doubt.

Q. The principal share is it not?—I do not think it.

Q. Have you done any farming?—Yes, I have farmed a thousand acres.

Q. Do farmers get better prices now for farm produce than before 1878?—We got as good prices before that, as we have ever since.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What were the prices you received?—I do not remember the prices. Last year we sent 50 acres of potatoes to Chicago.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Did you grow 50 acres?—Yes; we grew 90 acres the year before last.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You sent a good deal to the American market last year?—Yes, because there was a demand for them.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you send a good many potatoes to Chicago?—Yes, we sell them to dealers there; they come and buy them by the car load. Our soil is well fitted to the cultivation of potatoes.

Q. Do you experience any advantage as a farmer in having the home market?—Most undoubtedly.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. But you do not want a home market for your potatoes?—We sell some in the home market too. We sell them to the dealer in Toronto and he sends them to Chicago, at least a great many of them do. Then the Queen's hotel and a great many other by-hotels require a great many.

Q. Do you manufacture much lumber?—We manufactured 4,000,000 feet last year. We will not be able to do half that this year on account of the want of snow.

Q. You could not get the lumber out?—No. We manufacture also for the Toronto business.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you use much hardwood?—Yes.

Q. What kind?—For common furniture birch, maple, beech, basswood and all the woods of the country. Elm is very extensively used.

Q. All these classes of woods you obtain in Canada?—Yes.

Q. Your industry gives a market for a considerable amount of lumber?—Yes.

Q. That would not otherwise be sold to advantage in Canada?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You increased your prices in January last, 5 per cent.?—I think it was January, Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. That is the first increase since the adoption of the new Tariff?—Yes.

Q. And that increase is due in a large measure to the increased price of raw materials and the increased price of labour?—Yes.

MR. MURDOCH, examined :—

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You have lived in Manitoba for a long time?—Yes.

Q. Have you been there long?—Three years.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What are you engaged in?—Engineering and surveying.

Q. Does your business take you into the country?—I reside in town altogether.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I want to know if you have any personal knowledge as to whether the meat stuffs used in Winnipeg are obtained in Ontario to any extent?—Well, I can speak only from the result of my own enquiries from butchers and dealers, and I find that they come principally from Ontario.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Principally from Ontario?—I think so.

Q. Are you not aware that large droves come from Montana?—I am aware that such has been the case, but whether it is the case now or not I cannot say, I know a great deal of meatstuffs are brought from here; the butcher with whom I deal tells me so.

Q. How is it brought in?—It is brought in dressed.

Q. Is it in good condition when it arrives there?—Yes; poultry is also brought in largely and sold cheaply. Butter is also obtained largely from Ontario. The grocer with whom I deal had on hand last winter a good many hundred firkins of it and I used it myself.

Q. Are eggs obtained from Ontario?—They are brought in from the States from St. Paul. There may be some from Ontario, I cannot tell. I know upon asking the man with whom I deal, he told me his eggs came from St. Paul. They sell at 35 cents a dozen.

Q. Do you know anything about the freight charges?—I do not, but you can readily obtain that information from the Pacific Railway people.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What was the price of butter when you left?—I got a firkin of butter about six weeks since. I think it was 30 cents or 35 cents.

Q. What was the price of beef?—Fifteen cents was what I paid.

Q. Is that selected pieces?—I paid 15 cents for sirloin cuts.

Q. Have you any idea what the butchers pay per hundred by the carcass?—Twelve cents I think I paid this winter.

Q. For Canadian beef?—Yes.

Q. What is the price of mutton?—The last I priced on the market was 20 cents. I think I got mutton last winter for 20 cents by the carcass.

Q. What do you pay for poultry? Do you buy it by the pound?—I have not bought any lately. I do not know what it is. They were very cheap last year. These are things I cannot particularize about, because this winter particularly I had others doing the housekeeping for me.

Q. Are fat cattle brought in from Canada alive, do you know?—Oh, yes. On my way coming down I passed many loads of cattle going through, but I think they were principally for farmers. I cannot, however, give you any definite information on these points, because I am not in the way of knowing. All I know is the importation is very large.

OTTAWA, 24th April, 1882.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into the effects of the Tariff on the agricultural interests of the Dominion, met at ten o'clock,

ROBERT HAY, M.P., being recalled, was examined as follows:—

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you wish to add anything to your evidence?—I wish to state, as it seems not to have been clearly understood, that a duty of 17½ per cent. is not sufficient for the furniture industry.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Then 17½ per cent is not sufficient protection for your business?—It is not at all sufficient; it is not sufficient to enable us to make a living.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. The market was really taken from you by the Americans under the 17½ per cent. Tariff?—Yes; that was the case.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I should think that 17½ per cent. would be a good bonus for you?—The fact was that the Americans did not pay any duty at all on the furniture which they sent into this country.

Q. Are you not aware, Mr. Hay, that the goods of which you speak as having been slaughtered in Canada, came really from certain portions of Canada, and not from the United States?—Some of them were made in Canada. People make assertions in this respect, but the returns will show that a great deal of American furniture was sent into this country. I went and saw the returns this morning in the Bureau of Statistics. They make the figures, as to what was then imported of furniture, as having been so-and-so; but double the quantity, which is represented in these returns to have been imported, was brought into this country from the United States.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What amount of goods was imported according to those returns?—The value is given as having been \$400,000 and a few cents.

Q. What is the total aggregate in value of the furniture which is turned out of the Canadian factories?—It is impossible for me to give you that information.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Yes, it can be given. The value is about \$2,000,000.—I do not believe a word of that.

Q. The importations into this country in your branch of business amounted to about 2 per cent. of our total product.—I do not believe a word of that.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. If the total product of our factories amounted in value to \$2,000,000, and \$400,000 worth of furniture was imported, that would not be nearly 2 per cent.?—What I meant to say, when I was examined on Saturday, was that the duty of 17½ per cent. would not have been so disastrous to the trade, as it actually was, if the law had been properly enforced at that time; but I did not mean to say that a 17½ per cent. duty was a sufficient duty for our business, and for the protection of our manufactures.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Certainly, 35 per cent. would not be a sufficient duty if you could get prohibition?—I tell you that I am satisfied with a 35 per cent. duty on furniture.

Q. I think that you might be satisfied with it?—I am satisfied with it.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Then 17½ per cent. is not a sufficient protection?—I intended to say that a duty of 17½ per cent. in our favour would not have been so bad at that time if the duties had been properly collected on the furniture which was brought into the country.

Q. Still, it was not sufficient?—Not at all; I did not mean to say that it was sufficient.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think that it is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of your industry, to have a protection of 35 per cent. at least?—We ought to place the same duty on their furniture that they levy on ours. We have had hundreds of chances to send our furniture to the United States, but we were never able to do it on account of the 35 per cent. duty.

Q. Do you think that your business could be carried on prosperously under a less degree of protection?—I do not think so. I do not believe that it could be done just now.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. We are not taking Mr. Hay's evidence just now?—I do not want anything but what is fair.

Q. I understood you to say distinctly, the other day, that if American goods were properly entered by the Customs officers, and paid for properly, 17½ per cent. duty would be ample for your purposes?—No. I say that, had as 17½ per cent. duty was, it would not have been as injurious to our business if this duty had been properly collected and the goods fairly valued.

And the examination was closed.

GEO. WHEELER, M.P., examined :

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What industries are you engaged in Mr. Wheeler?—Flour milling.

Q. Any other business? Have you any farms in operation?—Yes, but they are mostly rented.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. You do not farm yourself?—Yes, we farm some in connection with two of our mills.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Where do you obtain your supply for your flour mills?—Well, we have mills in different places. The firm of which I am a member have five.

Q. Do you buy your grain altogether in the locality, or do you bring it from a distance?—Sometimes we bring it from a distance.

Q. What parts?—It depends upon where the mills are. Our mills are not all together.

Q. Not all in the same county?—Oh, no; one is in Uxbridge in North Ontario, another at Stouffville, County York, another at Meadowvale, County of Peel, &c.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you had that right along?—No, we have only had that about two months. We have another one at Church's Falls in the County of Cardwell, and another one north of that, on the Credit Valley Railway. We call them the Credit Valley Mills, that we lease.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are these mills supplied from neighbours?—We get all we can from neighbours. The balance we get from a distance.

Q. From what part do you get it?—From fifty and 100 miles around, and sometimes we bring it from a greater distance. Last year we brought a large quantity of red winter wheat from Lucan and Ailsa Craig to the mills at Uxbridge, a distance of 150 miles.

Q. But you seek for grain more in the immediate locality of your mills?—Yes.

Q. Did you own these previous to 1878?—We owned two of them. We built them some twenty years ago.

Q. Where did you then obtain your supplies?—The same place.

Q. Did you ever import foreign?—No, never.

Q. Have the duties which have been imposed on American wheat in any way interfered with your business?—It makes no difference whatever in regard to winter wheat. If there was no duty we would import white wheat.

Q. What difference does it make in regard to spring wheat?—Well, it would be much better for us, if we could import some spring wheat. We have found a want of that during the last two years. Three years ago we began to feel the effect of our spring wheat getting poorer in strength. Every year it has got worse, until now we have had to shut down grinding Canadian spring wheat. We have not since harvested ground  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of spring wheat, for the reason that we cannot sell it.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What wheat would it be to your advantage to import from the United States?—Hard western wheat. As a miller, I assert without fear of contradiction, that if we could import that wheat, we could make all the Canadian spring wheat into good quality of baker's flour.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What effect have the duties had on the price of spring wheat?—I do not think they have had any.

Q. Did you ever know spring wheat higher than fall wheat before the duties were imposed?—Yes.

Q. What years?—I do not exactly remember the years. It depends upon the scarcity.

Q. If the duties were not on, you could get any amount you required from the United States?—Yes, we could; but there is not much white wheat grown in the West.

Q. You are positive spring wheat has been higher than fall wheat in Canada before the duties were imposed?—Yes, sometimes.

Q. Do you know of your own actual knowledge?—I have known the flour from spring wheat to be higher than the flour from fall wheat.

Q. What I desire to know is, have you known spring wheat to be higher than fall wheat of your own personal knowledge?—I do not recollect. I am not prepared to say because I have not looked into the matter.

Q. Are you aware that spring wheat has been higher than fall wheat in Canada since the duty has been imposed?—Yes; it is now and also in the United States.

Q. Have you ever compared the prices of spring wheat in Canada since and before the duties were imposed with the prices for the same periods in Liverpool?—No, I have not particularly. We have never exported any spring flour, we have sold it all here until the last two years.

Q. Does the Liverpool market rule the price of spring wheat?—I think it rules the price of both wheat and flour.

Q. Do you think it rules it entirely?—Yes, except in the case of scarcity. Then the benefit of the National Policy comes in, not otherwise.

Q. How do you explain that if we consume all the spring wheat we grow?—Only a very small percentage of it is consumed. It is principally fall wheat that is consumed in Canada. I do not think there is one car load out of twenty that goes to the Lower Provinces, that is spring wheat. In two years we had not shipped a car load of spring wheat to the Lower Provinces. I sent some to Montreal but lost from 50 cents to 75 cents a barrel upon it.

Q. And you state millers do not desire to buy Canadian spring wheat?—They do not, and in consequence mills are placed upon the market and sold at half what they were worth two years ago. My firm bought a mill at Meadowville which was assessed last year at \$30,000 for \$12,000.

Q. Can you account for spring wheat being so much dearer in price than fall wheat and sometimes higher, if it is not sought after in the Canadian market?—I suppose it is taken and mixed with American wheat, that is all it is good for.

Q. Are you aware of your own knowledge where the spring wheat does go?—I should think it would go to Europe. I know large buyers in my own neighbourhood who used to sell it formerly to millers, who cannot now sell it to millers. They sell it in large quantities, by the cargo, for export.

Q. Do you not think it rather singular that our spring wheat should continue to sell at a high price if it is not sought for by millers?—It is the outside markets that regulate the price. It is higher in the United States than Canada and has been ever since the harvest.

Q. Would it not be higher if it were sold on the American market?—Well I do not know about that. I do not suppose it would make much difference because I never knew any of our spring wheat go on to the American market. When we had no duty on our fall wheat it went to the United States, but no spring wheat. I have here the relative prices of wheat in Chicago, Toronto and Oswego. On April 3rd No. 2 spring wheat was worth \$1.36, at Toronto \$1.30, and at Oswego red state was worth \$1.33. White wheat in Toronto at that date was \$1.28; Oswego, \$1.36. On the 22nd of this month, that is Friday and Saturday—

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Where did you obtain these figures?—I obtained them from the *Mail* newspaper in the Library just now.

Q. They are not authentic statements from the Boards of Trade?—No, but they are from the market reports compiled at the Corn Exchange, Toronto. They are not the retail prices, but the wholesale prices. White wheat at Chicago on the 22nd of April, was \$1.38; at Toronto, \$1.36; at Oswego, \$1.48; white wheat, Chicago, \$1.35; Chicago not quoted; at Oswego, \$1.41.

Q. At the present time wheat is higher in Chicago than Toronto, is that your contention?—Yes.

Q. Has not that usually been the case, do you know in former years?—Occasionally it has.

Q. Was it ever the case before there was Protection in this country?—Well, I am not prepared to answer that, I have not given the matter attention.

Q. Are you aware that the price of grain in Chicago is sometimes as high as the price in New York?—Very seldom.

Q. Do you know the distance between Chicago and New York?—I suppose it is about one thousand or twelve hundred miles.

Q. Is not New York nearer the markets of the world than Chicago?—Yes. Still to my knowledge the freight rate from Chicago to Liverpool and Glasgow are very little different from what they are in New York. When you send it right through the competition is very great by water and rail, and there is very little difference when it is shipped through.

Q. You are not prepared to give us any information in reference to freights?—Oh yes. There is probably on an average 6 cents a bushel difference between Chicago and Liverpool and between New York and Liverpool. But if you send to New York direct you will probably have to pay 14 cents.

Q. Is there not a good deal of speculation in corn in Chicago?—Yes.

Q. The prices are run up by speculative buyers far beyond the legitimate prices, are they not?—Yes, and the same parties will perhaps the next week run it down.

Q. Are the Liverpool prices more regular than the Chicago prices?—Yes. This year there has been a very steady market in Chicago, more so than for a good many years.

Q. What do you think about grinding in bond, what is your experience?—Well, I have had no experience in it. I only know of it from the experience of my neighbours.

Q. You can really give no evidence upon this subject then?—Oh yes, I can give you some evidence on the subject. It is a matter to which I have given a great deal of consideration. I moved for the first Returns brought down on the question last year.

Q. But you have no practical knowledge of grinding in bond?—No, I never ground any in bond myself, but I know of the operations of others.

Q. Will you make what statement you desire to make in reference to grinding in bond?—Well, I have some calculations I made some time ago from a Return, and they show that great irregularities have taken place.

Q. Is that in reference to the present regulations?—Yes. During my election in 1880—the election of 1878 was declared void—in 1880, Mr. Gibbs, my opponent, stated that he was one of the champions of the National Policy. He always styled himself the god-father, and I think yourself, Mr. Chairman, he styled the father of the National Policy. He used some very strong arguments then, and we got some evidence on it during the campaign, and it seemed to be pretty much the only question, this grinding in bond and the duty on grain, and we went into the matter pretty thoroughly. I may say that I believe a very large portion of the wheat brought in in bond never leaves Canada and is consumed in this market.

Q. Do you believe that?—Yes.

Q. Have you any positive evidence of that?—Yes; this way. During that campaign I made the charge at a public meeting that a large portion of the wheat ground in bond was sold in Canada and paid no duty. Mr. Gibbs said it was not possible and asked me to name a firm. That I did; I named Ogilvie & Co., Goderich. Mr. Gibbs sent a dispatch to them directly, and got an answer back the same day, certified to by the operators at the telegraph office, which stated that not over 10 per cent. of their wheat that they ground in bond was exported.

Q. Was that all sold here?—It was nearly all sold here. I find on looking over their returns that on the 3rd of August, 1880, Messrs. Ogilvie & Hutchinson imported 87,540 bushels; that they exported on the 11th of August 6,750 barrels of flour. The Order in Council computes it at four and a half bushels per barrel, and that is equal to 30,375 bushels of wheat. That deducted from the quantity imported leaves from 87,540 bushels 57,145 bushels of wheat on hand out of that cargo. That was imported in August when wheat was very much higher than we were paying at the

mills then—the Beaverton mills. Mr. Gibbs brought a miller, who said he was paying \$1.30 for the wheat he was then buying.

Q. Canadian spring wheat was that?—Yes.

Q. Then it was sought for by millers at that time?—Yes, it was scarce at that time. I am satisfied as a practical miller that that 57,145 bushels of wheat when ground into flour was sold in Canada. If not it would have been all spoiled. I should judge that it was disposed of some way.

Q. Are you aware that Messrs Ogilvie have paid a very large sum into the treasury recently?—Oh, yes; well.

Q. This year? I suppose so. The return I have spoken of shows that the first year of grinding in bond they pass that money in on the 3d of August, 1881. It should have been paid long before this. If they have only paid it in now they have cancelled their bonds.

Q. You cannot state positively that they sold flour, ground in bond, in Canada without paying the duty on the wheat?—I have only their telegram for it to that effect. I saw the telegram which was certified to be correct, that they sold 90 per cent. of what they ground in their Goderich mill in Canada. They did not state they had not paid the duty or did not intend to pay it. They did not pay the duty on that quantity up to the end of last year.

Q. Do you know how long they are allowed to pay the duty?—Twelve months by the bond.

Q. Then if they give proper security on that which they manufacture in bond, they need not pay duty until the end of twelve months?—Certainly not.

Q. But it is all right if they pay it at the end of twelve months?—Yes.

Q. Have not all millers the advantage of grinding wheat in bond?—No; the advantage is given to millers on the frontier and on lines of railway. It is practically a loan of 15 cents a bushel for a year without interest, whereas the other millers have to pay interest to the banks. Independently of this, it is one of the worst Orders in Council that could be adopted for Canadian farmers.

Q. What system would you adopt?—I would let it come in free. All that would be brought in would be hard Western spring wheat. I do not think that anything else would be brought in.

Q. Does that compete with red winter wheat, grown in Canada?—Yes; red winter is the only wheat from which we can make strong bakers' flour.

Q. I suppose in the interest of the miller you would prefer to see it come in free?—Yes; there is a very small proportion of red winter wheat grown in Canada. I only wish our farmers would adopt it and grow it more. I have done all in my power to induce them to raise it.

Q. Can it be grown in this country?—Yes; it can be grown in Western Canada. About 40 per cent. of our fall wheat consists of this variety. I find, on investigating the matter that about 40 per cent. of the fall wheat grown west of Hamilton, is red winter, and 60 per cent. is fall wheat. Now, on this side of that point, the line due north, there is very little red winter grown. As I told you, I brought a great deal of that down to supply my Ottawa business. We had to get that wheat and bring it to Ailsa Craig, Lucan, and from that direction, to make bakers' flour.

Q. If it was not for the duty you would telegraph to Chicago and get your wheat from there?—If it was not for the duty we would bring in hard Western wheat and mix it with our spring wheat. That would enable our millers to grind our spring wheat, instead of it being sent away. I ran one of my mills on spring wheat year in and year out until it became so poor that we had to close that mill down six months of the year because we could not get the wheat with which to keep it running. It is closed now, or merely doing merchant work. When we cannot get fall wheat we have to shut down. I have flour on hand at Scarborough Junction which I ground in October last from spring wheat. I cannot get a market for it, and what I did sell I sold at a loss. I am holding this now and cannot get a market for it. That was reported in the papers last week, in the *Mail* and *Globe*, that spring wheat flour was unsaleable in Toronto.

Q. Are you aware how spring wheat compares with red winter in price now?— I think the difference is from 8 to 10 cents a bushel.

*By Mr. Elliott :—*

Q. If there is that difference it must have been sour?—No. It is kept all through the summer. If it had been kept during that time in summer it would have been sour. Heat and cold have different effects.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you any positive evidence to offer to show that red wheat is 10 cents higher than spring wheat?—Yes; I have telegrams in my possession offering me red winter wheat from Lucan, about eight cents higher than spring wheat is quoted in Toronto. Red winter wheat flour is worth 75 cents to \$1 a barrel more in Montreal or any market in Canada than spring wheat flour.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Where do you find a market for your flour at present?—I sell it all at my station.

Q. Where does it go?—The greater portion of the bag flour goes to Europe, to Liverpool, I suppose, and it is shipped by Boston.

Q. Where does the red wheat flour go to?—It is sold here.

Q. I understand you to say that you bought your red winter wheat at Ailsa Craig and other places?—Yes.

Q. If it were not for the present duty you would buy this in the American market?—If we could get it in at equal figures, we would. We would then mix it with Canadian spring wheat. There is not enough to make any difference. I have not bought a bushel of it since last harvest. I bought 100 car loads at Lucan last year.

Q. And if it had not been for the duty you would have bought it in Chicago?—It depends upon the market.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is the milling interest depressed?—Yes, very much so. Mills, when they cannot get any fall wheat, are almost valueless except for custom work.

Q. Did I understand you to say that in the event of the duty on foreign wheat being removed, you could purchase Minnesota and Western wheat and mix it with Canadian spring wheat, and that in consequence you could give a higher price for Canadian spring?—Yes, most decidedly. Then we could make Canadian wheat into strong bakers' flour.

Q. By mixing it you could manufacture Canadian spring wheat into flour?—Yes. It would increase the value of our spring wheat. At present we cannot grind it at all. We have given up grinding it, in fact.

Q. Is the bonding system in the interest of the millers along the line of railway?—It is only in the interest of those on the lines of railway, on the Welland Canal or at places where there is water power.

*By Mr. Elliot :—*

Q. I desire to ask, with the permission of the Committee, what the witness terms red wheat. Red winter, I suppose?—Some spring wheat is red wheat; then, there is red Scotch wheat, amber and Treadwell. They are all red.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. At what ports is wheat entered and ground in bond?—The ports of entry begin with Goderich and along the canals and railway, every port with the exception of Peterborough, which is in the interior. At all the other ports of entry—Goderich, Sarnia, Collingwood, London, Paris, Chatham, Galt, Guelph, Gladstone, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Toronto, Oshawa, Belleville, Peterborough, Montreal and Quebec. They are all ports where wheat is entered to be ground in bond.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Could you name any of the parties who grind in bond extensively?—Yes. Paris, 16,000 bushels; Sarnia, 20,000 bushels; Stratford, 21,000 bushels; Galt, 28,000 bushels; London, 64,000 bushels; Guelph, 65,000 bushels; Goderich, 149,000 bushels; St. Catharines, 170,000 bushels; Quebec, 43,000 bushels; Montreal, 472,000; making a total of wheat ground in bond of 1,051,000 bushels.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have you any reason to doubt that the same material is not exported?—I have reason to believe that a large portion of it is not exported.

Q. Have you any idea of the quantity that is not exported?—Well the principal portion of this was imported during the scarcity in the summer months when wheat was high. I find about 400,000 bushels were still on hand at the end of the year in December, a long time after the crop had been harvested, and the price of wheat was down from 20 cents to 30 cents a bushel. Therefore, I concluded it had been consumed.

Q. Do you send much of your flour to the Maritime Provinces?—I do not ship any there direct. I sell a few car loads there occasionally. A certain percentage of that I sell to buyers going there.

Q. Can you compete with the Americans in the Maritime Province trade?—Well I know a large quantity of American flour goes in there. They have the advantage in the matter of freights, there is such active competition for freights on the other side. The duty of 50 cents a barrel is not high enough to keep it out. The difference in freight is so great that the market is open to them. That is what I believe to be the correct state of the case. The Americans have the advantage therefore, in the matter of freight. A member from the Maritime Provinces told me to-day that that was the case.

Q. Do you deal at all in oats?—Yes, some.

Q. How do the prices of oats in the United States and Canada compare?—Well, oats have been, and are to-day, a little higher in the United States than they are in Canada.

Q. And how about rye?—The same as oats.

Q. Can you give the prices of oats and rye?—I have the prices for the first of this month and the 21st of it. Oats in Toronto were on the 1st, 20 cents; Oswego, 50 cents; at Chicago, 46 cents. Chicago being 6 per cent. higher than Toronto. These are the wholesale prices of car or cargo lots. On the 21st of this month the price was, in Chicago 50 cents; in Toronto, 46 cents; in Oswego, 58 cents.

Q. What were the prices of rye?—On the first of this month the price in Toronto was 83 cents; Chicago, 84 cents; Oswego, out of bond \$1.29. At the end of this month, Saturday I think, it was, in Toronto, 85 cents; in Oswego, 90 cents in bond.

Q. Then these grains are all higher in the United States than in Canada?—Yes, and they have been nearly the whole year since last harvest.

Q. Under what circumstances would the imposition of a duty on the introduction of these grains here benefit farmers?—The only time, as far as I can see when any advantage would be derived, is when we have not enough to supply our own local demands.

Q. Do you deal in any other articles that farmers use?—Yes, salt and plaster. I did deal largely in plaster before the duty was put on.

Q. What has the duty on plaster increased the price? How much has it increased the price?—To the extent of the duty. It sent up the price at once. I think I was the largest importer of plaster up to that time.

Q. It was to the advantage of the farmer to have this free of duty as they used it as a fertilizer?—I think so. A duty was put on plaster a few years ago. The matter was afterwards brought before the Government by the late Mr. Adam Gordon, the then member for our county, and they took it off. The price at once went down about 15 cents a barrel when it was put on again in 1879, the price immediately went up that month.

Q. Do they manufacture it in this country?—There was a place at Napanee where they manufactured it at one time. The American plaster still comes in and the farmers have to pay 20 cents per barrel more for it than if it was free of duty.

Q. Is the American plaster superior to ours?—I kept both, and there was a larger demand for the American.

Q. Do you deal much in salt?—Not so much lately as formerly.

Q. Has there been an advance in the price of salt recently?—Yes, there has been an advance in the price of salt recently. A deputation came down to Ottawa lately from Goderich and some arrangements were made with the Government. The result has been that salt has increased from 55 cents to 80 cents. I do not know what was done, but they told me here the other day—the deputation told me—that they had accomplished what they came for. They said that the consequence would be that salt would increase 10 cents per barrel. It has increased 30 cents per barrel.

Q. Do you import cotton bags?—I do and woollen too.

Q. How does the price now compare with the price before the Tariff?—It is about 5 cents per bag higher.

Q. What percentage is that, 15 or 20 per cent?—Yes, about that. In order to show you that the increased cost is equal to the duty, I may say that a little while ago I got over 1,000 linen bags out to fill with salt. The terms upon which I got them were that if I sold them to be used in Canada, I had to pay 12 cents for them. If I sold them for export I was only to pay 10 cents. They are filling now at my mill. Those are the terms upon which they were sold to me, and the manufacturers gave me sixty or thirty days in which to operate. I have to pay 12 cents if I sell them for home consumption, and 10 cents for export. That convinces me that whatever duty is put on we have to pay it.

Q. Do you ship in linen bags mostly?—Yes for foreign trade, but for the Canadian trade we use cotton bags.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. Do you buy spring wheat?—Very little.

Q. What do you do with it?—We have most of it stored in our mills.

Q. If spring wheat is unsaleable, why do you buy spring wheat to mill?—We do not, but when a farmer has a quantity of hard wheat to sell, and he will not sell it without at the same time selling his spring wheat, we take both. It is only when the farmer will not sell the one without the other that we buy it.

Q. Do any of the mills buy spring wheat?—Not to make it under the old system. Some buy it for the purpose of making it into flour under the new process. This is the reason of the decline in milling property. It would involve an expenditure of \$10,000 and a change of the whole system of milling to enable us to manufacture spring wheat in the old mills.

Q. Then the reason mill property has decreased in value is on account of the new system of milling adopted?—No, and I do not say so, because that quality of grain will not make as good quality of flour as a better quality of grain.

Q. That is the same thing, you cannot mill as profitably under the old system as under the new, therefore old mills are not worth so much?—Well, a man might as well build a new mill. If we change the mill from the old principle we destroy the white wheat business. It means that a man has to confine himself to making a flour that will make a strong bakers' flour. By the new process they can make it very much better than by the old process.

Q. Therefore the old mills are not as valuable as they were?—Certainly not for grinding spring wheat alone.

Q. Would the importation of American spring wheat interfere with the prices of Canadian spring wheat?—Yes, it would increase it 5 per cent. at least.

Q. Can you increase the quantity of an article and increase its price?—Yes, we can do so, with this article by mixing it.

Q. What effect would the importation of American spring wheat have on Canadian red wheat?—I do not think it would make any difference.

Q. It would not interfere with it at all?—I do not think it would, because there is not enough in Canada to supply the demand.

Q. You think you could bring in American spring wheat without interfering with the value of wheat in this country?—Yes; as the demand in Canada requires it. Then you can grind it, and export it as bakers' flour.

Q. By selling a thing for what it is not you get a better price for it?—No, by converting it into what you want it to be, you get a better price for it. If you sell it the same as you buy it you cannot.

Q. Would it be just to the Canadian farmer to allow American farm produce into Canada free of duty?--It would be no injury to us.

Q. Would it be just?--I think it would be no injury.

Q. I desire an answer to my question?--I do not know what classes you desire me to look through. I answer your question as nearly as I can. I do not think it would be any injury.

*By Mr. Trow:--*

Q. Would it do good if we had American wheat to manufacture?--Yes, mills that are now shut down would then be running.

*By Mr. Wallace:--*

Q. Is there anything to prevent these millers from bringing in American wheat, grinding it in bond, and keeping their mills running?--Yes, there is a great deal to prevent them. No small miller will attempt any such thing, as to grind American wheat in bond, and send it to Liverpool without it is sold. It has to be a large man to do it.

Q. If it were sold could he do it?--Yes, I suppose so.

Q. Then there is nothing to prevent him from doing it?--Yes, there is a great deal to prevent him. There is a good deal of trouble in getting the wheat in, and the flour out.

Q. Can you pay the prices you are now paying for shipment to Liverpool?--Yes, we could do it every day at a profit.

Q. Have you shipped flour from spring wheat to Liverpool?--I do not know. I do not make any for shipment.

Q. You have not attempted to sell any in Liverpool?--Yes, I have. I have been offering some for sale every week and every day, since I have had it on hand, but have been unable to sell it.

Q. Will the people not buy it?--They will not buy it, except at loss.

Q. Then you cannot sell wheat at Liverpool at the price you pay for it in this country?--I never buy any wheat to ship to Liverpool.

Q. You cannot buy spring wheat at the prices you pay now, and ship the flour to Liverpool?--I do not know; I never had any experience in that.

Q. I thought you had opportunities of selling a good deal for shipment to Liverpool?--This is of winter wheat.

Q. No spring wheat?--I never said so, because I have not done it.

Q. Where do you sell your flour?--I sell it at my stations.

Q. Where does it go to as a rule?--I do not know; I sell it at my stations.

Q. Is Canada wheat flour shipped in bond decreased?--I am not prepared to say, for I have not had the Returns this year.

Q. Have you looked at the Returns of last year?--I have not; they are not printed yet.

Q. Ogilvie & Co., imported that large quantity, when?--On the 3rd day of August, 1880.

Q. When was the duty on that payable?--On the 3rd day of August, 1881.

Q. Has it not been paid?--I am not prepared to say.

Q. Did you say it ought to have been showed if it was paid?--No, I did not say anything about it being paid. I said it was not paid when the report was brought down.

Q. When was that report brought down?--In December of last year.

Q. And it need not have been paid up to that time?--No, it need not have been paid up to that time.

Q. You do not know that it was not paid?--No, but I should hope it was for the credit of that concern.

Q. If millers import wheat, grind it in bond and sell it in this country without paying duty on it they commit perjury do they not?--I do not think so, and I will give you the reason. I am glad you have brought that question out. In 1880 Mr. G. C. Rogers of Peterborough in order to test the question of grinding in bond imported two cars of wheat containing 890 bushels, Ho ground it into flour in Peter-

borough and sold it in that town and refused to pay the duty. He notified the Customs authorities of what he had done, and the Customs Inspector demanded the duty payable under his bond. They could not enforce the payment, and it had not been paid at the end of the year.

Q. He had not paid the duty at the end of the year 1880?—No. He said he had done this to make it a test case, and he was determined to carry it right through.

Q. Did not he pay the duty at the end of the year he was required to pay it?—I do not think so.

Q. You do not know?—I know that they gave up the charge against him as helpless as they were not in a position to enforce it. The officer went to enforce it, but he set them at defiance.

Q. They have the bond for its payment?—They had.

Q. When did they attempt to collect it?—Immediately they notified the authorities that the flour had been sold.

Q. Do you know that it is not paid now?—It was not paid last Session.

Q. You say the system of grinding in bond is equal to a loan of 15 cents a bushel?—Yes.

Q. Does it not then act for everyone alike. Cannot all millers avail themselves of the Order in Council?—They can, but it does not give an equal advantage to those who are not on lines of railway. 90 per cent. are not on lines of railway.

Q. Are those who constitute the 90 per cent. large exporters of flour?—They are large grinders of flour.

Q. Do the other 10 per cent. grind largely?—Messrs. Ogilvie & Co. grind largely for Montreal, and they grind American wheat to do it with.

Q. Do they pay duty upon that?—I do not know, I am not prepared to say whether they do or not.

Q. You say it is worse for the farmer to allow it to come in in bond than to allow it to come in free?—Well, it is a deceptive method of doing it, the man who is honest will not avail himself of it.

Q. How does it affect the farmer, more injuriously than by bringing it in free?—I do not think it will make any difference. The difficulty is that they have to bring it into the interior.

Q. What is the price of plaster now?—I am not prepared to tell you now.

Q. What was the price of plaster in 1878—About \$1 a barrel.

Q. My experience is that plaster is lower now than it was then?—I think you will find it is a good deal higher now. I have bought it and delivered it in Toronto at about 85 cents in barrels.

Q. How much a ton?—I never bought it in bulk.

Q. How many pounds in a barrel?—200 pounds at that time.

Q. Oats have been higher in the United States than in Canada?—They have been since the harvest.

Q. Is not that a common thing?—Well, it depends upon the yield in each country.

Q. As a rule, are oats higher in the United States than in Canada?—I do not know that there can be any rule except as to yield.

Q. Have you never known oats imported into this country for home consumption in large quantities?—Years ago there might have been when there was great scarcity here.

Q. Were not oats brought into the Canadian market from the United States in 1877?—There have been some brought into this market this year.

Q. And although they are higher in Chicago than Toronto, they have still been brought in here?—Some have been brought in transit, but I do not suppose they were sold here.

Q. In 1877, were not oats brought into Canada by the car load and sold for consumption?—Yes I think so, during a period of their scarcity in Canada. There were one or two years when we had no oats in Canada and we had to pay the duty.

Q. Cotton bags you say have advanced 20 per cent.?—Yes, 15 or 20 per cent.

Q. Since when have they risen in that manner?—Since the duty was put on.

Q. Since 1879?—Yes, that is my experience. A bag that we got for 22 cents we now pay 26 cents for.

Q. Are they of Canadian make?—Yes, of Canadian make.

Q. How much duty has been put on salt?—I do not know; it is a secret yet, I think.

Q. The price has gone up, has it not?—Yes, it has gone up very largely within the month, on account of the change made by the Government at Ottawa here.

Q. These arrangements, you say, are as yet a secret?—I do not know the particulars of it. I do not know what the duty is. I understood that they had increased the duty on Liverpool salt.

Q. On Liverpool dairy salt?—No, I should think it is coarse salt. The deputation told me the fishermen would be exempt. It is the farmers of Ontario who will have to pay for it.

Q. The arrangement has not been made yet?—It has not come to my ears yet.

Q. Would it be just to the Canadian manufacturer and mechanic to allow American productions to come into this country on a much smaller duty than their productions in turn could go into the United States?—Well, I don't know. I am not prepared to answer that question. People differ in opinion about that. I think our manufacturers are reaping a harvest out of this duty. I know in my own village the manufacturers are largely increased and getting better prices.

Q. I am asking you if it was just to the Canadian mechanic or the Canadian manufacturer to allow goods of American manufacture to come into this country at a less rate than their goods would be allowed into the United States?—Perhaps not, if he exported them and sent them to the United States. It would not then, perhaps, be just to allow such a state of things. But very few manufacturers do that now.

Q. I am not saying how many, or how few, do it; I am asking you if it would be just to allow that to be done?—I am not prepared to answer about the justice. I am not a judge of that—I am not a manufacturer. I do not see any injury. I believe they are making the farmers pay the duty now, and a large number of farmers in my county stated that to me.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Mr. Wallace has asked you if it was just to the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian mechanic to allow American goods to come in here at a less duty than theirs were admitted to the United States. I ask you if it was not just to the majority of consumers and the people at large?—They would get the benefit of it, certainly. They would get the benefit of the difference in the duty.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Does a large home market in the United States cause the price of grain to be higher there than in Canada?—No, I do not think so.

Q. Can you account for the price being higher there than in Canada, if the Liverpool prices regulate the market?—I have not looked into their yield of grain this year, or into their grain matters at all as compared with other years.

Q. Is there not higher protection in the United States than in Canada?—Yes, I think so.

Q. Therefore, if the Tariff has nothing to do with the effect of grain being higher in the United States, our Tariff is not high enough?—I do not think the Tariff would affect the price one iota, because it is but a very small portion of wheat of the best quality that would go there if it were free. We were in the milling business when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force, and we only sent our superior extra flour there, and none other. I never knew spring wheat or spring wheat flour to go there.

Q. Can the Canadian miller compete with the English miller in the English market?—Well, I suppose they must do it.

Q. Can they do it at a profit?—I know one firm that is grinding entirely for that trade—in Paris, I think it is.

Q. And they are succeeding well?—Yes, they seem to be making money.

Q. Are they grinding in bond?—No they are grinding Canadian winter wheat. It is the firm of Plewes & Co. One of my millers went from me to them, and he told me that was the business they were doing, and that six or eight mills in the neighbourhood were engaged grinding and sending to England direct.

Q. Are you aware that since the first regulations in reference to grinding in bond were passed that a more stringent Order in Council has passed?—Yes, previously they were only compelled to send out the equivalent; now they are obliged to send out the product.

Q. Do not large millers like Ogilvie & Co., and others along the front, want to have the law changed?—There were some millers down here last year trying to get the law changed.

Q. Therefore the present system is not in the interest of large millers?—I do not know what the millers wanted last year. I know there was one person here in the interest of some millers, but he did not represent the whole of the millers, because some were opposed to it.

Q. Is not Mr. Gibbs in favour of a change?—I think so.

Q. Is not Mr. Ogilvie also?—I could not say. I do not know.

Q. Is it not likely these large millers would desire to have the law changed if it was in their interest, as it is now?—I do not think it is in their interest.

Q. I understood you to say the Order in Council favoured millers along the front?—So it does. They have the advantage as compared with the other millers in the interior. They have an advantage, but I do not think it is to their advantage altogether.

Q. In the case of a large crop in the United States and a large crop in Canada, would it be fair to allow the American farmer to flood our markets with their surplus products, while our surplus would be kept out of the United States?—There is no danger of that. The English market would regulate the price. If 50,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat from the United States came into our country it would not vary the market. The market here is like a bucket full of water. You can only get a certain quantity into it. If you have a surplus you cannot get any more into it. It is the same way with the wheat market. I showed that right through my last campaign, and the farmers believed it.

Q. Are you aware that in 1877 we imported 551,000 barrels of flour to be consumed in Canada?—Very likely. It may have been scarce here that season. We have had years in which our crops were failures, but I am not prepared to say what those years were. That is one of them, very likely.

Q. Which in wheat would amount to 2,376,273 bushels?—Yes.

Q. Have you any figures as to the amount of flour imported from the United States?—I have some figures which were not prepared for this occasion. They were prepared for another occasion but not used.

Q. Have you the figures in reference to the flour imported from the United States?—I wanted to get those figures but could not do so.

Q. Have you compared the Liverpool prices with the Canadian prices so as to ascertain rudely whether admitting American corn free would affect our market?—Yes, and I did not discover any.

Q. What years have you examined?—I have examined different years, but none since.

Q. Our record which we have here shows, I think, in reference to spring wheat, that on the Liverpool market in 1877 the average price was 33 cents a bushel higher for spring wheat than in Canada, while in 1881 it was only 15 cents higher?—That might be, it just depends upon the yield.

Q. One was under Free Trade and the other under Protection.—These prices are regulated altogether by the Canadian yield. Every year; every harvest regulates itself.

Q. If our market approaches nearer to Liverpool under a system of Protection would not that show that Protection was a benefit to the country—that is if it regularly continued to be so?—If it was so on the same yield. For instance, if this year

we produced 20 bushels per acre on the same acreage, and produced the same every year, and the exportations were the same every year, all the conditions being the same from year to year, it might be some benefit, but not otherwise.

Q. What you really mean to say is, that if you increase the demand for Canadian grain in Canada it increases the price?—Yes; provided we could consume more than we could produce. If we consumed more than we could produce the National Policy would be an advantage to the producers.

Q. Are you aware that the Americans export to Canada more than they consume?—That is sent through Canada.

Q. Can you account for the price of grain at Chicago being higher frequently than the price at Liverpool warrants?—I never take Chicago as a basis. I take Milwaukee, it is a steadier market.

Q. You do not think Chicago a reliable market?—No. It is more liable to fluctuations than any other market in the United States.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. Is it not a fact that the Liverpool market is governed by the supply from the grain producing countries of the world?—Yes.

Q. Then Liverpool does not regulate the market?—It does regulate the market of each year.

Q. But it is regulated by the corn producing countries of the world?—It is principally. It is changed occasionally by Chicago and New York. These markets have a little effect. When there is a sudden rise in Chicago or New York it has a certain effect, but it is not to be compared with the change here.

Q. If the wheat crop was a failure in the United States, Russia and other grain growing countries of the world, the Liverpool market would go up?—Yes.

Q. The Liverpool market does not regulate the price?—No. I have stated that to you already. I have said that it is the supply that regulates the price.

Q. Then the Liverpool market does not regulate the price?—It does for that year; it regulates it every year.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. What prices are you paying at present for red winter?—Well, I have not bought any for some time. There is none in my neighbourhood, and I have not bought any from the West. The last inquiry I made it was \$1.32 in Toronto, and they asked \$1.40 in Lucan.

Q. Could you pay these prices and ship to England?—Yes.

Q. Could you ship red winter wheat to England?—Yes.

Q. Mr. Dight says not?—I say we can, we could a short time ago. I do not know what the price of red winter is to-day.

Q. What price is it in England now?—I do not know.

Q. Could you tell by looking back?—Yes, I could tell by looking back. I never sent any there, but strong bakers' flour is regulated there the same as others. At that time we could have sent it there.

Q. How long was that ago?—Three or four months ago.

Q. Do you know the price paid in England at that time?—No, I could not tell you.

Q. The reason I ask you is that Mr. Dight's evidence does not compare with yours. He says he pays 10 cents more for wheat than he could afford to pay to ship it to England?—There is too much demand in Canada for that flour to ship it to England, because that is the only wheat we have in Canada from which to make strong bakers' flour.

Q. Do you think you could ship to England at a profit?—I think so.

Q. You do not know the prices paid in England for it?—I do not, I am not posted. It is a very small staple of the wheat grown in this country. The percentage grown in Canada is very small.

OTTAWA, 24th April, 1882.

ROBERT HAY, M.P., was recalled and re-examined as follows :—

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Is it profitable to buy spring wheat?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are you a miller, Mr. Hay?—Yes, I am.

Q. Do you run a saw mill?—No, I run a flour mill.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you find it profitable, Mr. Hay, to buy spring wheat?—Certainly, I do, there is a great demand for it.

Q. How does the price which is given for spring wheat compare with the price which is paid for fall wheat?—It is always above fall wheat in price. We always pay more for spring wheat than we do for fall wheat. I raise spring wheat too.

Q. Do you find a ready market for spring wheat?—Yes. In my own locality, there is already a market for it.

Q. Has there been any greater demand for it since the duty was imposed, than was the case previously?—Certainly, there has been much more demand for it since the duty was placed on wheat. We have not been very long in the milling business. We have been in it for a couple of years, that is all.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you pay more for spring wheat than you do for fall wheat?—Yes; we do. I have always been given to understand that this was the case, I have not heard from them lately in this regard; have not been out there for two or three weeks, but I have always been told, when I was out there, that they paid more for spring wheat—and they buy it for cash—than they do for fall wheat. The former commands a better price, and therefore, I cannot see how it can be worthless, or the next door to being worthless.

Q. Do you manufacture spring wheat into flour?—Yes.

Q. To what extent do you grind it?—We have three run of stones in operation.

Q. You have a little country mill?—Yes; but it is a good one though.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Where is your mill located?—In the township of Sutherland near Toronto.

Q. Is it run by water power?—Yes, it is run by water.

Q. You do local gristing, I suppose?—Yes.

Q. You do gristing, chopping, and all local trade?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you raise fall wheat grain largely up in that section of the country?—A great deal of it is grown there.

Q. Do you merely do local gristing, chopping, and other local work?—We do some of it.

Q. Do you attend to these matters personally at all?—No, Sir.

Q. Then I suppose that you never really bought a single bushel of wheat?—I have not bought it, but my money buys it.

Q. Exactly.—Yes.

Q. Still, as a matter of fact, you do not know of these things, as to which you have given evidence, personally?—We keep a most accurate account of the operations connected with the mill. An account is opened for everything that has anything to do with it; everything is either charged to some account, or credited to it.

Q. I suppose that this business of yours is not a very large business?—We have been engaged in it for about two or three years.

Q. How much flour do you ship from it?—When a car-load of flour is ready, we send it to Toronto.

Q. And how often is a car-load of flour ready at this mill?—I am not sure that I can say how many car-loads of flour we make a month.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You manufacture flour for the home market altogether?—Yes. We call the Toronto market a home market.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You do not send any flour abroad?—No, not at all.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. How do you do your flour business?—We send the flour to middlemen in the city of Toronto, and they sell it.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You do not send any of it to England?—There is a great demand for it, on account of the scarcity of the article.

Q. But you do not ship any of it to England?—No, we do not.

Q. And you do not pay a price for your grain which would allow you to ship the flour made from it to England with any profit?—Oh! I do not know anything about that. All I can testify to is this: spring wheat is in great demand, and it brings a better price than fall wheat.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Is your mill run on the improved process?—We have all the improvements that we can think of.

Q. How do you grind the flour?—By means of stones.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you glass rollers in your mill?—We have not gone to that length yet.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You do not use the improved process, then?—No; but we make good flour notwithstanding that fact.

Q. And you really do not know anything personally about these matters at all? You have never bought a load of wheat?—But I know the business of the mill intimately.

And the examination of the witness was here closed.

JOHN CHARLTON, M.P. for North Norfolk, was examined as follows:

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. In what industry are you engaged, Mr. Charlton?—My chief business is lumbering.

Q. Are you engaged in the business of farming?—I have a farm of 200 acres which I have owned for about twenty years, and upon which I have a tenant.

Q. In what part of the country is this farm situated?—It is situated in Charlotteville, in the County of Norfolk. I also own a half interest in a farm of 200 acres in the Township of Walsingham.

Q. Do you farm it?—No; but I have tenants on my farms.

Q. You generally do not farm yourself at all?—I do not plough or sow, myself, nor dig and hoe potatoes; but I am interested in the operations of farming.

Q. Still, you are only a farmer in the sense that you collect rents?—I have a tenant who works the land on shares, and I have also a tenant who acts according to my instructions.

Q. Are you engaged in any other country besides in the Province of Ontario?—I am engaged in lumber operations in the Province of Ontario and in the State of Michigan.

Q. Did you cast your vote last year in the United States in favour of Mr. Garfield?—I never vote in the United States.

Q. What are the chief farm products which are grown in your section of the country?—Wheat and corn are the chief grains which we raise. Oats and barley are also raised to a limited extent, and dairying is a business which is carried on extensively.

Q. Corn can be raised to perfection in the County of Norfolk; can it not?—Yes; it is raised in the corn belt.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is the price of corn, which is grown in Canada, enhanced in consequence of the imposition of the duty on the American article?—No; it is not enhanced in price, owing to the imposition of the duty.

*By the Chairman :--*

Q. Could you give us any idea, Mr. Charlton, as to how many counties there are in the Province of Ontario, which are fit for the growth of corn?—I think that the growth of corn is chiefly confined to the belt of counties which are situated along Lake Erie. The greatest amount of corn is raised in the district from the County of Norfolk westward, including the County of Norfolk.

Q. Is there not a good deal of corn raised in the County of Middlesex?—Yes; it is raised there to a limited extent, but the chief corn belt consists of the counties which lie along the lake shore.

Q. What counties are included in this belt?—The Counties of Norfolk, Elgin, Kent and Essex.

Q. Is not corn raised to great advantage also in the Counties of Welland, Lincoln and Wentworth?—Yes; but not to such a great extent as is the case in the other counties which I have named. The soil east of those counties is largely composed of clay, and consequently is not so suitable for the growth of corn.

Q. But it is grown largely in these counties?—Yes, it is grown in all the counties along Lake Erie to a greater or less extent.

Q. Of course it is raised successfully in the County of Elgin?—Yes, it is.

Q. You say that the price of Canadian corn is not enhanced by the imposition of the duty on the American article?—No, not as far as my observation goes. I notice that the price of corn in Simcoe, our county town, is 65 cents a bushel, while in Chicago, to-day, it is 75 cents a bushel; and if the duty raised the price of corn, it should have been 10 cents a bushel higher in the Town of Simcoe than it is in the City of Chicago, plus the cost of transportation.

Q. Then the argument used by many, that the cattle feeders of Canada would be benefited if Indian corn were admitted free of duty has no weight?—It has no application with us, for the surplus of the crop of corn that we raise is very small; but if corn is imported, it must be bought at the price which it commands in the United States, and imported plus the cost of the duty and charges of transportation, and the farmers who live in our corn belt, according to the market quotations, receive no benefit from the duty, because the price of corn is lower to the producer of corn in Canada than it is in the United States. I suppose the fact is, that the surplus of corn which we raise is very small, our crop being chiefly used at home.

Q. And would not the American corn, if it were introduced into Canada free of duty, displace Canadian corn?—It would not displace corn in our case or to any extent in our county, as we raise corn almost wholly for our own use and have but a very small surplus.

Q. Has the crop of corn which is raised in your county increased in quantity since the imposition of the duty?—No; I have noticed no difference in the amount of corn raised or in the emoluments of those who raise it. The price of corn has changed very slightly, and the crop occupies about the same proportion of farm land which it formerly did, as far as my observation extends.

Q. Corn is a very important crop in your county, I suppose?—It is not a very important crop. The leading crop in our county is wheat.

Q. Then it would really not make very much difference if corn growing became unprofitable in your county? It would not make much difference to the farmers in that section of the country?—The duty as far as the farmers in our section of the country are concerned, has no influence or effect whatever on the price of corn.

Q. What I mean is: if it is not an important crop, it would not affect very seriously the interests of the farmers in your section of the country, if the price of corn were reduced owing to the importation of American corn?—No; the effect of the duty on corn, however, falls very seriously on those in other sections of the country, who buy corn for the purpose of fattening their stock, and on farmers, who wish to sell their oats and rye, and pease and barley, and to supply the place of these grains with corn for the purposes of feeding their stock; who desire to sell their coarse grains at higher prices than the price at which they can buy corn, and thus simply make an exchange, which is advantageous to them; for that reason the

duty on corn does not so particularly affect the profits of the farmer, who lives in the corn belt, and who raises a small quantity of corn, as it does on those farmers and stock feeders who live in other sections of the country, and who would desire otherwise to buy corn for the purpose of feeding their stock.

Q. Do you know how the feeding properties of Canadian and American corn compare?—Well, I believe that the Western corn—what is called the Horse Tooth or Gore corn—is preferable in some respects to Canadian corn. It is a rather superior variety of corn, owing to the small quantity of oil which it contains, and for some purposes this is preferable for nutriment to the two kinds of corn which we raise, but there is not much difference. The Canadian corn is the stronger corn.

Q. It is the stronger corn?—It is rather stronger than the Western corn.

Q. There is a considerable quantity of fruit grown in your county and in your section of the country, is there not?—Yes, there is.

Q. Has the imposition of the duties on American fruit encouraged to any extent the growth of fruit in this country?—Well, the business of putting up fruit has not been engaged in to any extent until quite recently, but I do not know whether it has been encouraged by the imposition of these duties or not. I am not prepared to say whether the duty on fruit has encouraged that industry or not, because it can hardly be said to be developed. One or two small establishments for the drying of apples have been started recently in the county of Norfolk, and there are one or two canning establishments, but we do not can fruit, however, to any extent, I presume.

Q. I see, that in the year 1877, there were 173,968 barrels of apples brought into Canada from the United States; and that in the year 1881, only 31,000 barrels of American fruit were brought into this country from the United States, which would go to show that the increased duties on apples has had the effect of checking importations. Do you think that the shutting out of this amount of American apples would not benefit the fruit growers in your section of the country?—The shutting out of that amount of apples might have been due to the increased orchard production of Canada, which is increasing every year. So far as our section of Ontario is concerned, we have never imported fruit from the United States. We have raised apples in large quantities, much in excess of our requirements, and the business of barrelling apples to sell in the Eastern Canadian market has recently become a considerable one there. I am aware that the price of fruit in our region has been lower than it was in the apple region of the State of New York, and this has been the case for years.

Q. Do you not think that the North-West Territories will afford us a large market for fruit?—Oh, very likely; that will very likely be the case.

Q. And if this market were preserved to our own people as it is, by the imposition of duties on American fruit, would this not have the effect of encouraging the growth of fruit in Canada and of enlarging the area, which is devoted to the cultivation of fruit?—That is quite possible, to the extent that it causes the North-West market to be supplied from this portion of the country; it might have a beneficial effect on the fruit growers of the Province of Ontario.

Q. Do you believe that the existence of manufacturing industries is beneficial to the farmer?—Certainly I do.

Q. Why do you think so?—The development of industries of any kind in the country is beneficial to the farmer, owing to the increase of population which this entails.

Q. Then if the imposition of duties upon manufactured goods has increased the number of employés in our factories and increased their prosperity, there is a benefit accruing to the farmer?—That depends entirely upon circumstances. If the farmer is paying less for the advantage he thus secures than is the advantage which he derives from it, this is a benefit to him; but if, on the contrary, he is paying vastly more for it than is the advantage which he derives from it, then the net result to him is a loss. If for instance he pays \$1 in the shape of duties in order to realize a profit of 10 cents on what he has to sell, he would be better off without the tax which was imposed for his advantage. This depends entirely on circumstances. The

existence of manufactures *per se* is a benefit to the farmer; but it depends entirely on what he pays for this advantage, before we can decide whether he gains a real advantage or no.

Q. I see you stated in the year 1876, and probably you will express the same opinion now—"A farmer raises a bushel of corn which he sells for 50 cents in a foreign market, and with the proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but supposing the manufacturers are brought to his door, and the better market which it creates increases the price to 68 or 70 cents per bushel, and although impost duties are levied on cottons from Manchester so as to add largely to its price, still he may be enabled to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn, instead of the three yards it was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labour is increased." I suppose that you hold to this opinion still?—I suppose that a great many things remain to be proved in that way.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I do not see the object of bringing up these quotations?—If we suppose that the farmers in this country, by submitting to increased taxation, have been enabled to get 25 cents or 50 cents more a bushel for his corn—suppose that this were to prove true—of course I admit that certain deductions would follow, but I do not suppose anything of the kind here.

Q. All I wish to ask you is, do you believe that the internal trade of the country is more important than the foreign trade of it? Do you think that more attention should be paid to the development of internal trade than is paid to the development of foreign trade? Is the internal trade more important than the foreign trade?—Yes. I do not know that I could draw any line of distinction between the one and the other. I consider that trade and commerce are a benefit to the country, whether it be internal, domestic or foreign. If commerce is allowed to take its free course without any attempt being made to dam up the stream and to seek to direct its course to other channels by the unnatural application of certain principles it does not matter I suppose whether it is internal or whether it is foreign; but if we were to sacrifice the one only for the purpose of creating an advantage to the other, and at an undoubted cost to the other, I doubt whether the internal commerce would be as profitable under these circumstances as the commerce in which we were naturally engaged.

Q. If the putting on of the duties, foreign commerce was at all interfered with, and somewhat decreased while the internal commerce of the country largely increased, would you, in that case, consider that Protection was a benefit?—Well, if I saw that such a result was produced by Protection we might arrive at some conclusion as to whether it was a benefit or not; but unfortunately in our case it seems that the operation of protective duties has been to increase the importation of goods, which are susceptible of being manufactured in Canada. This has been very largely the case, and in place of giving to our manufacturers the command of our market, they are gradually losing it apparently. They are losing extra trade and the production of goods which are susceptible of being manufactured here, the importation of which has been increased.

Q. You do not then think that Protection has really increased the production of our manufacturers to any extent?—I do not think that it has. I think that our manufacturers under a Revenue Tariff of 17½ per cent., which was previously 15 per cent. made more satisfactory progress than they are doing now.

Q. Does any industry, which gives an additional market to the farmer, benefit him?—It does, if it does not cost him too much; the compensation for the taxes imposed on himself may be such that it may not benefit him.

Q. Have all the industries, which have been started since the inauguration of the National Policy benefited the farmer more or less?—Well, with reference to industries which have been started since the inauguration of the National Policy, I suppose that it is fair to presume that such an industry has been called into existence by the National Policy, and that it had nothing to do with increased business under the revival of trade, under the continuance of the same policy, and a

larger trade. The number of industries that has been called into existence, owing to the operation of the National Policy, has been very small indeed; and I am of opinion that under a Revenue Tariff Policy the number of industries which would have been called into existence would have been greater than has been the case under this policy. The National Policy has called into existence, no doubt, some cotton factories which might not otherwise have been built; and perhaps it has benefited the woollen interest and the sugar refining interest; but, on the other hand, it has been an injury to the founder, and to the machine maker, and to the agricultural implement maker, and to the great line of industries which are injured by the imposition of duties on their raw material; and I am of opinion that the net result has not been to increase the number of our manufacturing industries at all under the National Policy.

Q. But still you say that if the manufactories are increased in this country, if the number of our factories is increased, if the number of hands which they employ is increased, and if an additional home market is created for their productions, all this is a benefit to the farmer?—I say that it is, if the farmer does not pay too much for the privilege, and if the farmer is not taxed unduly for the benefits which this may give him. If the taxes which the farmer pays are increased 20 per cent. or one-fifth, and the benefit which he derives from the creation of new industries is not one-tenth of that amount, he loses by such a policy, for although he may slightly increase the price which he receives for his wares and the productions which he raises from the soil, this will not pay the increased cost placed on what he buys, this being far more than the benefit which he derives from such a policy.

Q. You think that the Revenue Tariff, which existed previous to the introduction of the National Policy, was sufficient, do you?—I think that it was sufficient as a Protective Tariff.

Q. Do you then think, that by putting duties on American farm produce, you can thereby give to the Canadian farmer an additional market, by shutting out the American farm products; would this not be a benefit to the Canadian farmer under a Revenue Tariff?—Well, with reference to the shutting out of American farm products—

Q. I wish to ask you—and I would like you, Mr. Charlton, to keep this point in view: You state that, provided protective duties were imposed for the purpose of encouraging manufactures, and that new factories were started, it would be a benefit to the farmer if he did not pay too much, owing to the duties that might be imposed on manufactured goods; and you state that the benefit which the farmer would derive from this policy would be due to the increased home market that would be created by the existence of these manufactures in this country for farm produce; and I want to ask you if we could not, by shutting out American farm produce from Canada, thereby give to the Canadian farmer a larger market for his farm produce of every description, and would this not confer upon the Canadian farmer a benefit equal to the establishment of factories in this country, or thereabouts? Would this policy not benefit the Canadian farmer, at all events?—That would depend very much, Mr. Chairman, on the fact whether Canada imported food for home consumption. If Canada imported food for her own consumption, and if she failed to supply her own wants in these particulars, then, as a matter of course, the imposition of duties on American farm produce would raise the price of the farm produce of our own country; but if, on the contrary, Canada raised a large surplus of grain, then the imposition of duties on American grain would be entirely unprofitable to the Canadian farmer, and as a consequence the effect of such duties would be mischievous to our carrying trade, while the markets of this country could not be affected by such a duty. For instance, if you take the article of corn: we have a duty on American corn, and if you glance at the market reports, you will see that the imposition of the duty on American corn has not affected at all the price of Canadian corn.

Q. I think that the returns will show a different state of things?—I have the market reports of Saturday last. I have made it a practice to examine them from day to day for a good many months, and I find in all these market reports that the

prices of all classes of grain, including corn, are higher in the United States than they are in Canada; which proves simply this, with regard to duties, that these duties are unnecessary to keep these grains out of Canada, because they cannot be brought in here to slaughter the market if the prices of them are higher in the United States than they are in Canada. This is a self-evident proposition. I find, for instance, that corn is worth, according to the *British Canadian*, which I looked at a few moments ago, from 65 to 68 cents a bushel in the market town of the County of Norfolk, which is nearly in the middle of the corn belt. I find that corn is worth, on the other hand, in the city of Toledo, 78 cents cash per bushel, while it is worth in the city of Chicago 75 cents a bushel, so that in either of these markets it is some 10 or 12 cents higher per bushel than it is in the town of Simcoe; consequently it is impossible to bring American corn into Canada and slaughter the Canadian market, being much higher in price there than it is here.

Q. Is this usually the case in your experience?—It has been the case so far as I have noticed the quotations since the introduction of the National Policy. They show the remarkable fact that the prices of grain in the United States were relatively lower than they were in Canada before the introduction of the National Policy than they have been since the introduction of the National Policy, but why, I do not know.

Q. Have you compared the prices of grain in Canada and in the United States for different years?—Well, I have not done so for different years; but I was about to institute a comparison which is based on the quotations of to-day. I find that spring wheat No. 2 is worth \$1.37 a bushel in the city of Toronto and that it is worth \$1.38 in the city of Chicago, being one cent higher in Chicago market, although this is farther in the interior of the country. I also find that barley No. 1 is worth 88 cents in the city of Toronto while the same grade of barley is worth \$1.12 in the city of Oswego, just across the Lake. Of course, under these circumstances, it would be impossible to import barley from the States into Canada with the view of injuring the market. I find that rye is much higher in the city of Toledo than it is in the city of Toronto, and this is also the case with oats; 34 lbs. of oats are worth 40 cents in the city of Toronto, and 32 lbs. of oats are worth 47 cents in the city of Chicago, while 32 lbs. of oats are worth more in the city of Toledo than they are worth in Toronto.

Q. I think that this evidence as to prices is unnecessary, as we have taken the means of obtaining authenticated quotations in this particular, and these others will be of very little value under these circumstances.—I merely quote these prices to show at the outset, in answer to your question, that it is impossible to reap an advantage, so far as the Canadian farmer is concerned, from the imposition of duties in cases where the market from whence the grain in question is to be imported is a higher market, as regards prices, than the market to which these grains are to be sent.

Q. Exactly; that is the point. Then can you explain why grain is so much higher in prices in the United States than it is in Canada at the present time?—I think that by making a reference to oats I can give you an explanation. Before the adoption of the National Policy we bought large quantities of American oats for the purpose of converting them into oatmeal. We exported 174,511 barrels of oatmeal in the year 1878, but since the imposition of the duty upon American oats it has made it impossible for us to buy these oats; the Americans themselves have gone into the business of manufacturing oatmeal for export, and this business has fallen off in Canada, until, in 1881, we exported only 53,825 barrels of oatmeal, or less than one-third of the amount which we produced during the last year before the National Policy came into force; and I think that this fact, perhaps, may have some bearing upon the fact that oats are relatively higher in price in the city of Chicago now than they were before the National Policy was introduced. They now have an outlet for the export of their manufactured oatmeal.

Q. I would like to ask you this question: Do you know whether this change was not taking place before the Tariff was inaugurated in Canada? Are you not aware that the Americans commenced to manufacture their own oats into oatmeal for export

previous to the introduction of the National Policy? Many years ago we had certainly the best name in Liverpool and in the European market for our oatmeal, our market for this purpose being there held in higher esteem than the American, but for the last ten years the Americans have been increasing their manufacture of oatmeal. Is not this to your knowledge?—I am not prepared positively to corroborate your statement.

Q. You are not then thoroughly acquainted with the oatmeal business?—I am not prepared positively to state how long ago the Americans commenced to manufacture oatmeal; but it was only three or four years ago that they began to manufacture oatmeal to any extent; and at that particular juncture, the National Policy was imposed, and it operated as an efficient protection to the Americans in starting this business, and against the Canadian manufacturer who had been accustomed to purchase their supplies in the States, and thus gave to his American competitor an advantage which he would not have had were it not for the introduction of the National Policy.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Has not the manufacture of oatmeal in Canada fallen off?—The returns show that the exportation of oatmeal in Canada has fallen off from 174,511 barrels in the year 1878, to 53,825 in the year 1881, and a good many oatmeal mills have been closed in consequence of the impossibility of purchasing oats at the present time in the United States.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you know what price a manufacturer of oatmeal can afford to pay for oats, to be converted into oatmeal for the purpose of export?—I am not acquainted with the details of the trade.

Q. That has an important bearing on the case. If oats are worth 46 cents per bushel in the United States, and if it were impossible for our millers to import them at that price to grind into meal for the purpose of exportation to Europe, it would be important to make this fact clear. For my own part I have lived where oatmeal is ground pretty extensively, and I may say that our millers never could buy oats at a higher price than 40 cents per bushel for the purpose of grinding them into oatmeal for export to Europe, in my knowledge.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. That depends upon the state of the European market?—No doubt.

*The Chairman:—*As far as my own knowledge goes, this is the case, and I think that you will bear me out in this statement.

*Mr. Bain:—*I do not know about that, I have not paid much attention to the subject. I know that locally our own millers did a very good trade in grinding oatmeal two or three years ago.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. The protection which is in vogue in the United States has not injured the American market at any rate, Mr. Charlton?—Protection to the farmer of the United States I suppose is the matter to which you now have reference?

Q. Yes; and it has not injured the price of grain in the United States compared with the prices which we obtain in our market?—The protective policy has been in force there since the year 1861, when duties were imposed for the protection of the American farmer, but they have exported largely of their farm products, notwithstanding this Protection but it seems that Canada, under the system of Free Trade in grain, had a better market in the United States than they have had since, although an outcry was made about the entrance of American products into Canadian Free Trade markets. We put on duties in 1879, and I apprehended, that it followed as a matter of course from all this that Protection did not prove to be any good in that country in the way of making a home market which would absorb all home products.

Q. The fact is that their market is a better market than ours?—In the year 1880 their food exports amounted to \$377,000,000 to supply their own wants. Their markets seem to be glutted as much as our own is, in some cases, but their prices are

better than ours, and Protection is not necessary to protect our farmers against the introduction of their products into this country, when their prices are sufficient to prevent their grain coming in here at prices which would depress our market.

Q. As to a retaliatory policy, do you think it fair to allow American grain to come into our market, while they exclude our grain from their market by means of duties?—As far as the question of retaliatory duties is concerned, I suppose that if one nation does a silly thing, it does not follow as a matter of course, that it is the duty of another to follow their example. If the duties which the Americans impose on our grain do not benefit that country, and are no good, it is not necessary for us to copy their policy in that respect. The question should be raised, discussed and decided on its own merits. I apprehend, if the duties are necessary, impose them; but if they are not necessary, and if they are, on the contrary, followed by mischievous consequences, they should not be imposed, no matter what our neighbours may do; and we should not hamper our carrying trade, when such duties do not benefit our agricultural interests.

Q. I notice that in the year 1876, you said: "I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted, which would bring the United States to terms, and would at least protect us against slaughter invoices?"—Allow me to finish that quotation, Mr. Chairman.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I think that these quotations are quite out of place?—I do not know that this old speech has anything to do with this subject.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. I wish merely to know, whether you have changed your views on that point or not?—I prefer, that when you make a quotation, you should do it correctly, without garbling the sense of the speech. What I said was this: "With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted, which would bring the United States to terms, and would at least protect us against slaughter invoices. I doubt, however, whether that is an evil which requires the interposition of the Government. I think it is much magnified, and is entirely owing to a state of affairs across the lines, which cannot be considered permanent and which will disappear with the return of good times to that country. Greatly as our manufacturers have been injured, I think their complaints will not last long; and I doubt whether it is good policy in view of the fact, that this is a temporary evil for the Administration to pursue a course, which would lead to retaliation." Consequently you will see from the sense of that speech, that I did not favour a retaliatory policy.

Q. But you stated in that speech, that you did favour such a policy?—I stated explicitly, that I considered retaliation, merely for the sake of retaliation, to be a foolish thing. This, however, had no bearing whatever upon the subject, which we are now discussing. If a quotation is made at all, it should be made correctly without being at all garbled.

Q. You confessed that you would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted, on the part of Canada?—If I could see the United States brought to terms by means of a retaliatory policy, I would favour the adoption of such a policy; but it would be absurd to attempt it. We could not effect our purpose in that way; and it would be absurd for us to injure ourselves by doing what I protest would have no effect whatever in the desired direction.

Q. Are you aware, that the price of spring wheat and of red winter wheat in Canada has approached much nearer to the Liverpool price under the protective policy of the present Government, than was the case under the system which permitted the admission into Canada of wheat and flour free of duty from the United States?—Well, in regard to the difference between the prices, which exist in the Liverpool and Canadian markets, that is a matter which depends entirely on the cost of transportation.

Q. Exactly; the cost of freight has a good deal to do with prices?—If a railway war exists between trunk lines, and the cost of carrying wheat from Chicago to New York is 9 cents a bushel, the discrepancy between the prices, which prevail in the

Liverpool and Chicago markets, would be much less than if the cost of this transportation was 20 cents a bushel; and also if circumstances arose in connection with competition between the ocean lines, which would reduce the cost of freight across the sea, that would also have its effect. As a rule, when there is a very large crop of grain and an abundance of business, freights are higher than when the crops are smaller, and as a consequence great competition to secure business, is created; so that the difference between prices in the Liverpool and Canadian and American markets is a result, but which is due to competition between the various transportation lines.

Q. Are you aware that there is a great deal of competition at the present time between the various branches of railway for freight from Chicago?—This has been the case, I think, until recently.

Q. And there has been greater competition in this relation, than was ever the case before. Is not this so?—The railway troubles, I understand were, arranged lately. During last summer the railway rates were very low. At least this was the case during a portion of the summer.

Q. Have ocean freights been any cheaper this year than usual?—I am not familiar with the particulars. I only know that as a general rule, a difference applies in accordance with whatever transportation may be.

Q. Have not cheaper railway freights made prices somewhat higher in the city of Chicago, as compared with points nearer to the Liverpool market than is the case under ordinary circumstances?—Oh, yes, certainly; their local market has been higher in consequence of this fact.

Q. Do you not think that the operations of wealthy dealers in grain and in corn in the Chicago market, have a great deal to do with the present high prices of grain and corn in that market?—Very often what are called corners, make the prices of grain in Chicago higher than is the case in other markets.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. That is not a new thing in that market, is it?—No; I think that the business of gambling in grain has reached a greater development in the city of Chicago during the last three or four years than was formerly the case. But it must, however, be borne in mind, that when the prices of grain are forced up in the Chicago market, the producer in the interior, in the States west of Chicago, gets the benefit of these advances in price, according to the fluctuations in price, if you are pleased to call them such which take place in that market.

Q. In case there was a large crop in the United States and also a large crop in Canada, a considerable surplus existing in both countries, would it be fair to let the Americans flood our market with their surplus, and take the home market from the Canadian farmer, while they shut us out from any participation in their market?—It would be in the highest degree desirable under such circumstances, for us to handle the whole of the American crop. If we could import every bushel of their grain, and have the whole of their business instead of a small portion only of their business, it would be securing to us a great advantage.

Q. Do you know from figures whether the present protective policy has interfered in any way with the carrying trade of the Canadian railways and of the Canadian canals?—I presume that it is owing to such an interference that, as I understand, a petition was sent up to the Government from the Corn Exchange Association of the City of Montreal, protesting against the duties which are imposed on American grain, on the ground that they would affect our carrying trade. I see, at any rate, that our carrying trade has fallen off, and the effect of the policy which imposes duties on grain which comes into this country could not do otherwise than injure our trade, because it must impose obstacles on this business.

Q. As an actual fact, comparing the results of the different years with each other in this connection, do you know whether the Trade and Navigation Returns show a decrease or an increase in the carrying trade of the country?—They show that there has been a decrease in our carrying trade.

Q. On what articles has there been a decrease?—I do not know that I can specify the articles in which there has been a decrease; but the volume of business which has been transacted on our canals is not so great as it was in former years; while, as a matter of fact, there should have been a rapid increase in this department of our business. I may say, with reference to this matter—the importation of American grain—that the figures are given as relating to imports wherever the cargo happened to be entered, although it was only entered for transit through our canals. If it was merely entered at Port Colborne and went on through the country with the necessary transshipments, nevertheless it appears in the Returns as if our imports were enormously swelled when it only in great part refers to—

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Exported?—Imports, which, in reality, merely insure to our benefit. It certainly would be to our benefit to secure the whole of the American carrying trade.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. In the Returns the distinction is usually made clear between what is imported merely for transit through the country, and what is imported for home consumption, do they not?—Yes, they do.

Q. And I think that the Department always keeps proper returns as to what has been actually used in home consumption?—Our returns in that respect were not reliable before the adoption of the policy which imposed duties on American grains, because it at that time mattered little whether they were entered for consumption or for export. The only way in which, for that period, we can arrive at the net export is to take the total exports and deduct them from the total imports, and the net result will represent the quantity which has gone into home consumption.

Q. Are not the exports always classified as exports which are the produce of our own country, and as exports which are not the produce of our own country, so that there can be no doubt under this head?—To bring down the matter to the first principles, I would make this statement: So long as we have a surplus, it does not matter except so far as it tends to increase our prosperity, how much our exports are, because the imports under such circumstances cannot affect the prices on our local markets, as we have a surplus for sale.

Q. Are you aware during what part of the year this surplus passes through and out of this country?—Of course, the principal part of the crop is handled and exported before the new year arrives.

Q. It is finished before the arrival of the new year?—Yes.

Q. After the new year then we have not more of the crop generally left in the country than is required for our own consumption?—That is generally the case.

Q. And if the American grain were allowed to come into this country free of duty, after our surplus is disposed of, would it not affect the interests of our Canadian farmers?—It would affect those who bought the bread, but it would not affect those who sold the wheat. It would not affect them at all, because they would have sold out their wheat before the duty could come into operation.

Q. Do not some farmers keep their grain, holding it for possibly higher prices?—In this case, that grain would be used for local consumption. This case supposes that the grain would be in the country for sale; and then it would be bought for home consumption, but if the duty raised the price of grain, the farmer would get the benefit of it and would have sold out.

Q. Do not our millers, who possess the home market, usually try and provide for the requirements of the country for all the year round?—Well, as far as my knowledge of the country millers is concerned, I do not think that they usually carry very heavy stocks of grain. They do not desire to do so, as they would rather buy it as they need it for consumption; they do not wish to run the risk of the fluctuations of the market by holding stocks.

Q. Do you not think that if we shut out the grain of the United States, our millers would compete more keenly with the dealers who buy for the European market? Do you not think that our own millers, who supply our own home markets, would compete more keenly with the dealers who buy for the foreign market if the produce

of the foreign markets is shut out of the Canadian market?—I think that it makes no difference whatever in that respect. I do not think, however, that our millers in many localities would be prevented from buying red wheat and mixing it with white wheat, and they are obliged to pay lower prices for the white wheat than they would otherwise be able to do.

Q. Do we not raise plenty of red winter wheat?—In some sections of the country we do not raise enough red wheat. For instance, in the section in which I live it is very difficult to get red wheat to mix with white wheat. Two years ago it was impossible to procure the winter wheat unless it was imported, and it was necessary to have it in order to manufacture certain brands of flour.

Q. Is not red winter wheat grown very largely in the Province of Ontario?—It could not be obtained in that section of the country.

Q. Then the imposition of a duty on wheat really encourages the growth of red winter wheat?—The imposition of the duty in that case depresses the price of white wheat as it interferes with the procuring of the necessary red wheat to be used for the purpose of mixing. I am informed by the proprietor of a mill that if there was no restriction on the purchase of red wheat in the United States he could afford to pay from 3 to 5 cents a bushel more for the white wheat which he requires.

Q. If there is a scarcity of red winter wheat in Canada, and if the duty prevents the introduction of American winter wheat and of American spring wheat coming into Canada, this fact must necessarily increase the price of red winter wheat and encourage its growth in Canada? Do you not think so?—The beneficial effect which the duty has on our farmers is very little, as our millers will buy this grade of wheat whether it is scarce in Canada, or not; and if in order to procure this kind of wheat, he has to import it and pay the duty on it, the result is, that he has to pay less for the white wheat which he buys at home; and consequently the duty does an injury to the Canadian farmer, and is of no benefit to him. It may be possible, however, that the duty may benefit a few persons a little.

Q. Will it not be a benefit to those who raise red winter wheat?—It may be possible that its effect may be to encourage the growth of red winter wheat during the year following the demand for the article; but it does very little to improve the business of farming from time to time.

Q. But as far as the winter wheat and spring wheat are mixed with white wheat, the duty will have a beneficial effect?—Yes.

Q. And the Canadian farmer in that respect will be benefited by the imposition of the duty?—Yes; but the benefit which the Canadian farmer derives from the duty is not very appreciable.

Q. I think that both spring and the winter wheat are grown very extensively through most of the counties in the Province of Ontario?—The production of red winter wheat has increased, I presume.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Has the imposition of the duty upon American wheat affected favourably or otherwise the price of grain here?—As a rule, I do not see what effect the existence of this duty can possibly produce, except in the cases which existed in this country in the years 1876 and 1877.

Q. That is in case of a failure in our crops?—When our harvest is considerably short of the quantity, which is requisite to supply our own wants, the duty would affect the price of the wheat which was bought for home consumption, as a matter of course; but this would not be the case whenever we have a surplus; the result would then be that the duty would have little or no effect necessarily on the price of our grain, because we raised what we required for our own consumption, and have a surplus besides.

Q. Does the imposition of the duty on American trade affect our carrying trade?—Certainly; it must affect our carrying trade, which is injured owing to the interference that it creates in connection with this business. Although the grain can be bonded and passed through this country in bond; still it gives a good deal of trouble to enable this to be done.

Q. Bonding is attended with a good deal of inconvenience?—It does occasion to shippers a good deal of inconvenience, and grain is under this system sent to Buffalo and New York, which would otherwise pass through the Welland Canal and our channels of communication to the sea.

Q. Does not the bonding system discriminate in the interest of the millers who have mills along the border, and in favour of capitalists who grind wheat in bond?—I know very little about that business.

Q. I understood you to say that the imposition of the duty upon American oats has crippled our oatmeal industry and the manufacture of oatmeal in this country?—Yes; I judge that this is the case from the returns. The exports of oatmeal are largely diminished, and I know of my own knowledge that some of our oatmeal mills have been closed.

Q. I know that two of these mills have been closed in the town of Mitchell.—Yes.

Q. American oats used to be bought extensively for these mills, and they gave high prices for our own oats?—I presume that it would be found, on enquiry, that a good many mills in the Province of Ontario have ceased operations, owing to the fact that they have been crippled by the duty which has been placed on American oats.

Q. What effect has the imposition of the duty had on the prices of Canadian wool?—That is a matter to which I have not given much attention. The duty upon wool is placed, of course, on a grade of wool which we do not produce.

Q. And on the wool which is raised for manufacturing purposes in Canada, there is no duty at all?—No; there is no duty in favour of the wool which we produce here.

Q. Do you know whether the importation of the duties upon cotton and woollen goods have affected the prices of these articles to the consumer?—I think that they have affected the prices of these goods. I have an opportunity almost monthly during the summer for comparing the prices which are asked for these goods in American and in Canadian towns.

Q. How do the prices of these goods in the United States and Canada compare?—I see that cotton goods are relatively much dearer than they were before the increase in the duty took place. I say that relatively they are very much dearer in price than they were. The difference in the price of these goods is greater in these two markets than it was formerly.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You are speaking of the relative difference in price between the Canadian and the American markets?—Yes. In some cases there may not have been a positive advance in prices in Canada; but in such cases there has been a decline in prices in the United States, so that the relative difference has been increased.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. The machinery which is used in these mills is all made in the United States or in England is it not?—I think that none of this machinery is made here.

Q. None is made here? I refer to the machinery which is used in the manufacture of cotton?—I think not. I notice that the cotton mill at Cornwall has purchased a large amount of plant, and a portion of it has been brought from Boston, and a portion of it has been obtained in Scotland.

Q. It would require very large capital to be invested in order to make this machinery in Canada?—Yes; it would barely pay however to get up a company for the manufacture of this machinery when we can only start seven or eight mills.

Q. Do you know whether the imposition of the duty has had any effect on the price of barley?—It has had no effect whatever on the price of our barley. The price of barley is always higher in the American than it is in the Canadian market. The United States export no barley, but the Americans buy it for their own consumption. The table of prices uniformly show higher prices for barley in the United States than is the case in Canada. This will be found to be a fact if you go back any number of years.

Q. Could you give the quotations for barley for this year?—I could give them I think. I have the table of prices here but very few quotations.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I do not think that anyone holds that the imposition of the duty on barley does much good. I do not think that it affects it in any way.

*Mr. Trow :—*You will remember Sir John's argument as to a field on each side of the border.

*The Chairman :—*That was merely stated to show the injustice of it. I have the quotations of barley based on the prices which are obtained on the third Wednesday of each month, and the average price for the year is thus procured. Do I understand the Chairman of the Committee to say that he wishes to have these quotations as to the price of barley? They are based on the quotations which ruled the third Wednesday of each month of each year; and on these quotations I give the average for the year in question. The quotations on the third Wednesday of each month in the year 1876, give an average for that year, in the city of Toronto, of 81 cents a bushel, while the average price for the same year in the city of Oswego was \$1.08 $\frac{3}{4}$  per bushel. In the year 1877, the average price in the city of Toronto was 66 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per bushel, while the price in Oswego was 88 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents a bushel. In the year 1878, the price in Toronto averaged \$1.25, while it was \$1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$  a bushel in Oswego. In the year 1879, it was 72 cents a bushel in the city of Toronto, while in the city of Oswego it was 84 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel. In the year 1880 it was 84 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel in the city of Toronto, and it was \$1 in Oswego. In the year 1881, the average price of barley was 91 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents in the city of Toronto, and it was \$1.07 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents in the city of Oswego.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you any authority for these statistics?—Well, I compiled them from the quotations which are given in the *Mail*, and I think that they are fairly correct.

Q. You did not apply to the Corn Exchanges or to any reliable authority to obtain these quotations?—I applied to the Corn Exchange of the city of Toledo, and I obtained the quotations of barley on the third Wednesday of each month for the year 1876. I also got them from the city of Detroit, and I found that these quotations which I thus secured agreed, with slight discrepancies, of course, with the quotations which are given in our own papers.

Q. You have not the quotations which would enable us to make a comparison of figures for the years before the year 1876?—I could have gone farther back than the year 1876, but I thought that if I obtained the prices for the three years which preceded the adoption of the National Policy, and for the years following, this would afford a fair period for the purposes of comparison.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would it be in the interest of the feeders of stock in this country and of the farmers, if the duty which has been placed on American corn was taken off?—Well, I think that the removal of the duty would work decidedly for their benefit, whenever a country buys corn and sells a corresponding amount of other coarse grains, and if these grains are sold at higher prices than the corn costs, money is made by the exchange; and that is simply the reason why the duty should be taken off. Money is made by the exchange. We can sell our pease, rye and oats to advantage.

Q. It is in the interest of the Canadian farmer to make the exchange?—Certainly it is.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Would not the removal of the duty depress the price of oats which is raised by our own people?—I do not think so.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Is there any process by which we could add to our exports the export of corn from the corn growing Belt, Mr. Charlton? You live in it, and can possibly give us some information on this point?—I do not think that it is possible to obtain accurate results in this relation. We can hardly find in our exports from Canada the article of corn; at least it is so insignificant in quantity that it is scarcely worth mentioning.

Q. I suppose that you come from the corn belt: is Canadian corn sent out from it to be used for feeding purposes in other sections of the country?—No. I think, that the surplus of corn which is raised in the corn growing belt is very slight indeed. The little corn that we raise and is sold, is sold merely in our market towns, and it is very small in quantity. Our farmers usually calculate to raise only about the quantity which they want for the fattening of their hogs, and for their general feeding purposes.

Q. But they do sell a small surplus of corn?—Yes.

Q. No one makes a specialty of growing corn for the sole purpose of selling it?—No. The corn crop pays because the fodder is very valuable. A good crop of corn furnishes almost as much fodder as would a crop of hay; and it supplies excellent food for the fattening of hogs, while it is also good for horses in winter. But our farmers usually consume all the corn that they raise.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What counties are included in the corn belt?—The greatest quantity of corn is raised in the counties of Essex, Kent, Elgin and Norfolk. In the counties of Haldimand, Welland and Lincoln, the soil is usually a heavy clay, and it is consequently not so well adapted for the growth of corn, although these counties are situated in the same latitude.

*By Mr. Bechard:—*

Q. You have been asked if you did not think that the increase of manufacturing industries was procuring a larger home market for the Canadian farmer. Now, as to this question, do you not think that as the manufacturing industries increase in number and proportions, the agricultural industry would also increase, and that if, on the one hand, the demand for our farm produce was increased in Canada, on the other hand, the increase in the supply of farm produce would also equally increase?—Certainly, and not only is that the case, but the local surplus for export would also increase largely. So far from realizing the possession of the home market, we seem to be drifting further from it. I have some statistics which bear on that particular point, but they are not here. But they show that the exports of animals and farm products during the three years which have elapsed since the introduction of the National Policy, have amounted to \$10,000,000 more than they amounted to during the three previous years; and the value of these exports is constantly running up. The exports for the last six months ending the 31st December, 1881, were very much larger than they were during the corresponding period during the last six years. I think that they amounted during those six months to some \$18,000,000; so that the agricultural exports of this country are steadily increasing rapidly, and this is also the case in the United States under the operation of their protective policy as well.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you attribute our present prosperity to the Dominion in the surplus in exports which we have had, in the shape of stock, agricultural produce and lumber, which have brought a plethora of money into the country, amounting to some \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000, which is more than the usual amounts which we formerly received for our exports?—Yes, I do.

Q. And of course the distribution of this money gives a greater purchasing power to our people?—The causes of the revival of prosperity in this country may be arrived at, in my opinion, with mathematical certainty. Just at the time when the National Policy was inaugurated, or about that time, in the month of January, 1879, the United States returned to specie payments; the commercial crisis in that country had continued for over five years, and it was prolonged by the derangement which took place in their currency and by their currency troubles generally; but when the return to specie payments came, at once a great tide of prosperity set in; but whether it was due to that or any other cause, it is not for me to say, and that prosperity has continued increasing up to the present moment. The consequence of it has been, as far as we are concerned, to increase the price of our lumber very much, until it is now some 60 or 70 per cent. higher in price than it was

during the period of depression. Then there has also been an increase in the price of the barley which we sell to them, and of all the articles which we send to that country as well. Then added to all this, we have had since the National Policy was inaugurated, exceptionally good harvests, and coming in conjunction with these two good harvests, we have had two years of unusual demand in England for our products, owing to the bad harvests which they have had there—of the unusually high prices. Well, these causes added to the economical practices of our people during five years of hard times, which alone would always bring about a return to good times, if no other cause were brought to bear, have led to the revival of our interests to day in Canada, which revival has, however, been slightly diminished by the imposition of the National Policy, which has imposed extra taxation on the people of this country, and which has taken from \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000 in taxes, which ought not to have come out of their pockets.

Q. Has the effect of the National Policy been to keep within our limits our people; or has the exodus from this country been so great during the last two or three years to the United States as it was previously?—I believe that the exodus of our people from Canada during the last year of the Mackenzie Administration was 22,000 in round numbers; and during the first year of the Macdonald Administration, it rose to—I am now, I may say, speaking from memory, and I am open to correction—some 36,000. In the next year it advanced to 93,000; and in the year following to 118,000; while it is likely to be much larger during the present year than it has been during any year in our history. So the National Policy does not seem to act efficiently in keeping our people at home; and the rise in the price of wages, which is to be noticed in this country at the present time, is due not to the National Policy, but to the great exodus, which is taking away our labour, and taking our population from us.

Q. Do you know, whether the value of real estate has been depreciated or not since the National Policy came into force?—Yes, it has, as far as my observation goes. It is very difficult in my section of the country to sell farms, and in fact they cannot be sold now at the prices which were obtainable two or three years ago, and this is the rule throughout the country, as far as my observation extends.

Q. What percentage of depreciation do you suppose exists?—I do not know that I have any data from which I could calculate the percentage of the depreciation which has taken place.

Q. Has the percentage of depreciation been 20 per cent?—Well, to be safe in my figures, I should say that it has been 10 per cent.

Q. It is less than 25 per cent?—I only know that it is more difficult to sell farms at the present time, than it was two or three years ago; but what has been the average of this depreciation, or to what extent it exists, I would hardly venture to say.

Q. You are engaged in the business of lumbering?—Yes; I am.

Q. What effect has the National Policy had on that interest?—It has had a very beneficial one indeed.

Q. What?—It has had a very beneficial one.

Q. Do you say that the National Policy has had this effect on that interest?—The revival in trade has had this effect upon it, but as far as the National Policy is concerned, that is altogether a different matter.

Q. Where do you find a ready market for your products?—We find a market for our lumber in the United States. As far as the National Policy is concerned, the only effect that it has had on our trade has been to increase slightly the cost of some grades of supplies,—such as woollens, grains and hardware, &c. Some New Brunswick lumbermen say that the National Policy has increased the cost of production of lumber 10 per cent., and I think that this would perhaps be about the figure.

Q. It then by no means benefits the lumberman?—Not at all. It has no effect on the market, which we supply our market being entirely abroad; but it has raised to a greater or a less extent the cost of our supplies.

Q. The prosperity which exists in connection with the lumber business is entirely attributable to the prosperity which exists in the United States?—It is entirely due to that cause. As far as our market in the United States is concerned, it has been greatly increased during the past few years.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do you remember what has been the increase in the amount of our lumber trade?—No; I am not at the present time prepared with the necessary statistics, but from my own personal knowledge, I can unhesitatingly say that the prices which we now receive for our lumber are unquestionably very much higher than they were. I have spoken to Mr. Rochester and to others here, and they agree that there has been an advance of 60 or 70 per cent. in the price of lumber, compared with the price, which was obtained before the revival of trade in the United States took place. I have talked over the subject with several lumbermen, and they agree with me on this point.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you aware whether our corn growers were not obliged to export corn previous to the imposition of the duty on the American article in order to get a market?—No; I have never exported corn.

Q. Because evidence has been given before the Committee which shows that such was the case; that American corn came into Canada during the early part of the season, when corn was high in price, in such quantities that they really glutted our market, and obliged our corn growers to seek a market for their stuff in a foreign country?—I think that you will find, if you examine the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the export of corn, the produce of Canada, has been almost nothing in any year.

Q. Do you think that the home market is a better market than the foreign for the farmer?—It depends wholly upon the fact whether he can get the highest prices for what he produces at home or abroad.

Q. But as a rule which furnishes to the farmer the best market?—As a rule the farmer, after supplying the home market, is obliged to have a foreign market to which he can dispose of his surplus. This is the only way in which he can dispose of his surplus.

Q. But which of those two markets do you consider to be the best for the farmer, the home or the foreign market?—The home market is an excellent one for him to the extent in which it exists.

Q. It is better for him than the foreign market, is it?—But when his home market is supplied he must have a foreign market in which he can dispose of his surplus. In this country we must have a foreign market as extensive as the home market, or else reduce the quantity of production.

Q. That is not the question, Mr. Charlton. Do you think that the home market is not a better market for the farmer than the foreign market?—I do not think that it makes any difference where the farmer sells the produce of his farm; but he naturally supplies his customers in the home market first, and when this market is glutted he sells the balance anywhere he can find customers for it. He sends it abroad, and we are always in that position, we always have a balance to sell to foreign consumers. I say always, for there was only one year in our history when we have not had a surplus.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are you aware that, in the year 1879, we imported 3,000,000 lbs. of American pork, hams and bacon?—I have not looked at the returns in this relation, and I cannot say.

Q. Do you think that the importation of this quantity of American farm productions would affect our market in Canada at all for these articles?—I dare say that the importation of hams and bacon would affect the market here for these articles; but there was always a duty on pork, I understand.

Q. The duty on it has been increased 1 cent a lb?—Yes.

Q. The imposition of this duty affects the market of the Canadian farmer favourably?—Certainly it does, since we do not raise enough pork to meet the demands of our own home consumption.

Q. You do admit that?—Certainly I do.

Q. And we imported of beef 1,294,403 lbs. in the year 1878?—Yes.

Q. And the duty on beef has been increased 10 per cent.?—On beef.

Q. You admit that this is the case?—I do not know. I think that we raise a surplus of beef for export.

Q. No; this was imported for home consumption?—That may have been the case; but we export a larger amount than we import, and as we have a surplus of this article, that importation could not affect the price in this country.

Q. We imported, in barrelled pork, 12,000,000 lbs., in the year 1878. Are you aware of that?—Yes. If we imported more than we exported, the duty would affect the price of each article in the country.

Q. We imported of oats from the United States, in the year 1878, 2,162,292 bushels of oats. Are you aware of that?—I see that this was about the state of that year's trade in this article.

Q. I have the returns here?—Our net export of oatmeal, reduced to bushels of oats, in the year 1878, was reduced by as much as 2,014,060 bushels; consequently, whatever we may have imported, we imported 2,014,060 bushels of oats more, and the duty had no effect whatever on the price. I reduce the meal to bushels of oats at the rate of ten bushels of oats to the barrel of oatmeal.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you refer to what we exported?—I am speaking of our net export, I have arrived at this conclusion by taking our total export and deducting from it the total of our imports; and the balance will give our net export.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You are now alluding to oats, and not to oatmeal?—Of course, I have reduced the oats to oatmeal at the rate of ten bushels of oats to the barrel of oatmeal.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you take out what we exported to the United States, and what oats we manufactured into oatmeal? Do you arrive at your conclusion in that way?—Certainly I do.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. We also imported in that year from the United States 5,635,411 bushels of wheat?—Yes. Our net export of wheat—taking four and a-half bushels of wheat to the barrel of flour—amounted to 3,666,000 bushels, and consequently you will see that we had for that year a large surplus.

Q. But the Americans sent into our market that year 5,633,411 bushels of wheat?—No; but we carried that much of their grain that year through our canals.

Q. You are mistaken on that point. You do not mean to say that none of this grain was consumed in Canada?—Certainly, I do say so.

Q. Do you say that none of it was consumed in Canada?—That would make no difference. If the whole of it were consumed in this country, the worst that could happen would be to swell by that amount our surplus.

Q. You think that the consumption of this grain in Canada would make no difference to the Canadian farmer?—It would make no difference at all in the result. If we had 10,000,000 bushels of grain to export, and required 5,000,000 bushels of our own, using about that quantity, and we exported 15,000,000 instead of 5,000,000 bushels, it would have no effect on our local markets.

Q. The millers are of a different opinion from you on this point; they state that the operation of the Tariff has had the effect of increasing the price of grain on our local markets by 10 cents a bushel?—I do not think that it has had such an effect.

Q. We also imported from the United States during the year 1878, 314,530 barrels of flour?—I have put the importations of both flour and wheat together in my returns. I have calculated the quantity of flour at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  bushels of wheat to the barrel of flour, and I show that the net export of wheat and flour reached in this manner, amounted to 3,366,000 bushels of wheat.

Q. And you think that these importations into our country have had no effect on our market?—They have had no effect at all, as long as we have a surplus of

any article. Any importations that we may make of such article has no effect on the price of it.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. That is the case in your opinion?—Yes.

Q. You have no basis on which you formed that opinion?—It has the same effect—a duty imposed on an article of which we produce a surplus—as a duty would have if it were placed on woollen goods, when we supply our own wants in this particular, and we supply 65 per cent. of what we require with our own productions.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You say that it pays Canadian farmers to import American corn, with which to feed their cattle; but now that corn is 10 cents higher per bushel in the United States than it is here, how would it pay them to import it under these circumstances, seeing that they have grown corn at 10 cents less per bushel?—If the Canadian farmer wants to buy corn for the purpose of fattening his stock, he cannot get it in Canada. A small amount of corn is raised here, but it is not exported; and so small is the surplus, that it hardly amounts to a trade in the market towns of the counties where it is grown. It is true that it is lower in price than it is in Chicago, but nevertheless, if the Canadian farmer wants to buy a large amount of corn, he would be obliged to import it from the United States, as he would not be able to obtain it in Canada.

Q. But he could buy a certain amount of corn in Canada?—I made up a table showing very carefully the immediate effect on the country, of the importation of corn in the year when we imported the largest amount of corn that was ever brought into this country during the course of one season; this was the year which followed the scarcity of 1876—I refer to the year 1877. I have not this table here with me, but the result of the calculation which I prepared was this: That if we had not imported this corn, we would have consumed our entire surplus of oats, and our entire surplus of pease, and our entire surplus of rye, and 1,170,000 bushels of barley, and have been \$1,114,000 worse off than if we had not imported corn at a low price and sold our coarse grains at a high price.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. And you think that our farmers would have lost money if they had not imported the corn?—Yes; if a man can buy a bushel of corn for 50 cents and sell his barley for 80 cents a bushel he makes money by the transaction; and this is the reason why it is advantageous for our farmers to buy American corn and sell their coarse grains at a high price. If they did not follow this course they would import no corn, but they would consume our coarse grains.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Do our farmers ever grow barley to be used as food for their stock?—They never use it for that purpose when they can buy corn.

Q. Do they ever do so?—Yes, it is done sometimes; but a man is foolish to do it when he can get cheaper grain that will answer his purposes just as well. Consequently the farmer will not buy corn when he can use oats, or pease, or rye for feed.

Q. What crop do our farmers grow for feeding purposes?—They raise coarse grains.

Q. Could more corn be raised in Canada if there was a better demand for it in this country?—Oh, yes, the whole country could be put in corn; but a portion of the Province of Ontario is well adapted for the growth of corn.

Q. Would the shutting out of the American corn from this country produce a better demand for Canadian corn?—Not at all; there is a better demand for it but we do not supply it.

Q. Could more corn be raised in this country if we had a better market for it?—If it was cheaper in price, perhaps that would create a better demand for it; but a  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cent duty cannot produce a better market for Canadian corn.

Q. I am merely endeavouring to obtain an answer to a very simple question.—I do not think that a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel will encourage the production of Canadian corn.

Q. That is not an answer to my question; could more corn be raised in Canada if there was a better market for it in this country?—I have answered your question exactly. A duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel will not have the effect of increasing the production of corn in this country, in my opinion.

Q. I did not ask you that. I did not ask you whether a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel would increase the production of corn in Canada, but I asked you whether more corn could be grown in Canada if we had a better market for it in this country?—I said that you could have the whole country devoted to the growth of corn.

Q. Then would the shutting out of the American corn from this country make a better market for Canadian corn?—Oh, if you could not raise any oats, peas, or barley here, the shutting out of American corn in itself would make a better market in this country for Canadian corn to the extent of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel, which would be adding the amount of the duty to the price of the article.

Q. As a rule, do articles which are sold at home bring better prices than do articles which are exported?—That depends entirely upon the circumstances, whether there is a better market at home for the articles in question than there is abroad.

Q. As a rule, would not that be the case?—I do not know that I can answer the question on that basis.

Q. You say, Mr. Charlton, that it is more difficult to sell farms now in your neighbourhood than it was three or four years ago?—That is my experience at all events.

Q. Then farms in your neighbourhood have depreciated in value?—That is my experience.

Q. Why have they depreciated in value?—I cannot give you any answer to that question.

Q. Why is that the case?—I should say, if I attempted to answer your question, that it is due to the fact, that a great many of our people are anxious to sell out, and move to the United States or to the North-West Territories.

Q. Exactly, then the depreciation to which you refer is not due to the National Policy?—I do not think that it is due to the National Policy to a very large extent, but it may be due to this cause, to a small extent. The main fact is, that many of our people desire to emigrate.

Q. Would the exodus of people from this country be greater if there was less of manufacturing done in it?—I consider that that would be the case.

Q. Then if our people had not been employed to the extent they are, in our manufactures, what would they have done?—It seems to me, that the increased employment which is claimed to have been given to the people of this country owing to the existence of the National Policy, comprises 7,000 operatives; and this would have a very small effect on an exodus of 120,000 people per annum, in my opinion.

Q. What proportion would 7,000 bear to the number 120,000?—You can easily take up a pencil and find out for yourself.

Q. If these 7,000 people were not employed in our factories, is it likely that they would have left the country?—I think, that they might have gone into the raising of corn. They might have gone into the corn business, if the duty were high enough.

Q. How did the exportation of animals and of agricultural produce for the three years ending on the 30th of June, 1876, compare with the exportation of the same articles for the three years ending on the 30th of June, for the year 1873?—I have not made up the returns for those years; and I am not able to answer that question.

Q. Were they greater or less for the one, than for the other period?—I am not able to say, whether they were or not, as I have not looked at the returns in question.

Q. If these exports for the three years ending on the 30th of June, 1876, were greater than they were for the three years ending on the 30th of June, 1873, should this country have been more prosperous during the former, than it was during the latter period?—If they were greater?

Q. Yes; if they were greater for the three years ending the 30th of June 1876, than they were for the three years ending the 30th of June 1873, should the prosperity of this country have been greater during the former three years than it was during the latter period?—So far as the prosperity of the country depends upon the volume of its exports, its prosperity should have been greater; but other causes may have come in, which would check the operation of that influence.

Q. You said that the present prosperity of this country was due to the increase of its exports in these districts, during these past three years?—It is partly due to that circumstance, but I gave some other causes to account for this state of prosperity.

Q. Would like causes produce like effects?—Certainly, they will.

Q. If it were true, that the exports for the three years, ending on the 30th of June, 1876, were greater than the exports for the three years ending on the 30th of June, 1873, the country ought to have been more prosperous during the former period than it was during the latter period. Do you not think that this is a reasonable conclusion?—I do not understand the extent in which these two statements stand on the same basis. You might make a comparison between the year 1873, and the year 1881.

Q. No; I do not make such a comparison. I refer to the periods ending in 1876 and 1873?—By a parity of reasoning, what you say, ought to be so; unless there were some causes which intervened, and complicated the case.

Q. Does not the duty which is placed on Canadian barley, allow the American farmers to get a better price for their barley?—I understand that the quality of the barley which we raise is not the kind which is produced in that country. As to the price of Canadian barley, we have practically a monopoly in its production. The barley which is raised in the Western States is a dark barley.

Q. If there was no duty on Canadian barley going into the United States, could Canadian barley be sold cheap in that market, when it comes into competition with American barley?—Could it be sold cheaper?

Q. Yes?—It could then be sold cheaper in the United States, if the price of it were not raised in Canada.

Q. Would it then be sold any cheaper in the United States? Would it affect the prices of American barley?—Not at all; for they do not raise the same quality of barley.

Q. You cannot increase the quality of an article without decreasing the price of it; can you?—No, you cannot.

Q. Then the importation of seven or eight millions bushels of barley would have an effect on the American market if sent into that country?—It would not; if they did not raise the same quality of grain there. If Canadian barley is a kind of barley in which we have a monopoly as to the production of it, its importation into the United States would not affect the American price at all. The fact is, that the American barley is a dark barley, and it is almost invariably from 20 to 30 cents lower per bushel in that market than Canadian barley, notwithstanding the duty which is levied on the latter.

Q. What oatmeal mills were closed in Canada because the owners of them could not purchase their supplies from the United States?—I have not made up the list of them, and I consequently cannot speak positively under this head.

Q. You said that a great many of these mills were closed in consequence of that fact?—I said that a number of them were closed.

Q. You said that a great many were closed?—Perhaps I can give you a little information on this point. I understand that two of these mills have been closed in the town of Mitchell.

Q. But you were told that, since you came to this meeting of this Committee?—And one mill has been closed in the town of Sarnia; and that makes three mills which have been closed, while the operations of one of those mills in our own locality, in the town of Tilsonburg, has been very much crippled, owing to the imposition of this duty.

Q. But they were not prevented by the duty from buying American oats?—No, that would not be the case if they could grind in bond.

Q. Then the duty which was placed on American oats did not close their business operations?—It is very inconvenient for mills which are situated in the interior to purchase grain in bond. When a miller grinds oatmeal it is a great advantage to him to be able to select his own market for it, and to sell it either in the domestic or in the foreign market as he may choose. When he purchases his grain for the purpose of manufacturing it, he may not know in what market he will be disposed to sell it when it is ground. In this state of uncertainty, the duty which is placed upon grain, even if it pays him to export the product, has an injurious effect upon his business.

Q. Has the export business, in connection with produce not of Canada, decreased?—Yes, it has.

Q. You are positive on that point?—I think that such is the fact. To what class of goods do you refer?

Q. Has the export of goods, which are not the produce of Canada decreased?—To what class of goods do you refer?

Q. I refer to the total exports in this relation?—I do not know that I will venture to answer that question, I have not looked the matter up; and consequently I am not prepared to give you a positive answer.

Q. Is it your opinion, that manufactures have decreased in Canada?—No, it is not.

Q. What productions, which are purchased by the farmers of Canada, are increased in cost owing to the existence of the present Tariff?—Cotton and woollen goods are increased in cost owing to this Tariff.

Q. To what extent are woollen goods increased in price owing to this cause? And to what class of woollen goods do you refer?—Woollen goods, and agricultural implements, stoves and nails, hardware, and all kinds of building material have been increased in price owing to the existence of this Tariff.

Q. Do you know what the price of nails is to-day?—I do not know that, but I know that they are higher in price than when there was no duty on iron.

Q. Do you know at what price nails are being sold at the present time?—I have not examined the quotations, and consequently I cannot say.

Q. Why then do you state, that they are increased in price?—I say so, because in the very nature of things, the duty on iron must increase their price.

Q. Is it not the fact, that nails are now being sold at a lower price than they were before the National Policy came into force?—But they would be sold still lower in price, were it not for the existence of this duty. I mean that they are now relatively higher in price, than they would be, if there were no duty on iron.

Q. You say, that they are increased in price?—I say that they are higher in price than they would be, if the National Policy were not in operation.

Q. How much have woollen goods advanced in price owing to the existence of the National Policy?—I am not able to state what the advance in price is.

Q. Can you say that in reality there is any advance at all in the price of woollen goods to your own knowledge?—Yes, I can.

Q. To what extent has there been an advance in these goods?—I would not venture to give any definite information as to what the percentage of the advance in price is.

Q. If you know that they have advanced in price, you can speak positively on this point? You say that woollen goods are advanced in price owing to the existence of the Tariff. What classes of these goods have so advanced?—Coarse woollen goods, such as are manufactured in this country and which come into competition with the imported article, have advanced in price; they are higher in price, than they would be, if the duties had not been increased on these articles.

Q. What class of these goods have advanced in price?—Coarse tweeds have advanced in price.

Q. Have they really advanced in price?—They are higher, than they would be, if this duty did not exist.

Q. You say that they are increased in price comparatively?—I wish to be understood as saying, that these goods are relatively higher in price, that they are higher in price than they would be without the duty in question.

Q. But in reality these goods are no higher in price, than they were before the National Policy was introduced?—They may be higher than they then were, and again they may not be higher; but one thing is certain, they are higher in price than they would be, were the Cartwright Tariff in existence to-day.

Q. How many fruit-canning establishments have been started in the County of Norfolk, since this Tariff was adopted?—Two, I think, of these establishments have been started there.

Q. Two; and have fruit canning establishments largely increased the planting of peach trees in that neighbourhood?—I do not think that peach tree planting has been increased very much. The frost of the winter before last killed all the peach orchards in the country, and peach growers were rather discouraged in procuring supplies to go East.

Q. Are there not large quantities of peaches at the present time, grown in Canada?—In two years out of the last fifteen years, peaches have not been raised at all in Canada.

Q. Have peaches not always been raised along the shore of Lake Erie?—They have been raised lower down in the Niagara district.

Q. Have these canning establishments created a better market for our small fruits?—I think that they have done so.

Q. Are these establishments a direct result of the National Policy?—I think that they are not a direct result of this policy.

Q. Were there any of these establishments in Canada before the establishment of this policy?—I am not aware whether there were, or whether there were not. I do not think that they are necessarily the result of the adoption of the National Policy. But it is natural when a market is open that will give to capital profitable employment, for enterprising men to enter into new branches of business, and for new branches to be started whenever a favourable opportunity for so doing presents itself.

Q. Have you ever known American corn to be brought into Canada and sold for the purpose of feeding horses?—I have known of exceptional cases, when there was a scarcity of other grains in which this was done.

Q. Did the importation of that grain for that purpose affect the price of the corn which was grown in the county of Norfolk?—I have never known corn to be imported into the county of Norfolk for the purpose of feeding horses, or for any other purpose, except when there was a great scarcity of other suitable grains, and when these could not be procured.

Q. Did you ever know a lumberman in Canada to buy corn largely for feeding purposes?—I cannot say that I ever did know of such a case. I was engaged in lumbering in the county of Norfolk from the year 1857 down to the year 1869, and I never bought a bushel of American corn.

Q. Did you ever buy American corn chopped?—No, I never bought a bushel of it.

Q. Did you ever know of American oats being brought into the county of Norfolk in such quantity that they put down the price of oats in that county?—I never did. I never bought in the course of my business there, a bushel of American oats or corn.

Q. Did you ever buy American corn chopped?—No; I never did.

Q. Did you ever know our millers to bring in American corn, chop it up, and sell it for feed?—No; I never did. But I know that one season when the wheat crop was all out of the country, and when coarse grains were very scarce, corn was brought to Port Dover to carry our farmers over until their wheat could come in, and they could get off a grist to the mill. This was done to save them from starvation; but this is the only exception that I have known. I never saw it imported on any other occasion. I have never known corn to be imported for ordinary use in that section of the country.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Would it be just to the Canadian farmer to allow American produce to come into Canada free of duty, while their produce is not allowed to go into the United States on the same terms?—That would depend entirely on circumstances. If the Canadian farmer would be benefited by the duties which are placed on American products, it would not be just.

Q. Would it be just in principle to permit such a state of things to exist?—I think that the principle you speak of is absurd. As long as we have a surplus to sell, we should not put on an inoperative duty which will do no good to us, while it injures others.

Q. Would it be just to the Canadian manufacturer, to allow the class of goods which he produces, to be sent into this country free of duty, while his goods were taxed if he attempted to send them into the United States market?—I do not know that anyone proposes to do any such thing.

Q. But would it be just to place a less duty on American goods, than they levy on our goods of the same class?—I am not in favor of duties less than 20 per cent. for my part.

Q. Would it be fair to admit their manufactures at a much less duty than the duties which they put on our goods?—No, it would not.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you in favour of the admission into this country of American manufactured goods, and of American farm produce, free of duty?—I am in favor of a Revenue Tariff on manufactured goods.

Q. Would you favor the admission of American farm produce into this country free of duty?—I am in favor of utilising the system of canals, on which we have spent millions of dollars for the purpose of developing the carrying trade, and of making Montreal a great commercial city, of keeping our shipping fully employed by the pursuit of such a policy, and of rapidly increasing our marine.

Q. But are you in favor of admitting American farm produce into Canada free of duty?—I am in favor of admitting American farm produce of all kinds, of which we have a surplus, into this country free of duty, as under these circumstances the imposition of duties on them can do us no good.

Q. Would you revert back to the system which was in force previous to the inauguration of the National Policy?—Substantially, I would do so. I am in favour of a duty on pork and on all such articles, the prices of which to the farmer would be increased by the imposition of duties, but in cases where the imposition of duties would do us no good, I am opposed to them as inoperative and useless as far as the farmer is concerned, while they may be injurious to others.

Q. Then you think that a duty is of some good as far as the question of pork is concerned?—Yes; but I do not think that a duty is of any use as far as grain is concerned.

The examination of Mr. Charlton was at this point closed, and the Committee adjourned.

NATHANIEL CURRIE, of Glencoe, examined.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you engaged in agriculture?—Yes.

Q. Have you been long engaged in farming?—Yes, I have always farmed.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you work your farm yourself?—My boys do most of the work.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What is the extent of your farming operations?—I have been in the habit of farming about 400 acres; but the village is growing one hundred acres, and that reduces the quantity I farm.

Q. Do you think it is in the interests of the farmers of Canada to admit any or all kinds of farm produce free of duty from the United States?—No, I do not.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Why?—In the first place we require a certain amount of revenue to run the machinery of the country; and I think it is very unfair to the Canadian farmer to place the American farmer 20 per cent. ahead of him. If the American farmers refuse to allow us the free use of their markets, it is unfair to allow the American farmer the free use of ours.

Q. Are you speaking simply in reference to grain?—The products of the soil.

Q. But if we have a surplus what effect can it have on that particular cereal, —It strikes me very forcibly that the American farmer would scarcely take advantage of our Canadian market if it paid him better to send his produce to Europe. There are certain seasons of the year in which, and certain parts of the Dominion where the Americans can supply our demand. The consequence of the Americans doing that is to compel the Canadian farmer to pay the ocean freight to the Liverpool market, instead of the American farmer having to pay it.

Q. I do not quite understand that?—Say we have a surplus. Then if the American harvest is in before ours and American grain is imported to fill up our home consumption, we must find an outlet to the graneries of the world and pay the freight to those granaries, instead of the Americans, who have sent their grain here.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. And would not the millers who supply the home market get quicker returns, save interest, and able to pay the farmer for his wheat, by having the control of their own market?—I can scarcely answer that question. I am not familiar with that subject. Of course I came here entirely unprepared, and I do not wish to give evidence from a party stand point in these matters. I only desire to give evidence in accordance with my convictions, and with reference to what has come under my own observation.

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of the duty on Indian corn and coarse grain in your section of the country?—I think it has had a very beneficial effect.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. On what grain?—On Indian corn. It has increased the price of coarse grain. I think if my memory serves me right, there were some 8,400,000 bushels of American corn imported into Canada in 1876 or 1877, and a large quantity of it was exported again. The balance of it was used here and came into direct competition with our coarse grain. A large quantity was used in the manufacture of liquor in our distilleries. The importation of Indian corn into the Dominion of Canada free, caused our farmers in the West to cease growing rye, which was a very profitable crop to supply our distilleries. They ceased growing it through the distilleries being supplied with American corn.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. That was previous to the imposition of the duty?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you know the price of Canadian corn?—No.

Q. Do you know the price of American corn in Detroit?—I do not.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the produce of corn and of rye increased in your section of the country since the duties have been imposed?—The growth of corn has increased. I do not know whether they have commenced to raise rye, but I have heard that many are going into the raising of rye if the duty is kept on American corn.

Q. Can you grow Indian corn profitably in your section of the country?—Indian corn in parts of Middlesex is a very profitable crop.

Q. How much can be raised per acre there?—Sixty or seventy bushels.

Q. Is it a good crop for a rotation crop?—Yes; very good.

Q. Why?—It keeps the ground in good order, and it is a very profitable crop for the farmer to raise. Some farmers in our section raise as high as twenty-five

acres a year. Of course last year was not as good as previous years for corn; but it is a good paying crop.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you raise much yourself?—No; I do not raise a great deal of corn.

Q. Do you raise any?—Some years I do, and some years I do not.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think sufficient corn for the use of our cattle feeders could be grown in this country?—Yes; I have no doubt of it. As a general rule the farmers of this country raise sufficient to feed their own cattle. It might be to the convenience of the middle men who do not raise any crops of any kind to have American corn imported free of duty, without considering the prejudicial effect it would have in coming in competition with our other coarse grains.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you feed much stock?—I do not feed much in the winter.

Q. Do you raise much barley?—Yes.

Q. Do you not think it would be a benefit to sell the barley and buy corn for feeding purposes?—No; I do not think it would. I am not speaking now of the benefit to one man—of individual benefit. What I hold is this: that it is not to the benefit of Canadian farmers to send away four millions of gold and put it in the American farmers' pockets, and at the same time encourage the farmers of the United States to raise that particular article when we can raise it in our own country.

Q. You have reference to corn?—Yes, corn. I think, if my memory serves me, something like \$4,000,000 of Canadian money went into the United States for corn.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. In that case you would advocate the raising of the duty a little higher still, because, I see, large quantities come in yet?—I would not object to it being raised higher. However, I do not think it should be sufficiently high to exclude any article from our markets. Let them come in, but let them pay for the use of our market as we have to pay for the use of theirs.

Q. Then, you think, when a duty is imposed on American corn, the American farmer, whose corn is sent to Canada, loses the duty?—That just depends on the supply and demand.

Q. But you said just now, that if they get the use of our market they should pay for it?—Well, either the American farmer, or the Canadian who purchases, should contribute towards the revenue of the country, if we are not to have a repetition of the large deficits we had before 1878.

Q. But the duty has not been high enough to stop corn altogether from coming in?—It has been high enough to increase the revenue.

Q. But I was speaking directly of the farmers' interests?—It is to the interest of the farmer that the debt of the country be not increased.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. If we want to increase the revenue, would it not be a benefit to import large quantities of Indian corn for distilling purposes?—I cannot see how importing corn for distilling purposes would increase the revenue.

Q. We require very large quantities of it for such purposes, and if the duty is paid on all that is imported, would not that increase the revenue?—Well, if we can raise that corn and keep the money at home, would it not be better than buying it from abroad?

Q. Do you know that there are very few counties adapted to the raising of corn?—I am told there are some that are not adapted. I also heard in evidence to-day that clay soil is not suitable for corn. Now, that is not a fact. Heavy clay loam is well adapted for corn, and raises the very best of corn in our section of the country.

Q. I thought it required a light loam?—No; you can take the heaviest clay loam, and if you till the land properly you have good corn, if the frost does not kill it.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Still it is better adapted for other kinds of grain?—No.

Q. Do you think it is as well adapted for corn as anything else?—I think you can raise just as profitable a crop of corn on it as any other grain.

Q. On what class of land do you raise rye?—On sandy soil principally.

Q. Has the production of it recently been extended?—Not that I am aware of.

Q. Then the duty has not had any effect upon it?—No; but a great many have spoken of going into the growing of rye if the duties are continued.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think that the greater the variety of grain grown on a farm the better it is?—Yes. Rotation of crops, as well as variety of stock, is beneficial to the farmer.

Q. Do you think the imposition of duties makes it beneficial to grow a larger variety of farm products than previous to the imposition of the duty?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What is the extra variety they are growing?—There are a great many things to be taken into consideration in dealing with the products of the soil. The more you encourage manufacturing, and the more manufactures spring up, it creates a home consumption right at your own door, not for wheat, rye, corn and barley alone, but for all kinds of vegetables and poultry.

Q. Where do they find a market in your section just now?—We find an increased market in our own village.

Q. What industry has sprung up in your village?—A woollen factory has sprung into existence since the introduction of the National Policy, and a machine factory for manufacturing reapers, mowers, horse rakes, &c. These employ several hands; and the more hands there are to be employed, the more advantageous it is to the farmers adjacent.

Q. Perhaps they were doing business in some other place before they came there?—I cannot say whether or not. The young man who came there came from London, and I cannot say whether he had a business there or not.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Have they added much to the population of your village?—Not a great deal. The village I speak of is a small one.

Q. Then you think the duties have had a beneficial effect on the price of other grain besides corn?—Yes; I think they have on the whole.

Q. How much has it advanced in price?—I cannot say. It gives us the control of our own market. I remember—I think it was in 1876 or 1877, one of the two—that the price of wheat in our section rose to a figure that neither the Liverpool nor the United State market would justify. The farmers were asking a pretty good price and it ran up pretty high. The consequence was that a neighbouring miller, one at Strathroy, went over to the United States and purchased six or eight carloads of American wheat, and the price of the grain came down. That was just before harvest. Then we all know the American farmer can have his grain thrashed and he can supply our demand before ours is cut. As I said before that necessitates our Canadian farmers paying the freights to the markets of the world, instead of the American farmer, for I do not think an American farmer would for one moment sell a bushel of wheat in Canada if he could get a better price for it elsewhere.

Q. Does he get more by it coming to Canada than he would if he sent it to Liverpool?—I cannot say positively whether he would or not, but I look upon the American people as being as shrewd as other people, and I fancy they would not supply our Canadian market, simply because we are Canadians, at a lower price than they can sell their wheat for in Liverpool.

Q. But we have been told here that when a man goes over there to buy and tells them he is from Canada, they will sell to him at a lower rate than they sell to their own people?—I cannot say what you have been told. I can only say what I know myself.

Q. Do they pay the American farmer more for the grain here than he could get if he sent to Liverpool?—I am satisfied that the American farmer could not have realized the same price if he had shipped to Liverpool.

Q. The same price that our millers paid him?—The same price that our millers paid him at the time.

Q. I suppose our millers would go to the American market and buy it at market prices?—They would buy it as low as they could. Still, if the Americans saw that our millers were out of a supply, they would be very likely to make the best of it.

Q. Then, you think these people would charge a man from Canada a little more in that case?—I think the American merchant would make the best he could out of his grain; and there are certain times in Canada—

Q. But I am speaking of this specific case?—I also am telling about this specific case. There are times in Canada when the price in Ontario is higher than in their market; and it is then that the American farmer can take the advantage of our frontier.

Q. I suppose just before harvest they would be in the same position as ourselves, and the profits would not be realized by the American farmer, but by the dealer?—It does not follow that the high price is realized always by the dealer; because there are many farmers who have wheat in their granaries all the year round, and some of them hold it to their disadvantage:

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Suppose the duties were abolished, would there be greater quantities imported than now?—If the duties were abolished by the Washington Government, I would be quite willing to see the duties abolished by the Government here. I would be willing to see a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty.

Q. Are the mills kept running fully in your neighborhood?—I could not say whether they are run night and day or not at present. I hardly think they are.

Q. Are you aware that a number of our mills are shut down for the want of grain to keep them running?—I am not aware that the Tariff prevents the Canadian miller from buying American wheat in bond, and grinding it and sending it away.

Q. But at a great disadvantage?—Not much of a disadvantage.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you tell us what the effect of the imposition of a duty upon American wheat has been upon the price of our wheat?—I think you will find I have answered that already.

Q. You have to some extent. But will you specify the effect on the different classes of fall and spring wheat?—As to spring wheat we raise very little in our section. It used to be a profitable crop; but since the virgin soil has been worn off, our land is not adapted to spring wheat. Millers sometimes send away for it in order to mix with other wheat to make a better class of flour.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where do they send to for it?—I cannot say.

Q. To Minnesota?—No. They raise very good spring wheat up about Goderich.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I suppose they raise it on all the new portions of the Province?—Yes.

Q. What effect has the duty upon the red fall wheat?—I think it has the effect of giving us more immediate control of our own market. We raise a large quantity of red fall wheat there and some white, but we find that the red wheat is hardier and stands the winter better, in fact that it is a more profitable crop.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. And sells at a higher price?—I think it does just now.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the duties upon live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard increased the price in the Canadian market?—I don't think any person will attempt to question that it has. Go to London to-day and you will find any quantity packed up for the North-West Territory, and they are shipping there continually. If it was not for the Tariff I presume that market would be supplied from Chicago, St. Paul or elsewhere in the United States.

Q. Have the increased duties on horses and other live stock given a home market, especially in Manitoba and the North-West?—There are large numbers of horses

shipped from our section to Manitoba, and the prices are much higher than they were previous to the National Policy. In fact the price of horses are very high in our section of the country.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are they as high as they were in 1856 and from that to 1859?—They are higher than ever I knew them to be. Three year old colts sold as high as \$300 a pair.

Q. Do you not find a market in the United States for your separate horses?—Some go to the United States.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs, and so on improved?—Yes decidedly.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where do you find a market for your vegetables?—I am speaking of the country generally and not as to our own little village directly. But I may say we do find a market for our eggs and vegetables in Glencoe, Strathroy and London.

Q. To a limited extent?—No, it takes a greater quantity than you suppose.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose your experience must be confined to your own locality?—No, I am round the country a good deal.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would not our eggs and vegetables find a ready market in the United States?—I should think so, if there was free admission for them.

Q. What effect has the duty upon them?—I have not said that that was our outlet; but if we had a reciprocity of tariffs, our Canadians who live on the border of the United States close to their manufacturing towns, would take the advantage of their market from which they are excluded now.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Have you looked at the figures touching the export of eggs to the American market last year?—No, I have not.

Q. Have you shipped any produce to the United States yourself?—No.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do the Americans export eggs to Manitoba and the North-West?—I could not say as to that, I have no doubt that they do; but I cannot speak of my own knowledge.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You do not know that we ship a large quantity of eggs to the United States?—I should think that we ship some. I am only speaking of what I know myself.

Q. But you were speaking just now as to the general business of the country. You said the poultry market had increased, and I supposed you would be aware of this also?—I have been to London, Strathroy, Glencoe, and those are all the places I mentioned. I have no doubt that the market has increased wherever there is increased manufactures. We find that even the little town of Strathroy has become one of the workshops for the great North-West, which would never have been the case had it not been for the effects of the National Policy.

Q. By how much has Strathroy's population increased?—I cannot say as to the increase. I have seen the census, but I have not the figures in my memory.

Q. Have you shipped largely of potatoes to the American market this year?—No, the potatoe crop was not very good in our neighborhood.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What has been the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool?—I cannot say as to the price of wool. I am not posted in that line, although the woollen men who started in our village, told me the effect of the National Policy had been to increase the quantity of the finer quality of tweeds produced in Canada, and we give the Canadian manufacturer the control of the home market; so that the price had really been reduced on the finer qualities as well as on the coarser qualities, but the coarser qualities are not so much in use now as they were before the Tariff.

Q. Has the duty on wool increased the price or demand for Canadian wool to the farmers?—I could not say as to that for I have not looked into that point.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You know the price of wool, surely?—I should.

Q. Well, has it increased any?—It is about the same price as it was.

Q. Is it not a good deal cheaper than it was in 1878?—The question was what effect the Tariff had had on the price of wool. My answer is that I cannot say as to that point. Then I went on to state what a manufacturer of woollen goods told me.

Q. It is your evidence we want—not lies. It does not matter what he told you?—All right.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you know there is a larger demand for Southdown wool?—There is a greater demand for the finer qualities of wool that are admitted into the Dominion free of duty; the consequence is that it has increased the manufacture of the better qualities of tweeds, and has caused the price to be lower to the farmer on account of the manufacture of the finer quality. As to the price of wool I do not know whether it has increased or decreased.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. There is no duty on fine wool?—I understand there is no duty on fine wool.

Q. Then the Tariff must be a farce so far as the duty on wool is concerned?—I have stated already that as to the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool I cannot speak.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do you keep sheep?—I have none this year; I used to keep sheep.

Q. You have gone out of the business?—I have sold them out, I intended to buy more of a different quality.

Q. Do you not think it would be a fine thing to have a duty on fine wool?—I cannot say as to that point.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the cost of farm implements increased or decreased?—As to the cost of farm implements they have decidedly decreased. Farm implements are cheaper now than they were in 1878, and they are of a better quality.

Q. Have the prices of woollens, cottons and hardware, which are in common use among farmers, increased or otherwise?—If there is any difference the woollen tweeds are lower.

Q. What about hardware: can you give an instance, in your experience, in which the price has been decreased?—Hardware has decreased in price. Nails have decreased. I was astonished to hear a statement to-day that nails have increased. You can buy them at \$1 a 100 lbs. cheaper in our village than you can buy them by the car-load on the American side.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where are they made?—They are made in Canada.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Is there any duty on the raw material out of which they are made?—I think so.

Q. Would not they be cheaper if there were no duty on the raw material?—I do not know, but I know that we have never had nails cheaper.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Would they be manufactured in Canada, if it was not for the protective policy?—There is a nail factory which has sprung into existence since the National Policy. I fancy if there were no nail factories in the Dominion, or only one as there was before the National Policy came into operation, we would have to pay the American price with the duty added.

Q. How long is it ago that there was only one nail factory in Canada?—I think there was only one in Canada in 1878.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I thought there was one in Hamilton?—Did not that shut up?

Q. No.—It was the next thing to being closed, for they did not make anything until very recently.

Q. You remarked just now that a previous witness said nails were not cheaper, and you said it was preposterous for a man to say that nails were not cheaper. I heard that witness give his evidence, and he said “not relatively cheaper?”—He would be wrong in that too; because if relatively cheaper they would be lower in proportion to the price paid in the United States, and to the price paid in 1878, in Canada. Take either case and they are lower now.

Q. Can you give us quotations from the United States?—You will have to pay \$3.25 in the United States. You can buy them retail in the village of Glencoe at \$2.25.

Q. And the Americans pay \$3.25?—I am speaking from memory, but I think I am very near correct.

Q. You are not positive?—I am not.

Q. Supposing our raw material came in duty free, would not nails be cheaper?—Nails might be cheaper, but you must remember that the United States manufacture nails now, and they cost the consumer at least \$1 a hundred more than we have to pay in Canada.

Q. I do not think they do, and you say you are not positive. I am speaking though of the raw material for the nail maker?—You must bear this point in mind, when speaking of raw material, we must have a revenue, a certain amount of money with which to run the machinery of this country from some source. I hope the day is not far distant when our Government will encourage the manufacture of all kinds of iron and steel in the Dominion of Canada.

Q. What puzzles me to understand is, that in the farmers' interests, you are quite willing that, in the matter of wool, there should be no protection on the grade of wool which you maintain we should grow; but as soon as the question of nails arises you propose to protect the farmer by making him pay a duty on that article for the purpose of raising a revenue?—I cannot help what you cannot understand. What we farmers understand is that the price of nails is lower now than in 1878, and in view of that fact we are satisfied.

Q. Are you satisfied that it was the imposition of the duty that reduced the price?—I am satisfied that I know that if it had not been for the imposition of a duty we would not have the same amount of nails manufactured that we have.

Q. You do not know whether the raw material is cheaper now than it was?—I do not know about the raw material. We do not buy that in the village.

Q. We had testimony here from a manufacturer of waggons that his iron cost him more in consequence of the imposition of the duty; that his paints cost him more, and his raw material generally cost him more; and he was a party actively engaged in the business.—Did he tell you he charged the farmer a higher price for his waggons?

Q. No; he did not. I am only quoting this as the evidence of a man in the business.—Of course. I speak only of the prices of articles with which I am familiar, and these are nails, in particular, and one class of spades.

Q. But the mere fact of the nails being lower after the duty was imposed does not prove anything unless you bring along a statement of the cost of the raw material.—It does to my mind.

Q. Suppose, a few years ago, the price of wheat was higher than now that we have a Tariff on. Would you attribute the restriction in the price to the Tariff?—I have answered the question about grain. I do not think you will find many farmers ready to allow the Americans the free use of our market unless they will give us the free use of theirs.

Q. You said that when we put a duty on nails, nails went down; but that when we put a duty on wheat, wheat went up.—I do not say that. I say the duty gave us the benefit of our own market; and I repeat that it is not in the interests of the Canadian farmer to allow the American farmer the right to supply our deficiencies without giving us the same right in return.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you not think that the artizans employed in our manufactories are large revenue producers; do they not assist in paying the revenue of the country?—Whether we should make use of the word “large” or not, I do not know; but they certainly do contribute revenue.

Q. And thereby relieve the burdens of the farmers? Yes. Certainly, the more you increase the population, the more there are to bear the burden of taxation.

Q. Has the value of farm property in your part of the country increased or decreased under the National Policy?—There is another point of difference between the gentleman who gave evidence to-day and myself. The value of farm property has decidedly increased. It has increased from 10 to 20 per cent.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. I am glad to hear that; but since when?—Since 1878.

Q. Real estate?—Real estate; farm property.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Are many of your farmers going to the North-West?—Quite a number.

Q. Who are filling their places, neighbors? Or are strangers coming in?—As a general rule it is the young man of the family who goes to the North-West. Perhaps the father has 100 acres of land, a farm not large enough to supply the wants of father and sons, so the young men go to the North-West with what little help the father can give them, as one of my sons has.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are many farms for sale in your locality?—I suppose some could be bought by giving a price for them.

Q. I understood you to say real estate had gone up by 10 per cent. since the National Policy had come into operation?—Yes, and more.

Q. Will you say fifteen?—I say the increase would exceed 10 per cent.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What is the price of a farm in your section of the country?—From \$6,000 to \$7,000 for 100 acres. I know fifty acres sold the other day for \$3,000, with nothing but a little log house or log barn on it.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Perhaps it was near the town, or it had some natural advantages?—No, it was a little way out.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Then there are not many of your farmers offering to sell their farms?—Some are selling. From this fifty acre lot a whole family went to the North-West.

Q. And where do you find purchasers for these farms?—Farmers in the neighbourhood, and sometimes others from a distance buy them.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the general condition of the farmers and the labouring classes improved since 1878 in consequence of the Tariff?—Yes, decidedly improved, the general state of prosperity in the country aiding them.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do you think the prosperity is mainly due to the Tariff?—I think it is partially due to the Tariff.

Q. Are there any other circumstances that have helped us?—Yes. I think one of the gentlemen who gave evidence here this morning assigned a very good reason for a portion of the prosperity.

The Committee adjourned.

OTTAWA, Tuesday, 25th April, 1882.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock.

JOHN ABELL examined.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Where do you reside?—At Woodbridge.

Q. What industry are you engaged in?—In the manufacture of agricultural implements.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that industry?—I have been engaged in it since 1849; for about thirty-five years.

Q. How many hands do you employ?—I employ at present, including agents, about 200.

Q. Can you give us any idea as to the amount of wages paid out by you?—Previous to this year we have employed from 100 to 150 hands, but just now we have more. I can give you the figures of our sales and the wages. In 1877, the sales were \$81,796; the wages paid out were \$39,000. In 1878, the sales were \$100,000; the wages paid out, \$40,000. In 1879, the sales were \$86,000; the wages paid out, \$14,000. This was on account of some improvements going on in the works—putting in new machinery and improvements that we required. That year there was, in consequence of this, as I say, a decrease in the sales, and an increase in the wages. In 1880, the sales were \$116,000; the wages paid out, \$45,000. In 1881, the sales were \$119,000; the wages, \$47,000. In 1880, out of the sales to the amount of \$116,000, \$37,200 worth of machines went to the North-West. In 1881, out of the \$119,000 worth of implements sold, \$42,000 worth went to the North-West. In 1880, there were fourteen shipments, amounting to \$37,200 to the North-West. In 1881, there were seventeen shipments, amounting to \$42,000.

Q. Has your industry been benefited by the National Policy?—Yes, I think it has. The National Policy gave us the North-West Territory, which we had not before.

Q. From what quarter was the North-West supplied with implements of the kind you manufacture, previous to the National Policy?—I had shipped a little previous to that. In 1876, I made two shipments of \$850 to the North-West; in 1877, two of \$1,200 to the North-West. In 1878, I made none, I don't know for what precise reason, but probably it was owing to the trade being taken by the Americans.

Q. Did the Americans supply that market previous to the National Policy?—Yes.

Q. Can you manufacture farm implements as cheaply under the present Tariff as under the former one?—We are selling farm implements to-day at the same rate at which we sold them in 1870—precisely the same price.

Q. Is the quality as good?—The quality is better. We have put improvements into the implements and have not raised the price in proportion to the improvements.

Q. Do you think, from your knowledge of your locality, that the Tariff has benefited the farmers in the neighborhood of your manufacturing establishment?—I think so. There is an increased payment of wages, and they must have reaped the benefit of the outlay of those wages.

Q. What particular class of farm implements do you manufacture?—I have been manufacturing, I may say, nearly every implement for farm use; but I am now bringing myself more to a specialty in the way of thrashing machines and portable engines. We find that if we can get sufficient sales it pays us better to make a specialty than a variety of implements.

Q. You can manufacture cheaper by paying special attention to one line than by going into a number of lines?—Yes; and by having men educated to the production of one particular article we increase the output.

Q. And by adopting that system you will be able to supply the farmers cheaper?—Yes.

Q. Could that system be adopted where the market is limited?—Not so well.

Q. And the Tariff by increasing and enlarging your market has enabled you to make that change?—Yes, to make that change. You will observe by comparing the sales and the wages that by adopting that system the output is larger in proportion than the wages. In 1877, the sales were \$81,000, and the wages \$39,000. In 1878, the sales were \$100,000, and the wages were \$40,000. I will pass over the year

1879 when the sales were \$36,000, and the wages \$44,000, on account of new machinery coming in, and take 1880, when there were \$116,000 of sales and \$45,000 of wages, and 1881 when there were \$119,000 sales and \$47,000 of wages. Of course, that is just taking the wage question, leaving the material out of the question altogether.

Q. How does the cost of raw material compare with formerly?—There are fluctuations in the market. I just took a memorandum before I came away of the average cost of iron, taking the sterling value, in order to show the fluctuations in the English market. It fluctuates here sometimes in the same proportion, and sometimes not in the same proportion. When it is not in the same proportion it is on account of the high rate of freights. Freights now are high; 27s. 6d. are ocean rates. I have had iron brought out from Glasgow at 12s. 6d. These are the prices on the English market. Pig iron, in 1876, highest 72s.; lowest 60s.; average 65s. 1877, highest 64s. 6d.; lowest 59s. 6d.; making the average 60s. 8d. 1878, highest 59s.; lowest 48s. 6d. This was the year of the introduction of the National Policy when we bought cheaper than for many years before, owing to the state of the English market. We bought it for \$18 a ton delivered in Toronto. In 1879, the highest was 72s. 6d.; the lowest 44s. 6d.; the average 51s. 6d. In 1880, the highest was 90s.; the lowest 51s.; the average 62s. 10d. In 1881, the highest was 63s.; the lowest 54s.; the average 58s. 6d. It was the same with bar iron. In 1876, the highest price was £8 10s.; the lowest £6 5s. That year it was selling in Toronto at \$2.50 per 100 lbs. In 1877, the highest was £6 15s.; the lowest £6; the average was £6 5s. 8d. That year it was selling in Toronto at \$2.10. In 1878, the highest was £7 10s.; the lowest £6 10s.; the average was £7 4s. 5d. That was selling in Toronto at \$1.90; it varied a little during the year. In 1879, the highest was £8; the lowest £6; leaving the average at £6 5s. 8d. That year it was selling at \$1.85 in Toronto. In 1880, the highest was £8 10s.; the lowest £6; the average £7 2s. 1d. It was selling in Toronto that year at from \$1.90 to \$2.50. In 1881, the highest was £6 5s.; the lowest £5 10s.; the average £5 18s. 5d. Now there was a difference of £6 5s. in 1881, and £8 in 1879; but we paid more in 1881 in Toronto than in 1879, owing to the high rate of ocean freights. Pig iron the same way.

Mr. Bain:—I suppose you use more iron than formerly relatively?—Yes, Sir.

Q. More parts are made of iron?—Yes; well we use a great deal of steel too.

By Mr. Trow:—

Q. How does the weights of the articles compare with what they were in 1878?—They are about the same as in 1878, that is in the machines that I build. Of course, there are some makers who build light reapers that are not so heavy.

Q. Are your reapers as heavy as formerly?—We are not doing much in reapers now; we are doing most largely in thrashers and engines.

By the Chairman:—

Q. Are the thrashers about the same weight?—There is little more iron in them.

Q. Still you can sell them as cheaply as ever?—Cheaper; that is to say, taking into consideration the work and the material, they are cheaper now than they were ten years ago.

By Mr. Trow:—

Q. That is owing to the price of the raw material?—No, it is owing to the new machines we have put in, and the appliances we are using to increase the production.

By Mr. Bain:—

Q. I suppose when you invested in new machinery in 1878, it was with a view to turning out a great amount of finished work in proportion to the labour?—Well we are continually improving.

Q. Do you send engines to the North-West?—Yes, Sir.

Q. Will you be able to do business there in that line?—Yes, Sir.

Q. What class of boilers do you make, upright or locomotive?—Locomotive.

Q. Specially for portable engines.—Yes; portable engines for thrashing machines.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. There were none of these articles needed in the North-West prior to 1878?—They were needed as much then, but they were not called for.

Q. You are aware of the proportion of population there in 1878, compared with what it is now. A dense population, you must admit, requires more material than a small one.—Yes.

Q. Did you do much business prior to 1878 in the North-West?—In 1876, we made two shipments of \$850; in 1877, two of \$1,200; in 1878 there were no shipments; in 1879, there was a shipment of \$2,000; in 1880, fourteen shipments, amounting to \$37,700; and in 1881, seventeen shipments, amounting to \$42,000.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you know anything as to the quantity of American goods that competed with yours in the North-West during these periods?—No, Sir; but I understand from a gentleman who has come from there that they cannot bring American engines in there now. We sell a ten-horse power at \$800 here, for which they ask \$900 on the American side; and for the same class of goods in England they ask £180 sterling.

Q. So that whether you had the duty or not you would have the advantage of the market.—Of course their market has gone up, owing to the increased demand; they, nevertheless, made this a sort of slaughter market previous to the introduction of the Tariff.

Q. I suppose the present improved times there have advanced prices in almost everything?—We have not advanced our prices at all.

Q. No; but I am speaking of the American side—I cannot say as to that. Labor has gone up there, though, and I suppose prices have increased there.

Q. Do you know anything regarding the freight rates from Chicago and St. Paul to Winnipeg as compared with rates from here to Chicago?—They are enormous. They charge as much from St. Paul to Emerson as they do from Toronto to St. Paul. The average rate for a carload is \$293, and out of that they get \$152 from St. Paul.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you get special rates?—Yes.

Q. What is the duty now?—We pay no duty.

Q. I mean our duty on American goods going into the North-West.—Twenty-five per cent.; it was formerly 17½.

Q. That amounts almost to prohibition, does it not?—No, I think not. I get American goods even here. We get in fact two or three articles from the United States that we have always dealt with them for, as we think we can do better with them than buying them here.

Q. Are your patterns chiefly American?—No, they are my own.

Q. Do you make any reapers now?—Yes.

Q. Have you sent any to the North-West?—No, I have not sent any to the North-West.

Q. What do you generally send?—Thrashing machines and portable engines.

Q. What is the price of your thrashing machines?—From \$1,075, with a portable engine, up to \$1,175. We make different kinds; ten, twelve, fourteen and sixteen horse power. We have tread power machines, too. We are sending some down to Halifax. They are machines that a horse walks on; he walks on a platform.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. You find a market in Nova Scotia for these?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose the sale of these has gone out in Ontario?—There are a very few used in Ontario, but you cannot sell anything else in the Lower Provinces.

Q. How does the Tariff affect the other raw material that you use? Has it not a prejudicial effect?—I do not feel it. Our increased output more than out-balances that.

Q. Has it added anything to the cost of your raw material; there are a variety of imported articles required in your machines?—We have not increased the cost of anything; our list remains the same.

Q. You purchase at just the old rates?—Yes. The rate of wages has increased, I do not know whether it will go on increasing much longer.

Q. Have you had any strikes?—Not exact'y; but I have to keep the hands quiet.

*By Mr. Trow ;—*

Q. What has been the proportion of increase in wages?—Ten or fifteen per cent. this year.

Q. Do you manufacture ploughs?—Yes.

Q. Do you send away to the North-West?—No. I am going gradually out of ploughs, and into a specialty. We used to sell a number of ploughs before I was burned out in 1874.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Have you increased the price of ploughs?—No, Sir.

*By Mr. Trow ;—*

Q. Do you manufacture seed drills?—Yes.

Q. Do you send any of these out to the North-West?—No. I sent some up in 1876, but none since.

*By Mr. Bain ;—*

Q. I suppose you find your improved machinery facilities is cheapening the product very much?—Yes. We are trying our skill in that direction all the time. We are putting in a new machine this year, that in 1879 cost \$6,000, for rivetting boilers. It does the work of six gangs of men. One man and two or three helpers do the work of six sets of riveters.

Q. That will enable you to increase your output and to produce more cheaply than formerly?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you use coal?—Yes.

Q. What quantity in a year?—About 200 tons, and perhaps a little more.

Q. Does the duty affect you any?—I expect it does a little.

Q. Do you add the duty as an addition to the cost of the article?—No.

Q. You must have a sum equal to the duty?—As I said before, our profits at the end of the year do not seem to be affected by it on account of the increased output.

Q. The purchasing power of the people is better than formerly on account of the good crops?—That might have had something to do with it. Providence has blessed us with good crops, and we are thankful for them.

Q. Are you able to get special rates in consequence of your coal coming to Canada?—I get cheap freights—return cargoes.

Q. Do you import your own coal?—Sometimes I import it.

Q. Do the dealers on the other side make special concessions to you?—Sometimes.

Q. To what extent?—They understand the Tariff we have to pay, and give us a larger discount sometimes.

Q. How much a ton discount do you think they allow you?—I could not say. I have not noticed the coal so much as other items.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. In what other items have you noticed that they give you an advantage over their own people?—In varnish, bolts, and other things.

Q. That is they sell to the Canadian cheaper than to their own people?—They give us a larger discount.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose our Custom House officers go over your invoice at the boundary?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. To some extent then the duty is taken out of the American purchasers in the United States?—Yes. They do not like to lose their own customers, and they make efforts to retain them. Our Canadian varnish is not so good as the American on account of the want of age.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I suppose they calculate to lose half the duty ?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do I understand you to say that you can build a portable engine cheaper than they can manufacture them for in England ?—I am selling them for less than they sell them for there.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Are the articles similar ?—Yes.

Q. Are yours as good ?—Yes.

Q. How do you account for your building them cheaper, then ?—I suppose I have less profits.

Q. Is not labour cheaper in England ?—I do not know that it is.

Q. Are the raw materials cheaper ?—Yes ; in this way : there is the difference of freight and duty.

Q. That seems extraordinary ?—It seems anomalous. When I was in Philadelphia exhibiting a portable engine, the President of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, John Coleman, noticed the price on my engine, and asked me a similar question to that which you have put, how it was I produced the engine so cheaply. He said he paid £180 sterling for one a few weeks before he left, and he was one of the judges. I told him I could not account for it in any other way than that I suppose we got less profits. Of course we know the iron costs them less than it costs us.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose they build heavier machines than we do ?—As a general thing ; but the greatest difficulty has been to dispense with weight.

Q. And make the engine more portable ?—To make them more portable. We could make them heavier with less trouble and put a cheaper class of goods in them.

Q. I suppose you use steel ?—We use Landore Siemen's steel in the fire boxes. There is no duty on it. It is free, and I hope it will continue so. We test all our boilers before they go out up to 200 lbs. hydraulic pressure.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. From your experience in the manufacture of reapers and mowers, hoes, rakes and various other implements, do you think they can be sold to the farmer cheaper under the present Tariff than under the former Tariff ?—I think so.

Q. And of as good a quality ?—Yes ; on account of the increased demand, we can make more of them, and as I said, when a man is educated to one particular machine, he can produce more in a day than if he was taken off to work on a number of articles.

*By Mr Trow :—*

Q. Is there much competition in your line ?—Very keen competition.

Q. Where is it located ?—It is increasing all the time. There are establishments at Stratford, Fingall, and Clinton.

Q. Are they making thrashing machines at Stratford ?—Yes.

Q. Who is ?—Macpherson. There is an establishment at London. I think there is another already there. On Lake Erie there is another. Watson, of Ayr, did make them. There is a manufactory at Hamilton ; also F. W. Glenn is making them. Brown, at Napanee, makes them, and another party at Smith's Falls.

Q. Do you make any self-binders ?—No, Sir.

Q. Is yours a stock company ?—No ; it is my business. My brother has also an interest in it.

Q. I suppose you cast up your accounts yearly ?—Yes, Sir. We take stock every year.

Q. Could you give the Committee any idea of your annual profits ?—Perhaps they would want to go into manufacturing themselves if I did.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I would like to ask you this question. Is the plan of confining themselves particularly to the manufacture of one line of implements being adopted by manufacturers pretty generally ?—Yes.

Q. Then the result of that will be to give better implements and at a cheaper rate?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. When you are casting up your profits at the end of the year, do you allow for interest on the plant, interest on your investment?—We generally take into consideration the capital invested.

Q. At the rate of 5 per cent.?—Oh yes; more than that.

Q. What do you allow for the wear of machinery?—We allow for depreciation. Then we have bad debts to contend with. It takes us three years before we can tell about these. Now, this year's production we shall not get anything for until January, February and March next year; and so on from year to year. The system means thirty months credit.

Q. You do not calculate much on bad debts. The farmers are good payers?—Well, they are very slow sometimes, and we have to wait patiently on them.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How do your wholesale rates on your goods compare with your wholesale rates of former years? Have you made concessions in the wholesale rates, or have the agents' profits been affected?—I have not sold at wholesale rates. We sell to commission agents who get 10 per cent. commission. I never went into that wholesale business.

Q. Their commissions are on the selling value of the article?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you an agent in Manitoba?—Yes.

Q. And you forward your goods to him?—Yes.

Q. Does he sell on commission for you?—He sells on commission. He, of course, employs other agents under him. We have an agent in Halifax, and one in St. John.

Q. Have the Americans competed with you in your home market of late years?—Not since 1847 or 1848.

Q. I suppose you have practically had the Ontario market free from competition?—Except around the border. Of course, a little came in there, but not much.

Q. Have you any competition in St. John?—Yes.

Q. What class of goods do you send there?—Thrashers, principally.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has your trade with the Lower Provinces increased since the present Tariff came into operation?—Yes. I do not think they have entered their machines there at their proper value—the machines that they are bringing in.

Q. They are still bringing some in, then?—A few; but the importations are decreasing.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you sent any to Prince Edward Island?—No, sir; I have not.

Q. What proportion of your output do you send down to the Maritime Provinces?—Within the last two years it has increased, but not a great deal. Still it keeps increasing. It is not a very large percentage that we have sent down there within the last two years in implements. In 1874, I sent \$50,000 worth of machinery down there, but it consisted principally of mills and mill machinery.

Q. Do you send as much now?—No, we do not now. The lumber trade has been very dull down there for the last few years. It is improving a little just now. We have a patent machine for edging deals. It will edge 45,000 feet at least, in ten hours.

Q. How do your freight rates East compare with those West?—They are a good deal cheaper East than West.

Q. Do you ship by the Intercolonial?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you manufacture saw mills?—Yes.

Q. What is the capacity of one of yours?—Forty-five thousand in ten hours. I made an edging machine for Mr. Snowball, and put the first in for him as an experiment.

Q. What is the cost of a machine of that kind?—Five hundred dollars.

Q. What does that include—all the machinery?—All the machinery for edging deals. It is what we call an edging machine. They were edging deals with a single saw previous to that. My brother was down there and asked them why they did not use the double edger. The reply was that our Ontario machines were too light and were useless. My brother said he thought we could put one in that would suit, and Mr. Snowball said he would give us the privilege of putting one in, but on certain conditions. It was to edge for two gangs, and if it did not do that successfully I was to take it out, to pay the costs while the machinery was stopped, and to pay damages. I made the machine and sent it down. They put it in and started it. The first thing I heard was a message, saying, "Make me three more." With that I sent a number of machines down there and sold them to Stewart & Co., and to Hon. W. Muirhead. I sold quite a number of them, and quite revolutionized the edging of deals out there.

The examination of NATHANIEL CURRIE was resumed.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. I think that when we closed your evidence yesterday, you were relating your experience with reference to the price of hardware, and I will ask you again to give your experience with regard to what you further desire to add as to your knowledge of the cost of hardware?—And farm implements generally I suppose. Three years ago this spring, I was up in the Province of Manitoba, and I saw while there, more ploughs at the Portage and at Gladstone, than I ever saw in the Province of Ontario in any two places. They were manufactured in the United States, and I purchased one of them for my son, giving for it the sum of \$31, and on my return, that whole lot of ploughs were gone. I was storm-stayed, and I remained at that place for a couple of days or more, and I engaged in conversation with the American agent for these ploughs. He said that they had got in a fresh cargo of these ploughs, but that they would have to sell them at a loss I think, because a firm down in Arnprior—which is in the Province of Ontario—were furnishing these very identical articles for \$3 a plough cheaper. I said to him: "How can they afford to sell the ploughs cheaper than you can," and he replied, it is all on account of the Tariff. Implements of all kinds were supplied to that market from the United States, previous to the Tariff, but I am told that very few farming implements go to that section of the country at the present time from the United States. As for farming implements in our section of the country—

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. In reference to those ploughs, Mr. Currie, I ask you as a candid man—and you know pretty well what sort of ploughs were made in Canada at that time—are you aware that not a single plough, which was made in the Province of Ontario or in the Dominion, was serviceable for use in the North-West lands—at that date I mean?—I have told you candidly, Mr. Trow, what this man told me and what I saw with my own eyes.

Q. It is no matter what he told you?—This came under my own observation. He said to me: "Let us walk over and examine the qualities of these two ploughs," and he held that the plough which was made at Arnprior was just as good as the plough which they, the American firm, made, and I for my part could see no difference between the qualities of these two ploughs.

Q. He might not see the difference in the quality of those ploughs; but you as an old farmer and a good agriculturalist, must have known the difference. The Canadian plough would not cleave in the soil of that country?—The Canadian plough was made of the very same material, and it was of the very same pattern; and if you had a spy-glass you could not have detected the difference between these two ploughs—between the Canadian and American.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. The Canadian plough was as good as the American?—It was equally as good.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. All ploughs of Canadian make had to be thrown aside by the old agriculturalists, when they were tried up in that country?—It is true, that the old style of plough-board had to be thrown aside when it was tried in the soil of that province, but this Arnprior plough was manufactured out of the same material apparently, and it was of the same quality and of the same pattern as the plough which was made in the United States.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. The Canadian plough had been especially manufactured for the use of the farmers up in the Province of Manitoba?—It was made especially for that purpose, but there is a large quantity of them now manufactured in the city of London. They are made especially for use in the North-West Territories.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Did you see the Arnprior plough of which you speak?—I did not examine it particularly. I saw them just as they were brought in, in the rack.

Q. You do not know how these ploughs operated afterwards?—No, I do not know how they operated. Only my son wrote home to me, that the plough of Canadian make was in use there now, and that it had entirely superseded the American plough.

Q. How long a time is that ago?—I had several letters from my son about a year ago. He wrote me about the ploughs, and stated that having broken his plough he had to buy another of them.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. And he bought a plough of Canadian make, I suppose?—Yes, he did.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. That was about a year afterwards?—Yes, it was.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. It was in the year 1878, when you were up in the North-West?—It was three years ago this spring that I was up there.

Q. That was in the year 1879?—Yes; and we were all told that when the National Policy came into force, it was going to increase the price of farm implements, and to my own knowledge, in our own village, farm implements, reapers, and mowers, and hay-rakes, and ploughs are cheaper at the present time than what they were in the year 1878.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Have you bought any of these implements since the year 1878?—Yes; I bought a reaper which was manufactured in our own village in a factory which sprang into existence since the year 1878; and I paid for it the sum of \$85. Such a reaper cost \$100 before the National Policy had any existence.

Q. And you bought it for \$85?—Yes. Of course I got it a little lower in price by paying cash for it.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. This is not due to keen competition in business?—Yes; in my judgment that price is owing to keen competition in business. In the surrounding cities and towns the same articles are manufactured; and the older establishments would naturally like to run a new beginner.

Q. But very few establishments were working in those times?—Oh, yes; all were working.

Q. And the profits were enormous?—They were working at London and St. Thomas, and all around there. They were manufacturing large numbers of these machines. Mr. Elliott told me this year, that last year he manufactured 125 self-binding machines, and that he shipped 100 of them to the Province of Manitoba, while twenty-five of them were for other parts of the Dominion; so that you can very clearly see that Ontario in Canada is likely to become the work shop for the great North-West.

Q. Do you know what the price of iron harrows is?—They are of different prices.

Q. I allude to those which are made in four sections?—They are of different qualities; and they are of different prices.

Q. But what is the price of good harrows?—What one man would call a good harrow, another man might call a very inferior harrow. There is the revolving harrow.

Q. I do not mean that kind; but a harrow which you, for instance, would wish to use?—There is the curved toothed harrow, and there is the straight toothed harrow; but what would suit one man might not suit another.

Q. Do you know the price of harrows?—I know what their price was some years ago when I purchased them.

Q. That is the value of them?—Well, I paid \$14 for a set of iron harrows.

Q. Those harrows sold a few years ago for as much as \$35 and \$40 each; and now they vary in price from \$18 to \$30 each, so that the makers of them reaped enormous profits. It is not the National Policy, but it is the competition which has reduced them price. An enormous profit was obtained by the manufacturer on that article.—I bought a good iron harrow five or six years ago, for \$14. I got it at the wholesale price from the agent who sold them in our village. I do not know when they were worth \$35 and \$40.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. How many years ago is that?—It was about six years ago.

Q. I never knew iron harrows to be \$35 and \$40 each in our section of the country.—And such is not my knowledge.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think, Mr. Currie, that the competition which has been created by the National Policy, and the consequence of giving to our manufacturers a larger market has had the result of actually reducing the cost of farm implements?—I have not the least doubt as to that matter. The National Policy gives to the Canadian manufacturer more immediately the control of our own market, and enables him to sell more of the implements which he manufactures.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose, Mr. Currie, that you never made agricultural implements; and that you know nothing about their production, except as a matter of opinion; you profess to be a farmer do you not?—It is little more than a matter of opinion when a man buys an article and pays his money for it.

Q. Yes; but as to the other matters, you do not know anything personally about them?—I am not engaged in the business, but I have bought agricultural implements, and I know what I have paid for them.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Your experience in this respect is very limited, is it not? You buy a harrow in a life time, I suppose?—Oh, yes; I have bought a good many of them in my time.

Q. How comes it that you use them up so fast?—With reference to the price of nails, there is such a difference of opinion between my evidence and the evidence of the witness who preceded me. I stated that the price of nails was much lower than it was before the National Policy came into operation. The question was asked me, I think, "Would not nails be still lower if iron was admitted into this country free of duty?" and my answer to that was, that I had no doubt of that, if we did not require revenue; but I hoped that the day was not far distant when our Government would take steps to encourage a company to manufacture all sorts of iron in the Dominion of Canada, including steel rails as well, which would obviate for us our present necessity of going to the Old Country in order to buy these articles. It appears to me to be a great fallacy on our part not to try and develop, as fully as it is possible, the resources of our own country, and not to manufacture our iron here at home, when we have such an abundance of the ore. But nails are evidently cheaper in price than they were previous to the coming in operation of the National Policy.

Q. The manufacture of any article depends very much on the situation of the raw material which is required for such a business, upon the proximity of the materials required to each other. For instance, the manufacture of iron from the material

of iron ore, it is advisable to have the one near a coal district; and you must be aware that in the State of Pennsylvania both elements are found together, and, as it were, combined: this is a very important factor to enable the business to be carried on successfully?—No doubt that is important.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Can you give us any further information about hardware, Mr. Currie?—I can state nothing more in this relation than what I gave in my evidence taken yesterday. Hardware of different kinds is reduced in price. This is the case with spades, &c.

Q. I think that we questioned you with respect to the prices of woollen and of cotton goods, did we not?—Yes, you did.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have you not bought some cutlery lately for the house—such as knives and forks?—I cannot say as to that, my wife does that part of the business.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has the home market for farm produce on the whole increased and improved under the operation of the Tariff in your opinion, Mr. Currie?—I think that it has enlarged and improved under the influence of the National Policy. I think that it has increased. It has given to our farmers the control of their own market; and the effect of the Tariff has been to prevent American grains coming into competition with our own grains; and this necessarily increased the price of our own grains.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What has it increased the price of?—It has increased the price of farm produce of all kinds.

Q. What has it increased in price? Name any particular thing that it has improved in price?—You may take all kinds of grain, and you will find that such is the case.

Q. Has it increased the price of oats?—Yes, it has.

Q. If the duty on oats has increased the price of them in Canada, how is it that the price of oats is higher in the United States than it is here?—That does not matter. That is owing to the quantity of the supply.

Q. Do you think that any sane man would bring oats at the present time from the United States into Canada, when the price of them is 10 cents a bushel higher over there than it is here? Would a man be sane if he did such a thing? Do you know what the price of oats is in the United States at the present time?—No, I do not.

Q. Do you know what the price of oats is in Glencoe at the present time?—Yes, I do.

Q. What is the price of them there?—It is 40 cents a bushel.

Q. Well, they are worth 46 cents a bushel in the City of Chicago?—I was going to answer your question in this way—

Q. Would a man be sane, were he to buy oats at 46 cents a bushel in Chicago and pay the duty on them and sell them for 40 cents a bushel here in Canada?—I fancy that no sane man would advocate the policy which would enable the American farmer to have the free use of our Canadian market, as long as they exclude our farmers from their market.

Q. When we have a surplus, what effect has such a policy on our prices in Canada? If we have a surplus, is it not to our advantage to procure the whole carrying trade of the United States, and to allow their agricultural produce to pass through our country? Is this not to our advantage?—I do not see how you want me to answer that question. I think that you have already said no sane man would advocate so and so, and I fancy, for my part, that no sane man would advocate the propriety of allowing American farm produce to come into direct competition with our farm produce free of all duty, when we are obliged to raise a certain amount of revenue in order to carry on the governmental machinery of this country.

Q. We do not raise a revenue from this source.—As far as our carrying trade is concerned, the duties which are placed on agricultural products do not affect the car-

rying trade, because the Americans can ship their produce through our country in bond, and we can consequently have all the advantages which the control of this carrying trade would confer on us under any other circumstances.

Q. No; the bonded system does not allow this.—I hope that there will be no exhibition of temper over what one old farmer will say.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You think that the duty has advanced the price of oats?—I certainly do.

Q. How much has it changed the price of oats?—I cannot go into the figures, however. But supposing that they are so low this year, under the operation of the Tariff, it cannot be said that it has not advanced the price of grain by giving us the control.

Q. We were speaking of the specific item of oats.—By giving us the control of our own market, any person must understand that 8,460,000 bushels of corn thrown into the Dominion of Canada—as has been the case under the late régime—and coming into direct competition with our own coarse grains, must affect the prices of them.

Q. But I am asking you specially how much do you think that the duty has increased the price of oats?—In answer to Mr. Trow's question, as to about how much the duty upon oats has affected their price in Canada, I will just say this: Mr. Trow said, how could the admission of American produce affect our market if we had a surplus?—that was his question. But I think that it is very easy for any gentleman to see how it could affect our market, although we have a very large surplus. There are certain times and certain seasons of the year when the home demand raises the price of our agricultural produce higher than the prices which are obtained in the European market, will justify, and if the Americans at such a period have the right to take advantage of this demand, and of such circumstances, and throw their grain into competition with ours on our own market free of duty, this will injure our own farmers' interests, will it not? In the year 1876, the price of grain was raised in our section of the country; this was either in 1876 or in 1877—to a very high price. It became higher than it was at that time in the United States market, but the buyers imported half-a-dozen car-loads of grain from the United States free of duty; this was just at the commencement of the harvest and it had the effect of reducing the price of grain at once. Now, although we export a large quantity of grain that gave the American market the right of taking advantages of the market on our side of the line, and such a system compels our farmers to pay the ocean freight on grain for 3,000 miles, over to the Liverpool market. It is just so every year, whenever there is a scarcity before the harvest of grain in Canada, because we can have our elevators full of their grains before our own grain is cut. Then, it necessarily follows that we have got to send our grain to Liverpool, instead of compelling the United States to send the grain which they would send over to us to that market. I fancy that no sane man, I use the expression, as Mr. Trow has employed it, would say that the Americans should be able to send a bushel of wheat into the Dominion of Canada if he could make the United States send it to the Liverpool market in order to dispose of it; therefore, I hold that we have no right to throw our own markets open to the American farmer free of duty, as long as they shut their markets against the admission of our grain, because such a policy on our part would place the American farmer 20 per cent. ahead of the Canadian farmer.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Are you not aware that one-half of our mills are at the present time standing idle for the want of sufficient grain to keep them running?—I fancy that any mills which are idle at the present time, stand idle for want of money, for want of capital, with which to buy grain; but if you adopt Mr. Wallace's policy and make money, you can easily get over that obstacle.

Q. That policy would suit Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) but it would not suit me.—I heard something said in connection with the subject of grain yesterday, that the National Policy was the means of driving capital out of this country in connec-

tion with the manufacture of oatmeal. I heard a gentleman say in Toronto, previous to the adoption of the National Policy, that the Americans had put such a high Tariff on the oatmeal which passed from Canada to the United States, that he would be obliged to remove his capital which was embarked in this business to the other side of the line, where he could manufacture the oats of the United States into oatmeal, and send the oatmeal over here free, and supply the market of the whole of the Dominion of Canada; and I think that the change which has taken place in connection with this industry has been more due to that account than to any other reason.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Have you had any experience in connection with the manufacture of oatmeal?—I have used some of it at the table.

Q. But you have not manufactured any of it, have you?—No, Sir, I have not.

Q. We will now go back to the question of oats. Have you any idea as to how much the price of oats has been increased per bushel in Canada, in consequence of the existence of the Tariff?—No, I have not.

Q. I suppose you have sold oats occasionally like other farmers?—Yes, I have done so for many years.

Q. I suppose that you have made up in your books your profit on these transactions?—Yes, but we farmers only pay our way; we do not make up our profits.

Q. How much more have you obtained per bushel of oats in consequence of the duty which has been placed on oats?—No; I could not speak as to that point, I can only state the fact.

Q. You have never made up a general statement in this relation?—The effect of the Tariff has been the means of turning deficits into surpluses, and that is a great satisfaction to the farmers of this country.

Q. I only asked you as to what was the farmers' direct interest in the Tariff, and you are not able to say how much you think you have gained on each bushel of oats which you have sold?—One cannot tell as to the exact amount of the profit on each bushel.

Q. Is there any other grain which you can mention on which you have made a specific gain in price in consequence of the Tariff? And if so, what is the amount of such gain?—No. I cannot say.

Q. Is this the case with pease and barley, for instance?—The farmers of this country reap a general gain, owing to the fact that the Tariff has given them the control of our own market.

Q. And that is all that you are able to state in this relation?—Yes.

Q. You can only state that the farmers have obtained a general gain from the effects of the Tariff?—Yes.

Q. You are not able to say that the farmer is 2 or 3 cents richer on each bushel of grain in consequence of the existence of these duties?—I have not the least doubt in my own mind that he has gained more than that on each bushel of grain; but at the same time it is impossible, under the circumstances, to say what is the exact gain which he has made through the existence of these duties.

Q. Whatever may be the gain he has made, it is intangible—it is merely a general gain?—Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. You have known of American wheat having been imported under the Mackenzie régime, with the effect of bringing down the price of wheat in your own town?—Yes; I have already stated that.

Q. How much did that importation decrease the price of Canadian wheat?—Canadian wheat was worth \$1.50 at that time, and some farmers would scarcely sell their wheat at that figure. They were asking more. There was lots of wheat in the country at the time; but they were asking far higher prices. However, after the importations in question, the price of wheat fell to \$1.25 a bushel.

Q. And thus the importation of American wheat at that time caused a clear loss of 25 cents a bushel on the wheat, which was held by the farmers in that neighborhood?—Yes; that is the case.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. How about the consumer? How did this state of things affect him?—As far as the consumer was concerned, I do not think that the increase, which then took place in the price of wheat, affected him at all, because, as a rule, when the price of grain is high, the scale of wages is high also.

Q. But what was the effect of this increase upon the consumer at that specific time. I suppose that this was in the bad days of the rule of the Mackenzie Government?—A great deal has been said about the good crops with which Providence has favoured the present Government; but I had just as good crops, and I raised just as much to the acre during the last three years of Mr. Mackenzie's reign as I have raised at the present time and since the removal of the Mackenzie Government from office; I suppose that in the whole of the western peninsula of the Province of Ontario, the farmers have had as large a yield to the acre, previous to the year 1878, as they have had since the year 1878.

Q. But with reference to this particular occasion, it occurred under the Mackenzie régime, did it not?—Yes, it did.

Q. That must have been the case when American grain was brought into this country free of duty; you would not submit to that indignity at the present time?—I know that it happened a year or two before the Mackenzie Government left office.

Q. But this Government has taken the power, in case flour gets too high in price, to take the duty off, and prevent Canadian farmers taking advantage of the rise in the price of grain.—I am aware of that circumstance. If the people were in a state of starvation, no doubt the Government would do so.

Q. And the people who were asking two and three cents a bushel more for their grain than it was worth, might find their influence on the Government no longer of any avail?—I am not aware that any farmer has asked two or three cents more for his grain than it was worth.

Q. I suppose that you have the same farmers in your section of the country that we have in ours?—I am aware that during the Russian war, grain went up very high in price.

Q. But at this particular time which you have mentioned, there was lots of grain in your neighborhood, and yet the farmers were holding on for a higher price.—Yes, that was the case.

Q. And it was \$1.50 a bushel at that time.—Quite a number who had grain on hand would have liked to get a better price for it, if they could.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Does not the price of grain fluctuate suddenly?—I suppose that every gentleman in Canada is aware of that fact.

Q. How do you know that it was the introduction of American grain which reduced the price of grain in the place you have mentioned on that occasion? Was not the quotation, which you have stated, telegraphed at the time from the Old Country?—It was not at that time.

Q. That is only your opinion?—It is more than my mere opinion; for I examined the prices which were current at the time in the Liverpool market as well as the prices which were given in the markets of our own country, and of the United States.

Q. Was the price of wheat reduced all over the Dominion of Canada, on that particular day; or was it reduced in price merely in the village of Glencoe?—I do not say that the price of grain was then reduced on any one particular day; but it was not at Glencoe especially that this occurred. At other places in that section of the country, where there were large flour mills running, and which had to be kept supplied with wheat, they did not want to pay the price which the Canadian farmers in the vicinity asked for their grain, and they sent to the United States and brought over several car loads of wheat; and I can give you no other answer than that.

Q. But a few car loads of wheat arriving in your town would not affect the whole business of the country, would it?—I presume that if a few car loads of wheat were brought in from the United States, or if half-a-dozen car loads were brought

over for each mill, or if this were continued week after week, until the supply that could be obtained in the vicinity of the mills would change and lower in price, it would affect the price of grain in the locality.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you seen, Mr. Currie, the same effect produced on the price of oats, by the importation of American oats or American corn into this country?—American corn.

Q. Has this been the case in your experience?—Large quantities of American oats, and of American corn were imported into the Province of Ontario to the great prejudice of the best interests of the Canadian farmer, previous to the introduction of the National Policy.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Were they brought into your neighbourhood?—Yes, they were.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are you aware that the price of oats was raised from 8 to 10 cents a bushel after the duty was put on oats in the spring of the year, 1879—in the Toronto market?—I recollect that there was a change in the price of oats at that time, and an advance.

Q. And this occurred during the week when the duty was put on?—Yes, it did.

Q. This was proof positive, I should think of the beneficial affects of the duty in the interest of the Canadian farmer?—Yes; we had, previous to the introduction of the National Policy, very large quantities of American corn imported into our own village, and sometimes it was damaged in quality; and this was not very much in the interests of our farmers.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think that the present Tariff has given encouragement and diversity of employment to the various industrial classes of this country, and thereby retarded emigration to the United States, and encouraged Canadians who have gone there to return to this country?—Yes, I do.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. How do you know that such is the case?—I know it by experience.

Q. Have any persons who have lived in your part of the country left it for the United States?—I saw some young men coming home from the State of Michigan when I was coming down here.

Q. They had got through with their lumbering operations I suppose? They go out to Michigan to engage in lumbering during the winter season, and they return to this country in the spring, do they not? Is that not the reason for the return of these young men?—The Tariff has certainly had a beneficial effect in this relation.

Q. How many extra men have you employed since the present Tariff came into operation?—I have already answered that question.

Q. The number is seven, is it not?—I do not say whether it is seven or ten.

Q. Where do they come from?—I said that I had a number more employed, and that one young man who started a factory came from London. I answered that question yesterday.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I think that I asked you a question with reference to the tendency to invest capital in farm property at the present time under the existing Tariff?—The price of farm property has increased in our section of the country.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. By how much has it increased in value?—I cannot give an answer with reference to what is the fact in this relation, as far as the whole of the Dominion is concerned. I can only tell you what I know as far as our immediate section of the country is concerned, and in our neighbourhood the value of property has risen at least 10 per cent.

Q. The advance in value has amounted to 10 per cent?—Yes, it has.

Q. Do you mean to say that real estate has increased in value in your section of the country 10 per cent.?—Yes, it has.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think that the general condition of the farming and of the labouring classes has improved under the present Tariff?—I do think so. It has decidedly improved. They are getting steady employment, and they are receiving better wages.

Q. Have many people left your section of the country?—People are now working full time; and I have not heard during the last two or three years of any soup-kitchens being supplied by citizens in different parts of the country in order to support the poor.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Did you use to have soup kitchens in the village of Glencoe?—We had soup kitchens a few years ago in the cities and towns.

Q. In what city did they have them in your neighbourhood?—They used to have them in the city of London.

Q. You live a long ways from the city of London, do you not?—Oh no. We live quite close to London. We are only 30 miles from it.

Q. You would not then want a soup kitchen in your place?—No; but very often we had to ship tramps and persons in search of relief off there from our place.

Q. With reference to the question of farm labour, how do the wages which are paid this year compare with the wages which were paid during former years?—They are higher at the present time than they were.

Q. And how much higher are the wages which are now paid?—They are increased, and there is a great scarcity of hands in our section of the country. The farmer now has to look out some time beforehand in order to engage hands to be ready for the harvest.

Q. How much is the increase which has taken place in the wages paid?—Hands are now very scarce.

Q. How much are you paying in wages this season?—We are paying \$20 per month.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. How do you account, Mr. Currie, for this scarcity of labour? Have the people left the country?—Every person seems to have something to do for himself.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Have many people gone from your section of the country to the North-West Territories?—Some persons have gone up there from our neighbourhood.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Would you advise any steps to be taken on the part of the Government with the view of assisting farm labourers to come to this country from Great Britain, in order that in this manner the supply of farm laborers in this country might be increased?—I think that this would be a very good step to take, if we could obtain a proper class of farm labourers, both male and female. It would at all events be a great advantage to the Province of Ontario, where farm labourers during the last few years have been scarce.

Q. What suggestions, if any, are you in a position to make with a view to legislation which is required to make agriculture more desirable and more profitable as an occupation?—Well, that is a rather difficult question to unravel. I may say, however, that politicians and public men of a certain class are generally trying to array the farmer against the manufacturer, when, as a matter of fact, the interests of both these classes of society are so identical and so interwoven with each other, that it is impossible to promote the interests of the one without promoting the interests of the other. If you legislate in a way that will promote the interests of the farming class, in a very short time all the other classes in the community will find a benefit accruing to them through the prosperity of this section of society. The interests of the mechanic and of the manufacturer, and of the farmer, in truth, go hand in hand; and if you legislate in such a manner as to keep down the taxes of the people as much as possible, and not allow large deficits to roll up, I think that we will be all satisfied and contented.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you think that it is good policy to have a large surplus?—I do think so.

Q. You do, eh?—I do. Certainly, I think so.

Q. Well, I do not?—I cannot help what you think. I only say, in answer to this question, that at the time of Confederation, we commenced the career of the Dominion of Canada with a clean sheet.

Q. Yes? What then?—And we ran the machinery of the country on a 15 per cent. Tariff.

Q. Yes?—And we rolled up, under such circumstances, such a large surplus that the Government saw fit to place the articles of tea and coffee on the free list; and still we had a large surplus. Then other circumstances came over the country, and these surpluses, with a 17½ per cent. Tariff, were turned into deficits; and if the late Government, which retired, had remained in power and continued to roll up large deficits, this would soon have ruined our credit in the money markets of the world.

Q. Yes?—And on that account I think that it would be very well to have a reasonable surplus on hand.

Q. A reasonable surplus?—And we should apply that surplus to the reduction of the National Debt.

Q. Do you know how the revenue of this country is raised, and how the estimates are prepared? Do you know on what basis all this is done? You know how this is accomplished, do you?—I do not think it necessary to go into those matters.

Q. On what calculation are these prepared? What are our exports and imports? Is not the calculation to which I refer based on the supposition of the revenue which has been obtained during previous years? And if, in the event of a failure in the crops, we import less, would this not decrease our revenue?—I presume that the Government of the country stands in about the same position to the Dominion of Canada, over whose interests it guards, as a farmer does to the farm which he tills and manages in his own individual interest; and if a farmer found himself at the end of the year in possession of a surplus, I think that he would be very unwise if he expended every dollar of that surplus and left himself without a dollar at his disposition to run the machinery of his estate during the then coming year, as his crop might then fail. And the same argument will apply to the Government of the country. It is wise to have a fair surplus on hand, so that a large amount of deficits will not roll up and ruin our credit in the money markets of the world.

Q. You have been an old municipal officer, have you not?—Yes, I have.

Q. Do you think that it would be a wise policy on the part of the reeve and municipal council of your township to put on a certain rate of assessment on the inhabitants, and thus accumulate \$2,000 or \$3,000, which would remain in their hands for a year or two? Would it not be a more prudent policy for them to levy exactly the rate which would produce the sum which was required for legitimate purposes of expenditure?—Yes; if you know anything about municipal law, or municipal government.

Q. I am asking you that question.—You must know that the municipal council cannot levy a rate which will bring in only the exact amount to a dollar that will be required for the year in question. It is impossible to do so. You must leave a little margin; but when you speak of a surplus of several thousand dollars on the part of a municipal council, that is out of all proportion to the surplus which a Government may accumulate.

Q. Is this often done?—That sum is out of all proportion to the surplus of the Dominion; but it is well to have a surplus, and we have at the present time, in the county of Middlesex, a surplus which is laying over, waiting to be used at the proper time. And every municipal council, which acts wisely and prudently, should have a surplus.

Q. Every municipal council should have a surplus?—They should have a certain amount of surplus.

*By the Chairman :—*

B. In order to pay off their debts. Is it wise to have a surplus over and above the payment of their debts?—It is wise to have a surplus to run the machinery for a year rather than be compelled to go and borrow money for that purpose.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Is it wiser to have a surplus than to have a large deficiency?—Yes, certainly it is.

Q. And to have to pay interest on such deficiency?—Yes, certainly it is.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. From what source do we collect our present Customs' revenue?—We collect it on importations.

Q. How do we get the present Customs revenue? Out of whose pockets does it come?—You want me to go into the question of the collection of the revenue in all departments, including the Excise duties, I presume?

Q. Take the Excise and the Customs' entries—these are levied in order to obtain the revenue of the Dominion; who pays these duties?—I would say just this in answer to that question—

Q. Out of whose pockets does this revenue come?—I may say that I think that it would be a very wise thing on the part of the Government to strike the Excise duty off malt and place the duty on the barrel of beer.

Q. Out of whose pockets do the duties which are paid come? Whose money is this?—You are asking me where this money comes from.

Q. Yes, where does it come from?—I tell you that on every bushel of barley which the brewer buys from the Canadian farmer he has to pay 72 cents to the Government for the right to make it into malt; and I say that this is wrong. The manner of imposing this duty should be changed, but this is the way in which a portion of the revenue is raised. Then we all know very well that revenue is also raised from imports which come into this country. I suppose that I need not go into the details as to the duties which are now in question.

Q. Out of whose pockets do the duties which are placed on imports come?—There is a difference of opinion with regard to that matter.

Q. But I want to get your opinion, as to whose pockets this money comes out of?—But all cases and all articles in this relation do not occupy the same position. You have heard here to-day, that sometimes the American manufacturer and the American coal dealer thinks it advisable to keep control of the Canadian market, as was the case under the old Customs' law, and that he would in order to effect his object, and for the sake of retaining this market, make a certain sacrifice in lowering his prices on account of the imposition of the duty.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Not much. He would not do that?—I think that it is my duty to state my opinion; I think that this has been done.

Q. I would like to know whether you think that the average Customs' revenue comes out of the pockets of the Americans, or out of the pockets of the Canadian consumer, who finally pays the duty?—We do not pretend to say that all our revenue is collected on goods which are imported from the United States.

Q. I am asking you a simple question, I am not asking you for a political address; I am questioning you merely with relation to a simple fact?—I am just telling you what I believe on this subject.

Q. Taking the Customs duties generally, who pays them?—I believe that in some cases the consumer pays the duty, and that in some cases the producer pays the duty.

Q. I am speaking of the general Customs revenue. You are aware, I suppose, that we obtain the bulk of our revenue from Customs duties?—I am well aware of all that. I remember very well, that the American cattle buyers and the American sheep buyers, when they came over into our section of the country, would say to the farmers from whom they were purchasing: "Here, I can only give you \$3 for that lamb, but I could give you \$3.60 for it were it not for the 20 per cent. duty that we

have to pay when we take it across the border." They would insist upon that price, and they would finally get the lamb for \$3, simply because there was a duty to pay on it before it crossed the line. But other men may say that the consumer pays the duty.

Q. Then you are not able to tell us, Mr. Currie, who pays the bulk of the duties which we collect through the Customs Department?—No, I am not able to do so.

Q. You have not considered the question have you?—But if I did, and answered it, I would not meet your views. I am satisfied we differ completely on that point.

Q. I do not know about that, I think that I have asked you simply a civil question?—Oh yes, you have.

Q. I do not know that I have said anything improper. If I have asked you an unfair question, I take it back; but I submit that I have simply asked you a civil question. I ask you, who in your opinion pays the bulk of the Customs revenue which we collect? If this is wrong, let the question be struck out?—I believe that the bulk of the Customs revenue which we collect, is paid by the producer.

Q. I see. Then you do not believe that our own population pay the bulk of it?—I think that the bulk of it is paid by the producer.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think, Mr. Currie, that the present Tariff has relieved the burden of taxation to any extent from the shoulders of the farming population of this country?—Yes, I do think so. It has increased the number of our factories and consequently it has increased the number of the hands who are employed in them; everyone of these persons is a consumer, and each of them contributes towards the revenue of the country.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Have your crops been better during the last three years than they were during the previous six or seven years?—No, my own crops have not been larger. I have had very fair crops for a number of years past, but I do not see that my crops were better during the past few years than they were previously.

Q. Have the crops been better as a rule in your neighbourhood during the last three years than they were before?—No, they have not been better.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. But you live in a good neighbourhood, Mr. Currie. Land has gone up during the last few years, instead of down, in your section of the country? It must be a good farming country where the price of land has gone up?—It is a fair farming country.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. I do not think that land has gone down in price, as a rule; it is not that case with us?—You will not get a witness from the County of Middlesex, and it is a very large and wealthy county, who will say that land has depreciated in value.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Will farm land rent as high in your section of the country now as it would have rented three years ago, or will it rent higher?—It will rent for higher rates, to my knowledge.

And at this point the examination of this witness was closed.

ALEXANDER MURRAY, M.P.P., appeared before the Committee, and was examined as follows:—

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Mr. Murray, I believe that you reside in the Province of Manitoba?—Yes, I do.

Q. And I believe that you are a member of the Local Legislature of that Province?—Yes, I am.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What district do you represent in the Local Legislature, Mr. Murray?—I represent the district of Assiniboine, which is the constituency which adjoins the city of Winnipeg on the western side.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Have you a practical knowledge of the occupation of farming?—Yes, I am a farmer.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. How long have you resided in the Province of Manitoba?—I have lived there for forty-three years.

Q. That is about all your lifetime, I suppose, judging from your appearance?—Yes; I was born there.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Have you found it to be to the interest of the farmers of that country to admit American agricultural produce free of duty?—No. We have found this, as farmers, to be very objectionable in the past.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. What business do you follow in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Murray? What is your practical profession?—I am a farmer.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Where do you carry on the business of farming, Mr. Murray?—I farm at Sturgeon Creek, which is situated at a distance of eight miles from the city of Winnipeg.

Q. That is near John Grant's place, is it not?—It is in the neighbourhood of John Grant's.

Q. That is a good section of the country, is it not?—It is a good section of country. I submit that it is the best section of the Province of Manitoba; and it is the best section of the whole Dominion, for that matter, in my opinion.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Where do the people, who live in the Province of Manitoba, obtain their agricultural implements from, at the present time?—At the present time they get them exclusively from the Province of Ontario.

Q. Do they get their farming implements, carriages and waggons and other implements which they may require, now from the Province of Ontario?—Yes; all those implements are now obtained from Ontario. During the last two or three years they have been brought almost exclusively from the Province of Ontario I believe, or from the eastern Provinces of the Dominion.

Q. Was this the case, Mr. Murray, previous to the introduction of the present Tariff?—No; it was not then the case.

Q. Do you think that you can get these articles at reasonable prices and of as good quality from the Province of Ontario, as you can get them in these respects from the United States?—I think that the price of these articles of Ontario manufacture is a little cheaper; but I do not know about the quality as compared with the article of American manufacture. Although the manufacturers of the Province of Ontario have made, and are making, very great progress in improving their machinery, still, I think they are hardly equal in quality to the American machinery for use in our section of the country especially.

Q. You have now reference to self-binding machines, I suppose?—Yes; but I have reference more especially to ploughs.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. The United States plough is better adapted for use in your section of country is it not?—Yes; in fact the first ploughs that came up from the Province of Ontario to our country were of no use at all; but they are improving in this respect I think. Last summer we got very good ploughs from Ontario. We have a good soil, but it is very tenacious in its character, and the temper of the mould-board has to be of a very peculiar nature, otherwise it will not scour and clean; and it was in this particular that the ploughs which we used to get from Ontario makers were defective.

Q. And they could not be used in your soil on that account.—No; they could not.

Q. Are you aware that a great number of Canadian ploughs were at one time sold in the North-West and thrown aside as worthless?—Both ploughs and reaping machines of Ontario make were formerly thrown aside; but this has not been the

case latterly. And with respect to waggons, I think that the Ontario makers must have made some waggons especially for the purpose of sending them to be sold in our country, as they were made of very poor material.

Q. These were Canadian waggons?—Yes; they were from Ontario. I have known waggons to have been purchased in the City of Winnipeg, which looked new; they were oiled up and seemed capable of carrying about twenty hundred weight; but before they had gone six miles out of the city, the axles of them would break down, the wheels would turn in, and the whole thing would collapse. This was more especially the case with one shipment of waggons; but latterly I think the waggons which are brought from Ontario, have improved in quality.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. The Ontario waggons are at the present time as good as those of American make, are they not?—No, they are not as good as the American waggons. Woused to get what were called American waggons.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Whose make are they?—I do not exactly know the name of the maker, but they are very fine waggons. I used one of them myself for fifteen years, and I consider that it is as good now as it was when I got it. I do not think that there are any Canadian waggons which will stand the same wear and tear that those waggons will.

Q. Have you seen any Canadian reapers in your section of the country?—Yes, I have.

Q. This was some years back, was it not?—Yes. The first Canadian implement in which I invested was supposed to be a combined mower and reaper, with a self-raking attachment; but it proved to be perfectly worthless. Some fifty or sixty of these machines were sent up there, but they never did any work at all, they were of no use whatever. The self-raking apparatus was driven I think, by a sort of attachment, or something like that, and this worked all the barn. When you got it into a certain position, it would stay there, and it would take two men to pull it past the centre. But the next reaper which I got, was a very good one. The present reaper which I have, is the Osborne self-binder, which is manufactured in Canada, by Perry, Sons & Co. It is a very good reaper, still these reapers are a good deal heavier than are the American reapers of the same kind.

Q. What was the price of the last one that you bought? Was it \$310?—I paid for it the sum of \$300 in cash. It was \$320 on time.

Q. Have you seen any Canadian thrashing machines out in your section of the country?—Yes; I have seen lots of them.

Q. Some of them were lying in barn yards when I was up there. They were not fit for use.—Well, I cannot say that I have seen them condemned in that manner, but they were not considered as good as—

Q. As the American?—The American machines. But latterly I think that the makers of them in the Province of Ontario are manufacturing them after the American models.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You think that the machines of Ontario make are being improved in quality?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. And the waggons which are of Ontario manufacture, are also being improved in quality?—Oh yes; that is the case. I think that so many complaints were made by the farmers who bought the waggons that were first sent out there that the manufacturers of them got instructions from their agents, that they would have to furnish a better article.

Q. Have they better timber for the making of waggons in the United States? Have they more timber of second growth?—I fancy that they have; and this is where the difference comes in, I imagine.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is not the duty on these articles very injurious to the settler who goes up into that country? Is it not oppressive to the settler?—Well, I do not know about

that. There may be a disadvantage arising from these duties on the one hand ; but we get larger prices—we are obtaining better prices for our grain at the present time than we did before the National Policy came into force ; and, on the whole, I think that the farmers would not want to see a change in the present regulations. In this connection I may say that this summer we were furnished with machines manufactured in Canada for binding, but it was not nearly so good as the American.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you bind with rope too ?—Yes, some of my neighbours have bound with rope.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Have you had the Stephens' waggon of Strathroy. They ship a large amount to that section of the country ?—I cannot say definitely whether they do or not.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you seen any of Speight's waggons in the North-West ?—I could not say. I bought a Canadian waggon last summer, but I could not say what make it was.

Q. What do you think of the Government standard of waggons ?—I do not know to what you have reference.

Q. Well, the Government have a standard which they use, and which they require in all their supplies for the North-West Mounted Police and for Government here, and if they do not come up to the standard they are not accepted ?—That is something I know nothing at all about.

Q. I only wanted to know whether you thought they were good waggons ?—I do not know. There is a waggon I think they call the Snowball waggon, that gives very good satisfaction.

Q. That is made in St. John, is it not ?—I believe so.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. In reference to the meat supply of the country, do you think that the farmers of Manitoba will be able to supply the demand for some time to come ? Do you think there is a likelihood until that country is developed of Ontario supplying the Province with meat ?—I think there will be for a few years to come. At present we import meat there from Ontario, and I think that will continue for some time until the cattle ranches get into full operation.

Q. Do you think that the ranches will be able to supply the higher qualities of meat ?—Eventually they may, but at present I do not think they would be able to raise as high a standard of beef as down here.

Q. Do you think that country is adapted to stall feeding to any extent ?—Well, it would depend altogether on the market price of grain, and whether it would be more advantageous to ship grain out of the country or put it into beef. But I do not think that would arise for some years to come.

Q. Do roots grow much in Manitoba ?—Yes ; I do not think there is any country in the world better adapted for them.

Q. How do they keep in the winter ? Are there good facilities for keeping out the frost ?—Yes, they can be kept quite free from frost.

Q. Eventually, do you think it will be a good cattle feeding country ?—Eventually I think it will.

Q. In the meantime it will require to be fed to a considerable extent from Ontario ?—Yes, it is at the present time.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where do you get supplied from now ?—Principally from Ontario. We get a good deal of pork from St. Paul.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Where do you get your eggs from ?—Principally from Minnesota, I think.

Q. Are they imported largely in Manitoba ?—Yes.

Q. Is poultry imported largely also ?—Yes ; that is imported principally from Ontario. Whole carloads of it come in.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you also import your butter?—Yes; that we import from Ontario also.

Q. Are they shipping fat cattle there to any extent?—In the winter time they ship the beef in dressed.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What are your prospects as a pork-producing country in the next few years, when you get going?—I think it ought to be very good.

Q. You will be able to supply yourselves, you think?—Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Can you grow corn in the North-West?—I do not think corn would ever be a success, that is, the growing of it largely. Of course we can grow it; I grow some in my garden for table use, but it would take a great deal of work and attention to grow it extensively. I do not think it will ever be a corn producing country.

Q. Can you grow pease there?—Well, in that country they grow too large, and I do not think they would do well there. They are inclined to grow too much straw. There are some sandy bottoms along the rivers, upon which I have known farmers grow large crops of pease. I know, as a farmer, I have not myself grown many. I did not succeed very well with them. They do not seem to ripen.

Q. Barley grows well there?—Yes, barley grows well.

Q. Is it of good quality?—Yes, of very good quality.

Q. Is it darker than our Ontario barley?—I could not say, I am not in a position to know.

Q. Do you think that country will furnish a market for the fruit grown in Ontario?—Yes, I do not think it will ever be a large fruit growing country.

Q. Do you think it will afford a large market for fruit?—It must.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you raise any fruit there?—No, we do not raise much fruit there. We raise any amount of currants, gooseberries and fruits of that kind.

Q. Has any attempt been made to raise apples?—Yes.

Q. But hitherto they have not been very successful?—No, they have been failures so far. Some nurseries, however, have been started up there, and perhaps they may succeed better.

Q. How do you account for the failure? Do you think there is some ingredient in the soil not suitable?—I do not know.

Q. Or the severity of the season?—I could not say; I have spent considerable money myself in buying trees, but they have always died.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Do they grow after they are planted?—Yes, they do very well until the second year, when they seem to die away.

Q. Probably on account of the severe winter?—Yes, it may be.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Your land seems to be very suitable, and it has natural drainage?—Yes, there is a nursery started about a mile from our place, and the parties owning it are sanguine of being successful.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Have you raised plums with success; I understand that you have plenty of wild plums?—Yes, we have lots of wild plums there, but we have not been successful in growing tame ones.

Q. I suppose it is only the small bush fruit that you have?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You are very positive agricultural implements manufactured in Ontario are rapidly improving?—Yes.

Q. I suppose our manufacturers will have to make a specialty of manufacturing for that market?—Yes.

Q. And you think that eventually they will be able to provide you with as good agricultural implements as those from the United States?—I am satisfied that they will.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. There has been a very great improvement within the last two years?—Yes, a great improvement.

OTTAWA, 26th April, 1882.

The Committee met. CHARLES BURPEE, M.P., examined.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Where do you reside?—In the County of Sunbury, N.B.

Q. What is your occupation?—I am a farmer.

Q. How much do you farm?—Do you mean how many acres? I own a large quantity of land. Do you refer to the quantity I till.

Q. How much do you cultivate. A farmer cultivates land I believe?—I cultivate 200 acres, that is in hay. You know we raise a large amount of hay in the particular district in which I live.

Q. Would it be to the interests of the agriculturalists of Canada to admit any or all kinds of American farm produce free of duty?—Yes. In reference to that question I would say there are some agricultural products from which it would be to the interests of the farmers of New Brunswick, and I beg to speak from that standpoint, as I am much better acquainted with that Province than with the Dominion as a whole—to have the duty removed. It would be to the interests of New Brunswick farmers, to the farmers of a large portion of Nova Scotia, if not all Nova Scotia, and to the farmers of Prince Edward Island, if the flour and meal came in duty free.

Q. Is it the business of a farmer to raise farm produce and sell it?—It is.

Q. Is it to his interest to buy it?—It is in some cases. It is with us in the case of flour and cornmeal.

Q. Why?—Because we do not produce enough for our own use.

Q. Then what can farmers raise profitably in New Brunswick?—The general products that they raise and export largely would be hay, potatoes, vegetables of all kinds, oats, cheese, &c.

Q. Can they not raise wheat there?—Yes, they can.

Q. Can they not raise wheat there cheaper than they can buy it?—No.

Q. How much per bushel does it cost for wheat in your section of the country?—I have not figured up.

Q. How do you know that they can buy it cheaper than they can raise it if you have not figured it?—By practical results. I raise wheat. I raise some years more than I want; but take the country as a whole, in the larger portion of the districts of our Province, they can raise oats, vegetables and buckwheat much cheaper than they can raise wheat.

Q. Are these products of as much value when they are raised?—In their own particular sphere they are. They think it better to raise those articles, because the soil and climate appears to suit them, and to buy flour, because wheat is not as sure a crop as it is in Ontario. Some years it does very well. The year before last we had a pretty good crop of wheat. Last year wheat was a failure. Still, we have been increasing our product of wheat since the midge has left off injuring it.

Q. Your country is not suitable for the growth of wheat?—I should say not. Still, there are good crops of wheat raised in certain parts.

Q. Is it to the interest of the wheat-growers of New Brunswick to admit American wheat free of duty?—There may be individual farmers in whose interest it would not be. As a whole, speaking for New Brunswick, it would not be, in my opinion.

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of a duty on American Indian corn and other coarse grains upon the price of coarse grains in your section of the country?—I do not think it has had any perceptible effect.

Q. What is the American corn imported for?—There is a good deal of American cornmeal imported for use among the poorer classes; then a considerable portion—perhaps half or more—is fed to cattle.

Q. Does the importation of American cornmeal affect the price of oatmeal?—I do not think it does.

Q. Does it stop the use of it?—I do not think, to any perceptible degree, that it does.

Q. Can you raise oatmeal?—Yes.

Q. What is the use of importing cornmeal if you can raise oatmeal?—I think that corn is a better feed for cattle.

Q. I am not speaking about cattle; I am speaking about feeding men?—They prefer cornmeal.

Q. You think it is better food?—I am not speaking of my own opinion. An individual opinion would not be much. I like oatmeal, but the general public does not.

Q. Is it profitable for a farmer to keep stock he has to buy the feed for?—As a general rule, I do not think it is.

Q. Can you not raise feed cheaper than you can buy Indian corn?—I think, Mr. Chairman, you are getting into another question. I may say, though, that my advice to farmers would be to raise all they can.

Q. And not to buy anything?—If they have to buy anything, I would buy corn or cornmeal.

Q. Is it good for a farmer to keep stock he has to buy feed for?—Not as a rule.

Q. What has been the effect produced upon the price of wheat and flour by the duties imposed on these articles coming from the United States?—If you want to know the general effect, I should say it has been to embarrass trade more than anything else. That is a question that requires a good deal of explanation.

Q. We want you to give your views?—The fact is, we do import considerable flour into those Provinces. There is a certain trade between those Provinces and the United States which necessitates almost the importation of flour from the United States.

Q. That is not quite an answer to the question. The question is, what has been the effect of the duty upon the price of wheat and flour? Has it increased the price?—It has increased the price to a certain degree, not to the full amount of the duty. To those who import it from the United States it has increased the price, and it is only a certain trade that does import it.

Q. Is an increased price of wheat and flour likely to benefit farmers?—No.

Q. The increased price of wheat and flour is not likely to benefit farmers, is that what you say?—As a whole it has not, and it has not in our district.

Q. No; but I do not speak of that particular district.—I am speaking of New Brunswick.

Q. I am speaking of farmers as a whole?—Do you speak of Ontario too?

Q. Farmers as a whole; every place.—I explained when I first took my seat that I would speak from the standpoint of the Province from which I come. There are parties who have been examined, and parties who will be examined from Ontario and other parts of the Dominion, who will speak specially of their own districts.

Q. We are discussing principles here, and I ask is it advantageous to the farmer to allow the importation of the articles he produces?—In the Province from which I come it is not. I am not prepared to give a general opinion.

Q. Can they import Canadian flour from Boston in bond?—I think they can; I think there are regulations to that effect, but the difficulty and the trouble in doing it counteracts all the benefit.

Q. What trouble is there?—In buying it you only get it in bond in certain warehouses and certain cities. We have a coasting trade; there are small towns all along the coast to which we sell our products, and we would not get flour in bond except at Portland and one or two other points.

Q. But do these small places import at all?—Oh yes, they import.

Q. From Boston direct?—Yes; all along the coast.

Q. What has been the effect of the increased duty on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard, upon the average price of these articles in the Canadian market?—Favorable upon the whole.

Q. Favorable to whom?—To the producer.

Q. It has increased the price?—Yes.

Q. Where is your market principally?—The United States.

Q. Have you sent any to the North-West?—None that I know of.

Q. Do you find it profitable to breed horses?—Yes; I think it is about as profitable, if you have a good stock of horses, to breed colts as any other stock.

Q. Has the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter improved through the effect of the present Tariff?—No; it has not. We export all those articles. We do not import them. It has had no effect.

Q. Would the Canadian farmer be benefited by having a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?—He would.

Q. Why?—Because the United States market is our only market for a large part of our productions.

Q. Are the Americans exporters of the same sort of farm produce?—Of some of the produce they are. But with reference to vegetables, and all perishable articles of that description, the American market is the market for our surplus.

Q. What perishable articles do you ship to the United States!—Vegetables cabbage, and that sort of thing.

Q. Do you ship cabbage?—We made quite a considerable consignment last fall but there is a large amount of farm produce, and the American market is our only market.

Q. Are the markets in which the Americans sell their surplus not open to you?—Yes; they are.

Q. Why cannot you send to them as well as to the American markets?—Because the Americans are at our door.

Q. But they are exporters of the same kind of produce.—Exactly. Do you refer specially to cattle?

Q. I refer to everything. Is not the market in England better for cattle than that of the United States?—No. You can ship cattle from Portland or Boston for nearly half what you can ship it from New Brunswick for. The fact is, that in shipping our cattle to England we have to bring them clear up to Quebec. We have not facilities for shipping them there.

Q. But they go to the English market?—Some of them do. This present season there have been two or three shipments from New Brunswick, *via* Quebec.

Q. Do you cultivate flax, tobacco, and sugar beet in your neighbourhood?—No; we cultivate the sugar beet for feeding purposes.

Q. Has the Tariff on wool affected the price of it any?—No. The Tariff does not affect the price at all. We export coarse wool; but there is no duty on fine wool.

Q. Has there been more coarse wool used in manufactures since the adoption of the Tariff than before?—I do not know. I do not think there has been much of it.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you raise fine or coarse wool?—Coarse, principally.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. Has the cost of farm implements increased or decreased under the Tariff?—I think that the prices are somewhat lower, but the implements do not last so long and are not so durable.

Q. To which implements do you refer chiefly?—Mowing machines for instance.

Q. Have you used up a mowing machine since the adoption of the Tariff? Is it because of that that you say they do not last so long?—I have had two. I think I can judge by using a machine one season whether it is durable or not.

Q. You say they are not so good?—They are lighter; they are a little cheaper, but they will not stand the weather, they will wear out sooner,

Q. In your opinion have woollen or cotton goods advanced in price?—I cannot give an opinion, but I think they have. I am not prepared to go into that, you know my idea of the Tariff in ordinary cases must advance the price.

Q. That is a proposition I dispute?—All right.

Q. Has the present Tariff given diversity of employment and other encouragement to our various industrial classes, thereby retarding emigration to the United States and encouraging Canadians to return to this country?—No, Sir, it has not with us.

Q. It has not encouraged any Canadians to return to this country?—No, Sir, it has not with us.

Q. Has farm property increased or decreased in value?—It has decreased in value by 25 per cent. at least.

Q. Since when?—I do not want to be understood as saying that the Tariff has been the cause of all the decrease in farm property, but there has been a decrease during the last ten years of 25 per cent.

Q. In ten years?—Yes.

Q. Has it been going on during the last three years?—During the last three years it has been going on. There has been more people leaving the country during the last three years than formerly, and the result of them leaving the country is to reduce the value of farm property.

Q. The decrease is caused by the people leaving the country then?—Partly; partly from other causes.

Q. What other causes?—Well, our markets are not so good as they were. I do not say that is occasioned by the National Policy either; but for farm produce our markets were formerly largely with lumbermen.

Q. The home market?—Yes.

Q. Then the home market is better than the foreign market?—No doubt.

Q. Would not the establishment of manufactories create a home market?—We have not any manufactories to speak of.

Q. But would it?—To the extent that it increased the population.

Q. Is the establishment of manufactories likely to increase the population?—I do not think so. In New Brunswick we have not many manufactories now. We have two cotton mills and a sugar refinery at Moncton; but our towns are going down. St. John is not so populous.

Q. Since when?—I cannot say exactly; but since the last census.

Q. What were the causes? Was not the great fire an important element in its decrease?—That might be an element, but I do not think a great element, because the people who went away came back again after the fire. They scattered through the country during the rebuilding after the fire, but they almost all gathered in again.

Q. What has been the cause of the decrease?—The cause has been the decline of trade. I think the deflection of the Intercolonial Railway from St. John around the North Shore has taken the trade away from St. John, and has decreased the wholesale trade. Then there are a lot of manufactures that used to be produced in the Lower Provinces that are now manufactured in Montreal instead of St. John.

Q. They were manufactured in St. John before?—To some extent. For instance, the boot and shoe making business has been transferred largely from St. John to Montreal.

Q. Was that carried on to a large extent at St. John?—Not to a very large extent. Still we supplied our own boots and shoes largely.

Q. Are there fewer made there than there were?—I think so. The runners from Montreal go out through the country and take orders from the different country merchants. The goods thereupon go direct to them, and not through the wholesale houses of St. John.

Q. Has the general condition of the labouring classes been improved?—Labouring men, parties who get a living by labour, parties who hire out, get better wages than they did two years ago. Times have improved; lumbering has improved; but I do not think the general condition of the farmer is any better.

Q. How have the farmers' crops been during the last two years, compared with what they were three or four years before the adoption of the Tariff?—Last year we

had scarcely an average crop. The year before we had a very good crop. Previous to that, I do not think there would be much difference.

Q. You think the crops were as good before the adoption of the Tariff as they have been since?—They fluctuate. I don't think there is any very perceptible difference from that point of view.

Q. What changes, if any, in legislation are required to make agriculture a more profitable occupation?—Now, from an agricultural standpoint, I could not understand why they did not put a duty on hides and fine wool.

Q. Then you are favourable to Protection?—If we have Protection at all, I think the farmers should have their share of it. I do not admit that you can improve the condition of the farmer by Protection, but if you have Protection at all, one class has as much right to it as another. Then you fail to impose any extra duties on butter and cheese.

Q. Do you recommend a larger duty on butter and cheese?—I do not think I did. I do not think it would have a beneficial effect in New Brunswick.

Q. Do you recommend a duty on hides and fine wool?—I say as long as we have a Protective Tariff we should have a duty on hides and wool.

Q. Can you account for the high prices of grain this year in the United States?—I cannot answer that question.

Q. Does the large home market there affect the price of grain?—Where?

Q. In the United States.—Does it affect the price of grain where? In Canada?

Q. Does the large home market for grain in the United States affect the price of grain in the United States?—I presume that the more they consume in the United States, the less they export, provided the output is uniform.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I understand you to say that in New Brunswick, and in your section of the country particularly, you import considerable flour?—Yes.

Q. And you do not raise sufficient for your wants?—We do not.

Q. Where is your flour principally imported from?—Principally from Canada; but 14,000 barrels I see entered New Brunswick from the United States last year.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. I suppose when you say Canada you mean Ontario?—Yes; principally from Ontario. Our trade is such that we ship large quantities of wood, lumber and all descriptions of farm products to the United States, and in return we want ballast. We want in fact, an exchange of products in order to make a profitable trade. We want ballast in return from Boston to St. John. We formerly got flour which was carried for from 10 to 12 cents. It costs fifty to sixty from Toronto.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. It would be an advantage to get a return cargo?—Yes; we must buy a certain amount no matter what duty is put on it.

Q. Where do you find a market for your surplus hay?—In the United States.

Q. That is the only market you have?—No; we sometimes ship some to the West Indies, but the principal market is the United States. We have shipped isolated cargoes to the West Indies when at certain times prices go up there.

Q. But the best market is where? Boston?—Our best market is the United States. Our potatoes we ship very largely, and the only market we have is the United States.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Do you raise potatoes largely?—Yes.

Q. Your other vegetables also find a market in the United States?—Yes.

Q. And on account of the imposition of the Tariff you do not get return cargoes?—That is the effect of the Tariff. We do not stop the trade though. We cannot stop the trade because we must send to the United States, and we are obliged to pay the additional duty in consequence.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Is much cornmeal used in your Province?—Fifty-one thousand barrels were imported into New Brunswick this year.

Q. Do you know the Tariff on corn meal?—Yes, forty cents.

Q. Do you consider that a direct tax on the consumers?—A direct tax as far as cornmeal is concerned; but I do not consider the duty a direct tax so far as flour is concerned.

Q. There is not so much American flour and cornmeal coming over here as previous to the imposition of the Tariff?—Perhaps not. I have not looked at the returns.

Q. It is a necessity that you should purchase flour in the United States?—Yes.

Q. Did you say much American flour comes over?—Fourteen thousand barrels last year.

Q. So you do not raise enough for home consumption?—We have not heretofore.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Can you raise corn there?—There are some sections in New Brunswick in which we can raise corn pretty well; but as a rule it is not raised.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Are many of the inhabitants leaving New Brunswick?—Yes.

Q. Do you know their destination?—The United States. A few went to Manitoba, but a very few. They nearly all go to the United States.

Q. Is the exodus very large?—It has been very large.

Q. During the last three or four years?—Yes; during the last three or four years, but during the last two years especially.

Q. How does that affect the price of real estate?—Unfavourably, as I have already said.

Q. Could you tell the percentage of reduction?—I think I am quite safe in saying that, taking real estate as a whole, it has fallen 25 per cent.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. In two years?—In ten years.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. But principally within how many years?—The last decade.

Q. So you think the farmer is not benefited by the imposition of the Tariff?—I am certain New Brunswick farmers are not.

Q. And the pretence of a duty on wool is not properly adjusted; what kind of wool should it be on?—We can raise fine wool as well as they can in the Eastern States; but fine wool is duty free, and there is no encouragement for it.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. I understood you to say you import flour largely from Ontario?—I do.

Q. Would you import from Ontario so largely as you do if you had Free Trade with the United States?—I do not think we would.

Q. You would get your flour from the United States?—Yes; more than we do now.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I was going to ask Mr. Burpoe this: in the event of a surplus in the Dominion, of grain—any variety of grain—wheat, for instance, would it not be to our advantage to have American wheat in free? For the benefit of the carrying trade, if for nothing else, would it not be to the interests of Canada to admit American wheat free and carry it through the Dominion?—If there is a great artery—a railway or a canal—it would.

Q. What I mean to say is this: if we have expended thirty or forty millions enlarging our canals would it not be better to encourage the use of those canals than to close them by the imposition of these duties?—That does not apply to New Brunswick.

Q. But I am speaking of the whole Dominion.—I should say it would.

Q. What market rules the price of grain as a general thing?—The English market, I should think.

Q. The Liverpool quotations?—Yes.

Q. Would it not be to our advantage to have the whole, or the half, of the surplus produce of the United States pass through the Dominion to the seaboard for shipment?—I should say so.

Q. And when there is a surplus, in that case, it could have no effect on the prices here?—No; certainly not, as a rule. There might be exceptional cases.

Q. What is the price of oats in your Province?—About 45 to 50 cents last year.

Q. Have they been higher on the American side?—I cannot say exactly; but I believe they have been 56 cents per bushel, or 7 cents higher.

Q. So there are no oats imported?—So far as New Brunswick is concerned, we neither import nor export oats. We do not raise quite as much as we use. We get some from Prince Edward Island sometimes, and I think some comes down the Gulf from Montreal, on the north shore.

Q. So the duty has not enhanced the price?—Not at all.

Q. Have you any oatmeal mills in your locality?—We have very few—one or two—and they are not very good. Our oatmeal mills are not a success.

Q. Were they a success before the Tariff?—They have never been a success. We import our oatmeal principally from Ontario; but there is very little oatmeal used.

Q. Cornmeal is used principally?—Yes.

Q. Do you raise poultry extensively?—Yes.

Q. Where do you find a market?—In the United States. There are large quantities of eggs shipped to the United States; also butter; not so much cheese. Cheese factories are increasing, and we are exporting some just now; at all events we make all we want.

Q. The duties on cheese and butter are not changed?—They are not increased.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Has the Tariff caused a decrease in the price of farm property in your Province?—I did not say it had; but I think it has not helped it any. My impression is, that the additional taxes have that effect. I do not say it is a very perceptible effect, but the increased taxes must have that effect. Our local taxes may have that effect, they have increased as well as our Dominion taxes; but it is a notable fact that property—real estate—has gone down.

Q. Are many of your farmers going to the North-West?—Very few, indeed. The first of our emigration went to the United States; the stream commenced to flow in that direction, and it continues.

Q. Not on account of the National Policy?—I do not attribute it to that.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. You said you purchased your oats from the Gulf?—No. I say we do import some from Prince Edward Island, but not from any foreign country, and I thought that some oats on the North shore came down at certain times from Montreal.

Q. You said also that you thought if the duty was taken off wheat it would affect the price?—Flour; not wheat.

Q. I think you said wheat?—No; I do not know anything about wheat.

Q. Are you aware that in 1877-78 we exported \$1,224,904 worth of flour?—Yes.

Q. And that in 1890 and 1891 we exported \$5,104,063 worth, an increase of \$3,879,159 worth?—Yes.

Q. The export has therefore increased under the Tariff. How, under these circumstances comes it that you say you believe if the duty were taken off the exports would increase?—I think you mistake my position. I did not say it would increase the export.

Q. I think you said it would be more profitable for our canals, because we would have a larger trade—more exports?—I said I thought it would be to the interests of the country if a foreign trade passed through our canals, leaving the freight rates on the road. It would be to the interest of Montreal if the grain trade passed through Canada.

Q. You said that if the duty were taken off it would increase the exports. Now, according to the returns the contrary is shown to be the case. How do you account for that?—I did not say it would increase the exports.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. What Mr. Landry means is this ; you said if there were no duties upon American products there would be more shipped through Canada by our canals. He pointed out that in 1877, prior to the inauguration of the Tariff, there were less American products exported through Canada than in 1881 ; and we ask you now to explain that ?—I am not in a position to account for it wholly. I think there may be a great many causes.

Q. But do you not find that your opinion is not supported by facts ?—No, I do not. I do not want to enter into a controversy with any member of the Committee ; but I presume that you will acknowledge that a trade passing through a country must be beneficial to the country through which it passes ?

Q. Yes.—Well, that is the only proposition I make.

Q. But the returns show that the trade since the Tariff came in is larger than before ?—I cannot say as to that.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you believe that when there is a surplus exported to a foreign country the market price in the market to which it goes regulates the price in the country from which it is exported ?—As a rule.

Q. Then when there is flour exported from a country—and there is flour exported every year from Canada—the price is regulated entirely by the market to which the surplus goes ?—As a rule.

Q. Therefore the duties imposed on flour from the United States, as long as we have a surplus of flour, do not increase the price ?—As a rule they do not ; there are exceptional cases in which it will have no effect, as I have explained to the Committee already.

Q. Can you explain how it was that in 1877, we exported a large amount of flour, and the price of flour in Montreal was at one period higher than it was at Liverpool ?—I do not recollect the circumstance ; but these accidental cases will occur.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Would it not pay the farmer better to feed his hay than to sell it to the United States ?—Some of our farmers raise very much more than they can feed. I am speaking, of course, of the district in which I live. They export much hay ; their land is bottom land, interval land, and it will sustain itself almost.

Q. But would it not pay better to raise stock and ship it, than to raise and ship hay ?—You must keep enough stock on your farm to keep your farm up ; but they can do that and sell half the hay.

Q. Would not the freight on hay be a large item ?—Quite a large item.

Q. Would it not be more profitable to feed it to stock and to ship the stock ?—No.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What do you get for it ?—It is worth \$12 or \$13 in St. John.

Q. How much will the farmer get for it ?—About \$10.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. It is in the interests of the New Brunswick farmer to buy food for himself ?—Where he does not raise it.

Q. And it is in his interests to buy feed for his stock ?—I answered that question. I said I thought it would be to the interest of the farmers to raise the grain with which they feed their stock ; but if they have not enough of their own produce, it is better to buy corn than buy the grain raised in the country.

Q. What sort of a farming country is it that cannot raise food for its people or feed for its cattle ?—We have hardly time to go into the demerits of various countries.

Q. It cannot be a good country to live in.—It is a good country to live in. I have been in New Brunswick all my life time, and I have been in the district Mr. Wallace came from a month or two, and after being in that district, I went home perfectly satisfied to stay at home.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What kind of wheat do you grow ?—Spring wheat ; we do not grow any fall wheat.

Q. How much per acre?—From 15 to 30 bushels.

Q. How many acres does a farmer cultivate?—We are not a wheat growing country. The farmers have been in the habit of growing just what they want themselves. They do not profess to raise wheat to sell; they raise it for their own use mainly, and for the use of their farm labourers.

Q. They do not raise enough for their own use?—They do not generally do so.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is dairying carried on?—Yes, considerably.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. How much hay per acre do you call an average crop?—Two tons.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you find dairying profitable?—About as profitable as anything.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Would you raise fine wool if there was a duty on it?—I think it would be an encouragement to raise fine wool; if the Tariff is an encouragement to anything it would be to that.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you raise roots in your country?—Yes.

Q. Well?—Very well.

Q. Do you not think that in a country where root crops are grown, a farmer should raise sufficient for his own cattle cheaper than he can buy?—No. Roots alone are not calculated to make a beast fat. We want some feed grain. I use a great deal of buckwheat, and I think it is very good.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Where are your agricultural implements made principally?—We have two or three manufacturers; there is, notwithstanding, a large quantity imported from Ontario, and there are some from the United States. I think there are less agricultural implements manufactured in New Brunswick than there were five years ago.

Q. Do you find the article as good an article as formerly?—I think they are as good, but they are not so durable, in my opinion.

Q. Not sufficient material in them?—Not so strong; they are good, but not so strong. The Toronto mower is one of our best mowers.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. When our North-West is developed are there any possible supplies you could send up to exchange with them?—No; but there may be some small articles.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you send any cattle to England?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you a fruit-grower?—Yes.

Q. Do you think the North-West will give you a market for fruit?—I think Ontario will monopolize that with the United States. It is a long way to carry fruit.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. I understand you to say, that in shipping cattle to England, you ship from Montreal and not from your own Province direct?—Sometimes we ship from Quebec.

Q. Cannot you ship from Halifax?—Yes; but freights are very high by that route.

Q. We have shipped from our part of the Province?—There has been more cattle shipped from our Province *via* Rivière du Loup and Quebec than from Halifax; and more from St. John. I may add that the same quality of beef is lower in New Brunswick than in Ontario, although we are down by the sea.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. You ship west to reach the seaboard?—We ship west first in order to get our cattle to England. Mr. Coughlin knows you can ship for less by New York or Boston than by Halifax; and if it were not for the slaughtering of cattle going by those ports to reach England, we would ship that way—our trade would go that way.

Q. The slaughter neutralizes the lower freight?—Yes.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you know Mr. Josiah Wood, dealer in cattle?—I have met him.

Q. Does he not ship by Halifax?—Sometimes; I could not say as a rule. Perhaps he does; but this year he sent quite a shipment up to Montreal.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. I suppose the development of foreign trade is your best hold in New Brunswick?—Yes, Sir.

Q. And to encourage trade with the West Indies and so forth?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Do you know what the farmers are getting for beef cattle in your Province?—Do you mean by live weight?

Q. Yes.—We do not, we buy them dead weight. \$3 is a good price, dressed weight; and I think dressed weight is calculated at 60 per cent. of the live weight.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Thirty-three per cent. off all?—Thirty-three per cent off all. Sixty per cent. is a fair average. I think the price there now would be \$3 dressed weight. Beef has been enormously cheaper there than here, and the cheapness is occasioned by the want of facilities for shipment.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. I suppose the quality of your cattle is not so good as ours in Ontario?—Perhaps not; but we have some very fine cattle.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you find clothing dearer than it was previous to the imposition of the Tariff on cottons and woollens?—I think so.

J. D. SCHMOUTH, Professor of Agriculture in the College of St. Annes, Kamouraska, appeared before the Committee, and gave the following evidence:

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. In your opinion is it in the interest of the farmers of Canada to admit free of duty any kind or all kinds of American farm produce?—That is not at all desirable in my opinion.

Q. Do you wish to make any distinction between agricultural products in this respect? Is there any produce of the farm which should not be admitted free of duty into this country, as being to the greater disadvantage of our farmers, than may be the case in regard to other agricultural products?—It would not be at all desirable in the interest of the farmers in my section of the country to admit those kinds of produce free of duty from the United States, which we produce ourselves; but it might be that certain kinds of produce which we do not raise, and for which we have no equivalent, might be admitted advantageously free of duty. But apart from this supposition, I do not think that it would be to the advantage of our farmers to admit American agricultural produce into our country free of duty. This has certainly been a cause for finding fault in the past. When owing to heavy importations of farm produce from the United States free of duty, a great number of our farmers were made to suffer very considerable losses, while some of them were almost ruined.

Q. In your opinion has the free admission of American products in the past—corn for instance—sensibly lowered the price of the coarse grains which were produced in this country?—I could not say that such free admission has not had an injurious effect on the price of our agricultural produce. A great deal of American corn did come into this country when there was no duty on it, and the duty which has been placed on corn has increased the price of our coarse grains very considerably. So that barley, which before this Tariff was brought into operation was sold by us from 60 to 67 cents per bushel, to-day brings as much as 85 to 90 cents per bushel. And then we are now selling our other cereals with which corn can be replaced at prices which have been increased proportionately to the advance—due to the Tariff—that has taken place in the price of corn. For instance, take the case of oats: We used to sell oats before the present Tariff was brought into operation for

from 33 to 35 cents per bushel, but to-day we are getting 50 cents a bushel for them. We used to get 50 cents a bushel for our barley, but we now sell barley for 80 cents a bushel, and even as high as 90 cents a bushel.

Q. Then speaking from your point of view in the interests of the Canadian agriculturalist, the imposition of the duty upon American corn has a beneficial effect, and ought to be maintained?—The duty upon American corn ought to be kept in the Tariff in the interests of the Canadian farmer; owing to the fact that the existence of this duty enables our farmers to sell our coarse grains, with which corn can be replaced at higher prices than we could obtain; if corn were admitted into this country free of duty.

Q. In addition to the effect which the duty on corn has had on the price of our coarse grains, what effect has the duty on flour produced in connection with the sale of flour in your part of the Province?—We do not buy flour in retail for the use of the people on our farm. We cultivate about 400 acres. The ordinary price of flour this winter in our section of the country was \$6.60 a barrel; but we brought the flour which we use from the United States.

Q. Are you positive that the flour which you purchased came from the United States, or did it come from Upper Canada?—We brought a car load of flour from the City of Chicago; we brought it in direct. In every instance I may say, that the placing of a duty upon flour coming into this country, enables us to sell our wheat at higher prices than we received for them before the National Policy came into force. We are getting for wheat \$1.30 a bushel, and we were easily obtaining for it as much as \$1.60 a bushel. Of course, I am speaking of wheat of the best quality.

Q. What has been the effect which has been produced by the present Tariff on the price of live hogs, hams, bacon and lard?—We do not buy pork, but we sell it. In times past—I do not remember at this moment the precise years—we sold our pork for 5 cents a lb., but during the past few years the price of it has been gradually increasing, and to-day it is worth as much as 10 cents a lb. It has in fact doubled in price. The figure advanced from 5 to 6, and then to 7, 8, 9 and 10 cents per lb.; I am now referring to hogs which weigh at least 200 lbs. each.

Q. In the section of the country from which you come, do you raise horned cattle, or horses? Or do you raise both for the purposes of sale?—We principally devote our attention to the raising of horned cattle. This has been for some time our principal industry in this relation.

Q. Has the imposition of the duty of 20 per cent. on the importation of American cattle, affected advantageously for our farmers, the price of the animals which they sell in this country?—I am almost certain that this has been the case with reference to horses. In any event, I am satisfied that at least a part of the increase which has taken place during the last few years in the price of horses, is due to the influence of the Tariff. I have observed that during the last few years the price of horses has advanced considerably, and this has been particularly noticeable this year. The market for horses in our own section of the country is found in the United States.

Q. You are now referring to horses alone?—Yes, to horses. We hardly send anything in this respect to the Province of Manitoba, or to the North-West Territories. Our horses are bought from us by men whom we call runners. They go all through our section of the country for the purpose of buying horses.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. These men are traders, are they not?—They are traders; they come from the United States, and they come over to buy our horses. They prefer to get those animals which have the most pronounced characteristics of the Canadian breed. Our agricultural society has imported one stallion, and even two stallions, with the object of improving the breed of our own horses; but it is not this class of improved horses that these men, of whom I have spoken, are in search.

Q. What class of horses do they want?—They want horses of the Canadian breed.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. These men come over to your part of the country from about Vermont?—Precisely.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Do these men want to get the heavier class of horses? No; this is not the kind of horses which they require. They seek horses which are small in size and thick-set of the old Canadian breed.

Q. Do they want to buy horses of the Clyde breed?—That is not the case in our section of the country; but it is the other kind of which I have spoken—which are in demand. Formerly—five or six years ago—these animals were worth from 15 to 20 louis. I fancy that the price which is given depends greatly on the appearance of the animal; but some of them bring as much as 25 louis, or \$100 each. We still use the term louis in our neighbourhood. Last summer sales of this class of horses were made as high as \$145 each, others were sold for 26 louis each, but these, of course, were not so fine in appearance and in quality. We generally obtain for these horses 30 and 35 louis each—that is from \$120 to \$130 each.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. Do not these horse dealers send a certain number of these horses, which they obtain in your section of the country, to the city of Montreal?—They tell us that they come from across the line, and that they send them to the State of Vermont; but I do not know whether this is the case or not.

Q. Do you think that it is more advantageous to the farmer to raise horses or cattle?—It is not to his advantage to make a special business of the raising of horses. If the farmer raised horses only for the purpose of selling them, this would not be to his interest. But the farmer finds the raising of horses advantageous to him in this way: he can raise them for the purpose of being used in working his farm, and after he has worked them for a few years, when they have reached the age of five or six years, he can sell them. Under these circumstances, the raising of horses is certainly advantageous to the farmer. There is more profit to be obtained by the farmer in the production of butter and of cheese, they can deal in these on a larger scale and with more hope of success.

Q. Are the farmers in your section of the country engaged in the fattening of cattle and in the production of cheese and butter?—We are engaged in all these things. We make cheese, we make butter, and we fatten animals.

Q. Can you tell us whether, since the year 1878, there have been established any cheese or butter factories in your country?—There has been established a cheese factory in the neighbouring parish to ours, in the Parish of St. Roch; and there has also been established a factory for dairy purposes in the second parish below us, in the Parish of St. Denis. We have one of these establishments in our neighbourhood, a cheese factory which has commenced operations. There is also one in the Parish of St. Pascal, and I think that, besides these, there is one in the Parish of St. Pierre. In any event, including the one which is in the Parish of St. Roch, we have already four of these establishments, and they have all been established since the year 1878; in fact this has been the case within the last two years.

Q. Can the Canadian farmer raise, in your section of the country, all the grain that is necessary for the fattening of his cattle?—He can raise more grain than is sufficient for this purpose. We always fatten a great number of animals, of hogs and horned cattle, and we export a considerable number of them. This is done in our neighbourhood every year; and besides this, one of our farmers sold this winter 1,100 bushels of oats, the produce of his farm.

Q. Where do you find a market for oats?—We sell our oats to the same people that I have mentioned, to these Americans. The same traders come into our section and buy our oats. They ship these oats to the United States. We sell these oats on the spot; that is, our farmers do not leave their homes for the purpose of making these sales. The only condition that the buyer puts on the sale is that the grain shall be delivered by the seller at the station, and this does not necessitate a very long haulage. We made very considerable sales of oats this winter, and we got 50 cents a bushel for them. I am speaking of the Imperial bushel.

Q. Do you find an improvement in our market for the sale of vegetables, poultry, butter and eggs?—Butter has greatly increased in price. There is a very

great improvement in the price of butter. Three years ago butter in our section of the country was only worth 10 cents a lb., but it has since gradually raised in price until last year, when it was worth 15 cents a lb. This was at the commencement of the season. It has advanced to 18 cents a lb. since then. I am now speaking of the ordinary qualities of butter. I do not refer to butter of extra quality, which has always commanded a good price, but to ordinary butter. This is at present worth 20 cents a lb., and, as you will see, there has been a great and steady improvement in this respect. As a matter of fact, when butter during a couple of years was worth only 10 cents a lb., it was scarcely worth making, and when made, it was of little advantage to the farmer. It was hardly worth the trouble of taking it to the market, it was so cheap. Pork was also at that time very cheap; it was in fact too cheap; so cheap that farmers hardly obtained any advantage from what they raised.

Q. Are poultry and eggs improved in price since the introduction of the present Tariff?—As to fowl and eggs, what we produce are used altogether in local consumption.

Q. You do not export any of these articles?—We do not export any of them at the present time in our neighbourhood. Eggs are worth 12 cents a dozen; that is not very dear.

Q. Do you think that it would be profitable for the farmers in your section of the country at all events, to have a Reciprocity Treaty?—Formerly, when we had a Reciprocity Treaty, we found that it was a profitable thing for us, but nevertheless I do not think that at the present time we would find a Reciprocity Treaty to be advantageous for us. The state of inferiority, which we formerly occupied before the establishment of the present Tariff, was such that it did not permit us to compete advantageously with the products of American manufacturers; but it is not unlikely that in a short time we will be able to do so, and then it will be an advantage to us to have a Reciprocity Treaty which would permit our products to enter the American market free of duty, and the United States products to enter our market on the same conditions. But until we emerge completely from the unfavorable condition in which we were, it would be better for us in my opinion to continue the present system.

Q. Do you think that the present system would enable us to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States on better terms than would be the case, if we did not have a protective régime?—Oh, yes; that is undoubtedly the case. We are able to produce grain as cheaply as our neighbours can. Our oats sell for 50 cents a bushel; and they are also worth 50 cents a bushel in the United States.

Q. It is not from that point of view that I ask the question, but from this point of view: duties are placed on the American products, which may be sent into this country, as the Americans impose duties on our products, which we may export to that country, then under this system of reprisals which we have adopted, are we not placed in a better position for the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty—which would be profitable to this country—than if we had not these duties imposed on American agricultural products, as was the case in the year 1878?—It seems to me that it would be more proper to address this question to a politician, or a member of the Government. I do not see that people in my position can answer fittingly so important a question.

Q. I think that you have not understood me properly, I am speaking of the exchange of products between these two countries; if, on the one hand, the Americans, as they do, place duties on our products; and if, on the other hand, under our system, we were under the obligation of receiving into our country all their products free of duty, and we were forced to seek a market for our produce in a foreign market, would not our position be less favorable for the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty, than if we occupied in this respect positions of equality, as is the case to-day. Being in a position of equality, can we not negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty on better terms than if we occupied a less favorable position, through our not placing duties on American products?—Probably that would be the case. The fact that we have

placed duties on American farm products, will certainly give us an advantage in case we were negotiating a Reciprocity Treaty.

Q. Then the present Tariff puts us in a better position than we would occupy if we did not have it in force, in case we wish to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty?—I could not give an answer to that question.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. If the Americans could send their grain in here free of duty, what interest would they have in the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty with us?—Exactly. It would be useful for that purpose.

Q. But now that we have duties on their agricultural products, if any attempt were made to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty, could not we obtain such a treaty on better terms than would be the case if we had nothing to offer them in return for concessions on their part? At present we can offer to take off the duties which we have placed on their farm products. It is for that reason, it seems to me, that this is a question to which it is not easy to give an answer. But I will try and give you an answer. We are, at the present time, under the *régime* of reciprocity in trade, and they say that this is a protective Tariff, but it is not protection at all against the United States. We are not protected; we are really under a reciprocal *régime*. They impose duties on our products, and we place duties on their products; and this is Reciprocity.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. These are reprisals in Tariffs?—Yes.

*By Mr. Béchard :—*

Q. This is reciprocity in Tariffs?—You can call it reprisals in duties, if you wish.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. I allude to the question of Reciprocity, not in that sense, but in the sense of the admission of products of either country into either country free of duty.—That would be an advantage for us.

Q. And it would be an advantage for us in case we were negotiating a Reciprocity Treaty, to have something to offer, as is now the case?—This is an advantage, because we have some compensation to offer.

Q. I ask the question with reference to Reciprocity in that sense?—We could accept their products free of duty, and they could accept ours on the same conditions. This would be a system as advantageous as is the present system. It would confer a benefit on our farmers; and we are, at the present time, in a better position than we were before the year 1879, as far as the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty is concerned.

Q. That is the question: are we in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty on favourable terms for this country, than we were before the National Policy came into force?—Yes, I think we are.

Q. Can you tell us whether the present Tariff has increased the price of wool in your section of the country?—We raise wool for local consumption merely, and the price of it has not been increased much. It is now with us worth 50 cents a lb. We do not send any of it out of the district. It is used for local consumption wholly.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Have you observed any change in the price of wool since the introduction of the present Tariff?—No, I have noticed no change in it during the last twenty years.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. What effect has the present Tariff had on the cultivation of flax and tobacco in your section of the country?—The flax which we raise is used for local consumption; as to tobacco, the area of cultivation has been increased. Two or three times as much tobacco is now grown than was formerly the case.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Is it used for local consumption?—Yes, that is the case. It is not exported.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. Then, less foreign-grown tobacco is sold in your section of the country than was formerly the case?—The merchants in our neighbourhood do not now sell one-half of the tobacco which they were accustomed to sell ten years ago. But the tobacco which we raise is not sent out of the locality. Less tobacco, however, is brought into the neighbourhood from the other side.

Q. Has the price of agricultural implements been increased or decreased since the present Tariff has been in force?—The general tendency has been to lessen the price of these implements. We buy these implements in Canada. We generally get what we use in our section of the country from Frost & Wood, of Smith's Falls.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. Do you buy many of them in your section of the country every year? Yes. We buy some of them every year. We buy ploughs, harrows, shovels and various other things in this line; horse rakes as well.

Q. What price is it that you have paid for agricultural implements?—What has been the nature of your purchases in this respect, in the aggregate? It amounts to \$15,000.

Q. Do you now refer to farm implements which you have bought? I do not; but I allude to the capital stock. Some years ago we paid as much as \$140 for mowers; the price afterwards fell to \$100, but to-day we can buy the same machine for \$80.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. And can you get them on the same conditions as formerly at that price? Yes. They are No. 1 in quality.

Q. The quality of them is No. 1? Yes, it is.

Q. They are always sold on the same principle? Yes; the firm from which we purchase make very fine machines. Reapers used to cost \$120 each; but last year I bought a new reaper and I paid \$90 for it. This was on the 1st of last January, and it is the nominal price, as the amount is payable on the 1st of January, 1883.

Q. It is payable in three years? I bought it in the year 1881, and it does not become payable until the 1st of January, 1883, and this without interest. The price is nominal. It is not really \$90, since we can reap two crops with it before we make any payment.

Q. The price of this machine is \$90, less the interest? Yes; that is the case.

Q. It is \$90, less the interest, for these two years? Yes; and as to ploughs, we paid some years ago, \$12 for them.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. Are they mixed ploughs, made up of iron and wood?—No, they are not made of iron, but of steel, and we are paying at present for these ploughs, \$10 each.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. These ploughs are made by Frost & Wood, I suppose? Yes; they are made by the same firm. They have three models of ploughs: Hill's Patent No. 5 and No. 8. The best of their ploughs is No. 8, and we pay more for it than we do for the other two.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. You have paid for ploughs made partly of wood \$12?—They are not made of wood.

Q. They are what is called a mixed plough?—No. 8 plough is worth \$12 at the factory, and \$13 when it reaches us.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. The price of harrows has also decreased, I believe, since this Tariff was introduced?—The price of harrows has not been increased, and it has not been diminished. It has remained uniform.

Q. What is the result with reference to thrashing machines?—I have not bought any thrashing machines lately; but I think that they have remained the same price.

Q. Do you know anything about the prices of other agricultural implements? Have the prices of spades and shovels, etc., been increased, or have they been diminished under this Tariff?—There has been an improvement in this respect. The prices of these articles have been lessened. As to the small implements which are used by hand, they generally come to us from St. Catherines and from Oshawa, and there has been a decided lessening in their price since this Tariff came into operation.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Has the quality of all these articles been lessened during the past three years? Have they been cheaper during this period than they were before the introduction of the National Policy?—They are now made in a better style than they were.

Q. They are better made, are they?—They are better made, and the finish of them is finer. At present our merchants get such tools from the town of Oshawa, and they are finished in the most perfect manner.

Q. They are better made now than was the case some years ago?—Yes, and they are otherwise better finished.

Q. And they are cheaper as well?—They are cheaper also.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. Do you know whether the Tariff has increased or decreased the prices of cotton and woollen goods?—In our locality we are not in such continuous communication with the manufacturers of these articles as would enable me to answer that question satisfactorily.

Q. How is it with reference to the price of hardware?—I have already given an opinion as to the prices of these articles.

Q. Has the present Tariff given increased employment and other encouragement to the labouring classes, prevented their emigration to the United States, and encouraged Canadians to return from there to this country? Can you give any information under this head, at all events, so far as your portion of the Province is concerned?—What is an undoubted fact is that at the present time, and during the past two years, and, in fact, during the last ten years, there has been a great and continuous stream of emigration from Canada—and in any event, from our locality—towards the United States; and during each year this stream of emigration has notably increased. So much has this been the case that during this year there has certainly gone to Montana, and to some other States of the American Union, double the number of men and women who went from here there in the course of the past year. This current of emigration, instead of decreasing, has in fact increased; and this stream of emigration is generally attributed, as to the cause of it, to the current of emigration which was produced under certain circumstances during previous years. This has gone on increasing, little by little. Commenced and continued under the force of circumstances, it has probably at the present time reached its full extent, and it is generally thought that from this time forward it will decrease in volume, as we can today offer to our people higher wages than we could before, in order to induce them to remain in this country. In our locality salaries have been very low. Formerly we paid men \$60 a year, and board; but now we give them as much as \$120 a year and board.

Q. Wages are double what they were?—Yes, they advanced to \$80 a year and board, then to \$90 and \$96, and now they are \$120 a year and board. During the past ten years wages have doubled. Nevertheless notwithstanding the increase in wages, which has taken place, the current of emigration having become established, has continued to exist, and emigration has not decreased its proportions. On the contrary, it has increased to a considerable degree. For instance, twice as many people left our section of the country this year, as did last year.

Q. Do you know whether the population in your part of the country is shown to have decreased in number, according to the census returns?—It has increased as far as I could discover from the reports which I read.

Q. Then you have a surplus of population?—Yes; the French Canadian race is very prolific.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. The current of emigration, of which you speak, commenced twenty years later in your part of the country than was the case in other parts of the country. I now refer particularly to the country around the city of Montreal?—Yes; the current set in later in our section of the country.

Q. It has become exhausted elsewhere, while you are at the present time, experiencing the full force of the movement?—Yes. It is in its full strength with us. I have frequently passed through other parts of the Province, and I have noticed that in the parishes in the neighbourhood of Montreal and Three Rivers—the latter I may say is my birth-place—the same thing occurred some time ago. Fifteen years ago there was considerable emigration from those parts of the country. In fact, everybody seemed to be leaving it.

Q. And the same thing is occurring in your section of the country at the present time?—Yes; and it is for this reason that I remarked a few moments ago, it is probable that in a few years, or perhaps in a very short time, this current of emigration will greatly diminish in proportion.

Q. Is there enough land available with you for the employment and support of the people who are in this manner leaving you; or is this movement due to the overflow of a superabundant population?—It represents a superabundant population. We have only a small extent of land which is of good quality. It only extends back for a concession and a half, or a few acres, and beyond that the soil is very poor and very difficult of cultivation. It is very rocky. In fact, at the present time the young people who remain in the country for the purpose of colonizing it, prefer to take up free grants about Lake St. John.

Q. Have some of your people gone out to the Lake St. John District?—Yes.

Q. And some of them are going to the Province of Manitoba, are they not?—Yes; some do go to Manitoba.

Q. And some of your people have gone to the Territory of Montana?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. And some of them have gone to other portions of the States?—The great bulk of the emigration from our section of the country has been directed toward the Territory of Montana.

Q. And there is a tendency at the present time among the people in your neighbourhood to go to the Province of Manitoba?—Yes, emigration is now being directed toward Manitoba. Those who have gone to this Province are either farmers or the sons of farmers, and their intention in going there is to take up farm lands; but those who have gone to Montana are men who work by the day—they are labourers.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. Are you aware whether farm property has been increased in value since the introduction of the present Tariff? What has been the general effect of it? Has the Tariff increased or decreased the value of farm property in your section of the country?—Speaking in a general way, the effect of the Tariff has been to improve the value of farm property. Our markets have improved; the prices which we obtain for our agricultural products are higher; and generally speaking, the value of farm property has very sensibly advanced, as far as I can see.

Q. To what extent has property generally or farm property increased in value under the influence of the present Tariff?—Since the introduction of the present Tariff, farm property has increased at least 20 per cent. in value. The average increase in value has been in my opinion 20 per cent. Formerly it was the farmer who ran after the capitalist in order to borrow money; but now it is the capitalist who runs after the farmer in order to lend him money. Borrowers had to seek lenders in those days; but now the lenders seek the borrowers; in such a manner have times changed since this Tariff has been in force.

Q. Then, in your opinion, the general condition of the Canadian farmer has improved in a very considerable degree since the year 1878?—Yes; we do not find

many mortgages made at the present time, and money can be obtained on mortgages at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, while money is lent on notes at the rate of 6 per cent. It is probable that a part of these results is not entirely due to the influence of the present Tariff. I must in all fairness make this statement, as I ought to tell you exactly what I think on this subject. The people who go out to Montana, send back money which they have there earned to their friends in our section of the country; and the latter use it in order to pay off old debts. But this remark, however, only applies to a small minority, still it is a circumstance that should be mentioned in this relation.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. The sale of farm produce and the high prices which the farmers obtain for their produce, has something to do with their present prosperity?—The principal cause of this prosperity is due to the better sale of farm produce at higher prices.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. The high prices which are obtained for farm produce improves the general condition of the agricultural class.—Yes; that is undoubtedly the case.

Q. Have you any changes to propose in general legislation, which would have the effect of advancing the interests of the agricultural class?—The present condition of the Canadian farmer is not at all unfavourable. On the contrary he is in a very good condition.

Q. Do you mean with reference to legislation?—That is a little out of my line.

Q. Have you any changes in the Tariff to suggest, which you think would be beneficial to the farmer?—Perhaps some changes in the Tariff could be made which would benefit the farmer; but I do not think that the farming interest requires much change in this respect. The farmer can do very well as he is. I do not think that the farmer should be placed in swaddling clothes; or, as it were, put under the charge of a tutor.

Q. In your opinion the Canada farmer is satisfied with the present Tariff?—Yes; he is contented with the general features of the present régime.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. You spoke just now of importations—made on behalf of the college to which you belong. Yes; they are also made on the part of our merchants.

Q. I understand that you occupy a peculiar position, and that it is not the general practice in your parish, or in your county, to bring in carloads of flour?—In our neighbourhood—I do not know whether the same thing is the case elsewhere—the farmers never do any importing.

Q. Who does the importing?—This is either done by the merchants, or on the part of the College of St. Anne's.

Q. Is it done every year, or only occasionally? Does it take place merely every three or four years?—With us it takes place every year. We only bring in flour from the United States.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. You only refer to flour in this relation?—Yes, we do not raise enough wheat for our local consumption.

*By Mr. Béchard :—*

Q. You are now referring to your own neighbourhood?—Yes, we do not raise enough wheat to supply with flour 250 mouths. There is not sufficient for the needs of our scholars. I am not speaking of the situation as it exists in our neighbourhood.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Has the present Tariff encouraged the production of cheese and butter? Has it encouraged the prosecution of agricultural industry generally? Has it had the effect of encouraging the cultivation of the sugar beet?—We do not raise any sugar beets; but we make some butter and some cheese.

Q. Have you no woollen factory in your neighbourhood?—We have no woollen factory. In the same way that the current of emigration was slow in commencing, manufactories are rather slow in being started.

Q. Have you any manufactories of any kind in your neighbourhood? Do you send away any wool?—There is a small export of wool; but apart from butter and cheese there is nothing manufactured.

Q. You have no manufactories?—We have none at all. There is no doubt that the establishment of manufactories would be a great benefit to the community, and if we had a small town like Kamouraska in our midst, something might be done in this direction, and this is the opinion of everyone in our locality.

Q. Do you think that the Protection given to manufactures under the present Tariff is not sufficient to cause manufactures to be started in your vicinity? Does it not hold out enough prospect of profit to induce people to engage in these businesses?—It would be necessary to have considerable capital before manufactures can be started.

Q. There can be no doubt on that point, but I am asking you whether the present Tariff is not of such a nature as would encourage the establishment of manufactories?—As to that I think that it does encourage their establishment.

Q. Have you nothing to suggest in this respect?—No, I have not.

Q. Then it is not owing to any defects in the Tariff that you have no manufacturing establishments in your locality?—No. This is not the fault of the Tariff; the contrary is the case. If there were a little more inclination felt for engaging in manufacturing enterprises, the influence of the present Tariff would naturally encourage capital to engage in them.

Q. There is no doubt that a good many things which you use in your locality, could be manufactured with a profit?—Yes, unquestionably.

Q. But such articles are bought by your merchants in the city of Quebec, and your merchandise, such as tweeds, country cloths, and other articles that could be manufactured in your neighbourhood, are brought into your section of the country, from outside districts. They are made in the city of Montreal and elsewhere?—Woollen goods and tweeds are brought into our neighbourhood from Sherbrooke.

Q. And these articles could be made in your neighbourhood; and if this were the case, it would at all events afford employment to your people, who could then remain at home and not be obliged to emigrate?—It is always necessary to import some articles; but the establishment of industries in our locality would undoubtedly be an advantage.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. You were asked just now, Mr. Schmouth, whether it was desirable to admit certain American products free of duty, and I understood you to say in reply that this was hardly desirable except with regard to articles which we do not produce?—Yes, I said so.

Q. Can you mention some products which we do not produce, and which it would be desirable to admit from the United States free of duty?—There is raw cotton for instance; but there is not much else.

Q. When I refer to American products, I mean products of the farm—such as cereals for instance, or animals?—There is nothing of that kind which it is desirable to admit free of duty. We do not raise corn for instance but we do raise grains, with which corn can be replaced, and I think it is better for us to raise and use those grains, with which corn can be replaced, than to admit corn free of duty from the United States.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. Do you raise any corn in your section of the country?—We can raise it in a fashion; but not profitably. We can get 25 bushels to the acre, but this does not at all prove remunerative.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Do you think that the duty which is placed on corn is in the interest of the Canadian farmer?—Yes, I think so.

Q. Do you think that the exclusion of American corn from this country is in the interest of the Canadian farmer?—Yes, it is in his interest and to his advantage.

Q. Is it not within your knowledge that some Canadian farmers bring it in for the purpose of fattening their stock?—This has not been done now for some years. Formerly it was practised, when corn was cheap. This was not done so much, however, by farmers, as by persons who were engaged in fattening stock, and who, finding American corn cheap at the time, bought it for feeding purposes.

Q. Why did they do so? Because they found it to be to their advantage?—They did it frequently because our farmers did not raise enough of other grains to supply their wants.

Q. The farmers did not raise enough of other grain?—No; and corn came into the country in great quantities, and was cheap. Besides, at that time Canadian produce, such as oats and barley, which are used for feeding purposes, were not high enough in price to enable them to be grown with advantage to the farmer.

Q. Do you consider that oats and barley are a good substitute for corn?—They are more profitable to our farmers than corn; and pork, for instance, which is produced from the feeding of these grains to hogs is of a better quality than pork which is produced from the feeding of corn.

Q. And they are more profitable to the Canadian farmer?—Yes, they are.

Q. And they are preferable for fattening purposes to corn?—Yes; in proportion to the price which they command, this is the case.

Q. You state that when American corn was brought into this country free of duty, our oats and rye were sold at lower prices than they now command?—Yes.

Q. Do we raise in this country more of oats and barley than is required for your local consumption?—I do not know how it is with the whole Province of Quebec in this respect; for that is a matter into which I have not looked. I cannot consequently speak in a general sense; but I know that in our neighbourhood, not only do we fatten beef and pork with oats, but we also raise it in such considerable quantities that we export a good deal of oats. As I stated before, one of our farmers this winter sold 1,100 bushels of oats.

Q. You raise more than is sufficient for home consumption, and you are consequently obliged to sell some of it to be sent out of the locality?—We certainly raise in our section of the country, more oats than we require for home consumption.

Q. You have just stated that corn, and oats, and rye have sold for higher prices since the imposition of the present Tariff than they did previously.—Yes; that is the case.

Q. To what cause do you attribute this fact? To what cause do you attribute this increase which has taken place in the prices of these articles?—It is probably due to decreased production on the part of the Americans, and less production on their part has obliged them to raise their prices.

Q. Then the advance in prices is not due to the imposition of the present duties under this Tariff, but to a reduced production on the part of the Americans?—This is a state of things which occurs in all industries. If the United States do not produce enough oats for their own wants they are obliged to have recourse to us to supply the deficit in their own production.

Q. Then the cause of this increase in prices is due to the fact that the Americans come over to buy our grains?—Yes.

Q. Then your answer is, that the increase in the price of oats is due to the fact that there is a better demand for our oats in the United States?—It is necessary in order to give an answer to this question, to recognise the fact that the Americans are not the only people who buy oats from us. A good many oats are consumed in other parts of the Province of Quebec; and if in these other parts of the Province—as was the case formerly—Indian corn was brought in from the States and used, our farmers would have a much less demand for the oats which they raise, while the local consumption of oats would be also less considerable if corn was imported into our section of the country from the United States. And our farmers would be obliged to keep their produce on hand for a long time before he could dispose of them; and at the same time, in order to make sales, he would be forced to sacrifice his grain and accept lower prices.

Q. Would this fact prevent the Americans buying our oats if you had need of them. You have just stated that you exported a considerable quantity of oats to the American market, and that this is probably the cause of the increase which has taken place in their price. Do you suppose that if corn was brought into this country it would prevent them coming to us for oats?—No.

Q. And the same exportation of oats would be made to the States to satisfy their requirements which now takes place?—But it is likely that we would not obtain for them present prices; our farmers would perhaps have to wait, under these circumstances, until they were forced to make sales. In this kind of business, as in all others, if a great deal of stuff is put on the market, buyers would wait until the demand had slackened, and they would be able to purchase at lower rates. If the farmers could not afford to hold their produce they would be forced to realize and could not get as much for their grain. But now there is a good demand and the farmers are getting good prices.

Q. You are aware that as a general rule the Province of Quebec produces more of barley and oats than is consumed within the limits of the Province?—As I have already remarked, I am certain that this is the case with regard to oats.

Q. Now with respect to this surplus, this excess of production, what do we do with it. We export it, do we not?—Yes, we do.

Q. And what would we do with it if we did not export it?—It would remain probably on the hands of the farmers and would be consumed.

Q. It would be consumed in some other form?—Yes.

Q. But we now export this surplus to foreign markets?—Yes, that is the case.

Q. Why do we do so? Do you think that we send it to foreign markets because it is an advantage to us to do so?—That is necessarily an advantage to us.

Q. Then it is in our own interest to adopt this policy? It is because those who raise this grain find that it is profitable for them to export it that they do export it?—Yes, that is the case.

Q. Now, if we sell all this surplus of the crop of oats, this excess of production in the foreign market, do you not think that the price at which it is sold on the foreign market determines the price which is given for the oats which are required for home consumption?—No, Sir. This is perhaps an extraordinary circumstance, but it is recognised with us this winter to have been the case. Everybody knows that oats were sold at 50 cents a bushel delivered at the cars, to be sent to the United States this year; but at the present time oats can be got for a less price, they can be obtained for that price and perhaps for less.

Q. At the present time this is the case?—Yes, it is.

Q. Why is this the case? Is it because the exportation of oats has ceased?—Yes.

Q. Then, that clearly shows that the exportation of oats increases the price of them?—Not at all; that does not at all follow as a necessary consequence.

Q. You say that every one is aware that oats, during this winter, sold in your section of the country at the rate of 50 cents a bushel; and that at the present time the price of oats is lower when the demand for export has been arrested; then it would necessarily be inferred that the price was increased to 50 cents a bushel owing to the demand for oats from the United States.—The demand for export has ceased; but there is still a good deal of oats in the country.

Q. There is still on hand in the country a large quantity of oats which is not yet sold?—A large quantity of oats will yet be required for local consumption.

Q. If oats had not been exported from your section of the country this winter, the price of oats would have been less, would it not?—The price given for oats in our locality was what I have stated it was.

Q. But at the present time the price of oats is not as high as it was?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. And if none has been exported, would not the price of oats in your section of the country be less than it is to-day, since there would have been a greater quantity of oats left in the country?—Yes.

Q. Without question, now, when oats were sold at the rate of 50 cents a bushel for export, they were not sold at a higher price than for local consumption, were they?—No, they were not.

Q. Consequently, the price at which oats were sold for export, and the price at which they were sold for home consumption, was the same?—Yes, that was the case.

Q. Now, would you not naturally infer from what you have stated on this subject, that the exportation of oats from this country to the United States increases the price of them here?—Yes, it does.

Q. Consequently the price which is given for oats to be sent to the United States determines the price at which they are sold in your section of the country?—No, it does not.

Q. It seems to me that this is the logical sequence. Hence it is rather the exportation of oats to the United States—since you say that this had the effect of increasing their price—which has caused the advance in the price of oats, than the present Tariff. Now you have spoken of the price of pork and of flour. It seems that you import the flour which is used in your college and in your neighbourhood.—We import it for the use of the college.

Q. And you generally import your flour from the city of Chicago, if I understand you correctly?—Yes, we brought it from the city of Chicago.

Q. You import it from Chicago, and you have duties to pay on this flour?—Yes, we had duties to pay.

Q. The duty on flour is 50 cents a barrel, and you paid that duty? You imported this flour and paid the duty?—We imported it and paid the duty on it.

Q. You have also spoken of the price of pork; and you have alleged that pork sold at one time in your locality for from 5 to 6, and 7 and 8 cents a lb., and that at the present time it brings 10 cents a lb.—Yes; that is correct.

Q. To what cause do you ascribe the increase of price to which you have referred? What has caused this advance in price, as far as you can state from your means of observation?—I am in a position to state that this increase in the price of pork, which I have mentioned, has taken place since the present Tariff came into operation.

Q. It has happened since this Tariff has been introduced. But do you think that the advance in the price of pork is really due to the imposition of the duties contained in this Tariff? Is not the improvement in its price in reality due to the revival of business which has taken place all over the world? Do you not attribute the advance to these other causes? I am not in a position to judge of that.

Q. Has the duty, which is levied on pork, been increased under the present Tariff? We never import any pork.

Q. Is the duty on pork increased? What is the increase in the duty on pork under the present Tariff? I do not know what it is.

Q. Then it would be difficult for you to state to what point the Tariff has been able to increase the price of pork? If I told you that the duty had only been increased 15 cents a barrel of 200 lbs., do you think that this would have the effect of increasing the price of pork from \$3 to \$4, if there were only 15 cents difference between the duty which was collected on pork under the old Tariff and that which is collected under the present Tariff? I do not know by how much the duty was increased.

Q. I suppose you would admit, Mr. Schmouth, that if we placed a duty of \$1 a barrel on the pork which was imported into Canada, and if the demand for it remained in proportion, and the supply of it continued the same to-day that it was in the year 1878 or the year 1876, then the price of pork would be increased by \$5 a barrel. Would not that be the result?—It probably would be the result.

Q. The advance would be represented by the amount by which the duty was increased, would it not? And if the price of pork advanced from 5 to 6 or 7, and 8 and 10 cents a pound, while the duty was only increased 15 cents a barrel of 200 lbs., would you infer from this that the duty of 15 cents a barrel had contributed to the increase in price of pork—to all this difference?—I do not think that such an increase in duty would account for all that advance in the price of this article.

Q. But you think that the duty would account for an advance of 15 cents a barrel?—With regard to this question, I may say that there is not merely one cause for the advance in price.

Q. Do you not think that the revival which has taken place all over the world, speaking generally, has rendered the demand greater, and thus increased the price of pork?—No doubt this fact has had something to do with the increase in the price of pork.

Q. You have some recollection of the state of things which prevailed some years ago?—I have been for a long time interested in these matters.

Q. Then you ought to remember that before the year 1876—prior to the commercial crisis—the price of pork was very high?—It was high in price at that time.

Q. It was then as high in price as it is to-day, was it not?—We sold pork at very good prices at that time.

Q. And this was before the duty was imposed as it is under the National Policy?—Yes, it was.

Q. I myself sold pork at the rate of \$12 per 100 lbs. before this Tariff came into force, and I think that it will be within your own knowledge that this price was then obtained for it?—Yes; that is within my knowledge.

Q. And pork was very high in price before this Tariff was introduced?—Yes; it was high before the imposition of the duties under this Tariff.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. And if the Tariff had been then arranged as it should have been, would not the price of pork have been still higher at that time?—It is probable that the price of it would not have been lower at any rate, in view of what has taken place since the present Tariff was introduced.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Did you state a few moments ago, that you were almost certain that the National Policy had contributed to the increase which has taken place in this country in the price of horses?—I think that such has been the case.

Q. It is then your opinion that the present Tariff has contributed to the increase which has occurred in the price of horses, is it not?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. Can you explain why the present Tariff has increased the price of horses in your section of the country?—It is very probable that formerly, when American horses came in here, they came in free of duty, and horses were then purchased in the United States for certain portions of the Province of Quebec. It is proper to bear in mind that the cost of transportation has something to do with the prices which are given for such things, and moreover certain parts of the Province of Quebec are nearer to the United States than we are. Montreal is nearer in fact to the United States than we are to the City of Montreal, and the people who live in its vicinity could obtain horses from the United States at that time free of duty. This was unfair, and we were placed at a disadvantage in that respect, and our horses were not in demand at that time; but this is not the case at the present time under the National Policy.

Q. Horses in your section of the country were not then in request on the part of the Americans?—They were neither in demand on the part of the Americans, or on the part of those who wanted horses for the home market.

Q. And this was because horses at that time were imported into this country?—It was because horses were then imported into this country to supply the then existing demand. This is the explanation which I have to give of the state of things that at that time prevailed in this country as far as I am aware; and I think that it is the correct explanation.

Q. If I understand you correctly, you allege that horses were sold at a less price some years ago, on the Canadian market, than would otherwise have been obtained for them, owing to the fact that we imported horses to supply the home demand?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. Do you know how many horses were imported into Canada at that time? Whether the number of them was considerable or not; and whether the number of them was sufficient to be prejudicial to the sale of our own horses on our own market?—I do not think you can reasonably expect that I should give the figures in this respect; but I was for some time the editor of an agricultural journal, and I was then intimate with the facts which bear on this question; but it would be rather difficult for me to remember the figures.

Q. Since a moment ago you affirmed as a fact, that we imported at that time a sufficient number of horses into Canada to depreciate the price of our own horses on our own market. I have the right to ask you, whether it is really your opinion that we then imported horses into Canada; and whether after all the number of them, which was at that time brought into this country, was not a bagatelle, and so small that it had no appreciable effect upon our market?—When I discussed this question, at the time when I was an editor of a paper, published in the interest of Canadian agriculture, I made a study of the Public Accounts in such a manner, that I was intimate with the facts and the figures; but at the present moment I am unable to give the figures in question. My impression is, however, as I have stated it.

Q. Do you admit, that if we at that time did not import any great number of horses into Canada, and that if the number which was imported was a mere bagatelle, this could not have affected the sale of our own horses on our own market?—It would under those circumstances have had very little effect on the prices of our horses. If we only imported very few horses that would not affect the price of horses on our market in a very great degree. The effect would be proportionate to the number that was imported.

Q. You have stated that at that time we imported horses to supply the home demand?—I cannot give you the figures, however, as I have not them in my possession. But I saw them formerly, when I was investigating this question. I am unable to carry them in my head.

Q. Where is our best market for the sale of our horses?—If I had the Public Accounts with me, I could give you the figures which are in question.

Q. You have stated, if I understood you correctly, that our best market for the sale of our horses is found in the United States?—That is the case, as far as our section of the country is concerned.

Q. That is our best market for this purpose?—It is, as far as relates to our neighbourhood.

Q. I am speaking with reference to the whole of the Province of Quebec?—I am speaking with regard to my own locality.

Q. You are speaking simply with an eye to the circumstances of your own parish?—I have reference in my statements to certain sections and parts of the Province merely. I allude to the state of things that exists at the present time in two, three or four counties in our section of the country, below the city of Quebec.

Q. You only speak as to what concerns the district in which you live? You do not pretend to speak with respect to the interests of the whole country?—No; I cannot do that.

Q. You cannot even speak with reference to the best interests of merely the Province of Quebec?—No; I cannot do so.

Q. You cannot speak for the whole of the Province of Quebec?—No; I cannot.

Q. You have reference in the statements which you make merely to the interests of your district?—Yes; I only refer to what concerns my section of the country.

Q. You have stated that your principal market for the sale of horses is to be found in the United States?—I have stated that our principal market for the sale of horses is found in the United States. I except however this winter, when some horses were sold in our part of the country to go to the Province of Manitoba; but during all last summer the sales which were made in our section of the country were of horses which were sent to the United States.

Q. As a general rule, however, the greater number of the horses which you sell go to the United States?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. The surplus of the horses which are raised in your section of the country are purchased for the Americans?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Then, in view of the fact that you sell the surplus of the horses which you raise to the Americans, do you not come to the conclusion that the price which is obtained for horses in your section of the country, depends on the price which is given for them by those who purchased for the American market, and on the demand which exists in that market for your horses?—Probably that is the case; there are also certain preferences which ought to be taken into account. Canadian horses of the old Canadian stock are much sought after by the Americans.

Q. I understand you to say that you sell a good many horses to the Americans; and if it is the fact that you sell the surplus of your horses to the Americans, is it not the fact, that the price which you obtain for horses in your section of the country depends on the demand which exists in the United States for your horses?—For these horses?

Q. For the horses which are sold in your neighbourhood?—The buyers for the United States market make their choice from among the horses which are offered in our market for sale. They choose the Canadian horses of the old Canadian stock for appearance and style and action; as far as this particular breed of horses is concerned, it is sold for the American market, because there is a good demand for it in that country.

Q. And if it were not for this demand for these horses from the United States, probably there would be no sale for them?—I do not say that.

Q. But you would not obtain a good price for them were it not for this demand?—If there was no demand for them from the United States, still they would possess their intrinsic value.

Q. But they would not be sent out of the country?—They would not be sent out of the country if there was no foreign demand for them.

Q. And if there was no demand for these horses from the United State, what would be the consequence of this state of things?—They would not then be so dear.

Q. Then the consequence of what you say is this: the price of these horses is high in your section of the country, because there is a demand for them from the United States, and the high price which you now get for them depends on the American demand?—No, I do not say that.

Q. You state that the demand for this class of horses comes from the United States?—I state that the buyers for the American market prefer to obtain horses of this particular breed.

Q. This is the fact?—Yes, it is.

Q. Then the American demand for these horses is what raises their price in your section of the country; is not this the case?—It may have an influence on their price.

Q. Do you remember that before the present Tariff came into force, and before the commercial crisis from which we suffered so severely a few years ago was past, the price of horses was very high in your section of the country?—That was not the case with us.

Q. This was not the case in your section of the country?—It was not.

Q. Well, it was the case in our part of the Province of Quebec. You state that, since the year 1878, a cheese factory has been established in your neighbourhood?—Yes, that is the fact.

Q. Do you attribute the establishment of this cheese factory to the effect of the present Tariff, to the imposition of duties under this Tariff, or do you attribute it to other causes? Do you find the reason for it in the fact that the business in question was found to be profitable?—The cheese which is made in this factory is not consumed in our section of the country. In fact, we eat very little of the cheese which is made in this place; we export it.

Q. You make cheese principally for the purposes of exportation?—Yes, it is sold principally outside of our locality. I do not believe, certainly, that one-sixth of the

cheese which is made in this factory is consumed in our neighbourhood. We sell most of it outside our section of the country.

Q. You have stated I believe, that the price of butter in your section of the country has been increased since this Tariff was brought into operation?—Yes; but the price of butter has not only improved since this Tariff was brought into force; but it has improved during the past five or six years,

Q. The price of butter is better now than it was?—It was very low in price five or six years ago, but it has gradually improved in price.

Q. But the price of it began to improve before the present Tariff came into force?—Butter was very dear in price some years ago. Nineteen or twenty years ago it was very high in price. It was as high as 30 cents a lb.; but it fell gradually in price until five or six years ago, it was as low as 10 cents a lb.

Q. It was then 10 cents a lb.?—Yes; it was only worth 10 cents a lb.

Q. And three years ago it was only worth 10 cents a lb.?—Three years ago it was worth 10 cents a lb., but this was only during the autumn. It then increased gradually in price, until it came to be worth 18 cents a lb.

Q. The present Tariff was in force three years ago, was it not? You have stated in your evidence that tobacco is now cultivated to a greater extent than was formerly the case?—Yes; I think so.

Q. Do you think that this fact is due to the influence of the Tariff, or is it due to other causes?—I think that the increased price which we get for it is as much due to the Tariff as it is attributable to other causes.

Q. Can you mention any of these causes?—Perhaps the nature of the Excise duty on home-grown tobacco has had a beneficial effect on its cultivation, in encouraging its use in preference to foreign-grown tobacco.

Q. Do you believe that the Excise duty which is collected on Canadian tobacco has an injurious effect on the development of this industry? Do you think that the Excise duty which is placed by the Government on Canadian tobacco should be reduced?—In truth, it is my impression that the Excise duty does not affect at all the cultivation of Canadian tobacco. In fact, the Excise duty collected on Canadian tobacco is almost nothing.

Q. It is very little. Yes; that is the case.

Q. You are of opinion that it does not discourage the Canadian farmer cultivating tobacco?—It has no effect on our cultivation of tobacco, as I have first stated. We cultivate a great deal of tobacco, and we grow it largely.

Q. You have stated that a tendency has been shown during some time past towards a decrease in the prices of agricultural implements?—During the past several years, in the position which I occupy, I have noticed a diminution of the price. Twenty years ago, as I have remarked, we used to pay as much as \$140 for a reaper, while to-day we are giving \$90 for the same article.

Q. Then during the past twenty years the price of farm implements has steadily diminished?—It has steadily lessened during this period; when I purchased the first machine of this kind which I ever bought they were very dear; but since they have decreased in price, and during the last two or three years in particular, there has been a very marked diminution in their price. Everybody has remarked this circumstance.

Q. You have stated that you are at the present time paying higher wages to your labourers?—Yes, Sir; that is the case.

Q. To what cause do you attribute this increase in wages?—We are selling our agricultural produce at higher prices; consumers and labourers are obliged to pay higher prices for what they consume, and we must consequently pay them better wages.

Q. Do you not think that one of the causes for this increase in the wages of labourers is due to the fact that at the present time a great many of our labourers have left the country, and that in consequence of the scarcity of available labour in Canada, wages have been necessarily advanced?—I consider that this fact has also had its influence on the price which is now paid for labour; and it is for that reason also, that we deplore the emigration which has taken place.

Q. You have stated that, in a general way, the effect of the present Tariff has been to increase the prices which are now obtained for our agricultural products?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. You are aware that, speaking generally, we produce a greater amount of agricultural products than we require for our home consumption, are you not?—I believe that this is the case.

Q. I am not putting the question from a general point of view, since you have told us that you give your evidence simply with respect to the interests of two or three counties; but is it not the fact that in your section of the country, in the name of which you speak, you produce, as is the case elsewhere in this country no doubt, more agricultural produce, horned cattle, sheep and cereals than are needed to supply the requirements of home consumption?—Yes; that is the fact.

Q. And in view of the fact that you are obliged to export, as is the case elsewhere in the Province of Quebec, the surplus of your products, do you not think that the increased prices which are given for these products for foreign markets, has contributed enormously to the increase in the prices of these articles, which has taken place in your section of the country?—I do not believe that.

Q. Are you not of opinion that the partial failure of the crop which has occurred during the last couple of years in Europe, where we export a great deal of produce, and the increased demand which this caused for our produce in England and elsewhere, has occasioned the increase in the prices which have been given for our agricultural products?—As far as I can judge from what I have read in the newspapers, that circumstance has not had a very sensible effect on the prices of our produce.

Q. This has not had any appreciable effect on the prices of produce in your section of the country?—It has not, judging from what I see in the newspapers.

Q. You observe that the price of agricultural produce is not regulated like that of the horses which you send to the United States market?—Certainly.

Q. You state that if there was not a demand for these horses in the United States, they would not be so high in price; and the same principle applies here: If a great quantity of our produce were not sent to the European market, in consequence of the demand which exists there for it, the price of it would not be so high in our own market, would not that be the case?—Yes, it would.

Q. And hence the demand which exists in foreign markets for our produce has increased the price of it in your own market during the past few years. Is not this the case? It is as true in this case as in the instance of horses?—It seems to me that this is attributing too much influence to the demand from foreign markets, because it is not our little Province alone which furnishes these supplies to that great market.

Q. Certainly; that is without doubt correct, because supplies can be obtained for the foreign market elsewhere.—In fact, what we have exported to the European market hardly bears any comparison with the immense exports of produce which are sent from the United States to that market.

Q. I certainly agree with you on that point.—Our exports to the European market are very small.

Q. But if there was not a demand in your section of the country for the surplus of produce which you raise to be absorbed in foreign markets, would not the price of these products in your locality be increased?—Our exports of produce have been principally made to the United States market.

Q. I do not speak of the United States, but of the exports which are made from your section of the country?—They have very little influence.

Q. In your section of the country you export the surplus agricultural products? Having a surplus, you send it to foreign markets; and I ask you whether these exports of your agricultural products which take place, have not increased the price of these products in your section of the country?—I do not think that this has contributed to the increase which has taken place in the price of these articles, because we do not see any difference in the quality which is sent out of our section of the country.

Q. Do you see no difference in prices owing to this cause?—I do not see any difference in the quality of produce which we sell. We have not exported more agricultural produce this year than we have done other years; and this can make no difference in the price obtained.

Q. That perhaps may be the fault of your farmers; if you have not exported more during late years than you have done in other years, is it because the produce is not consumed, or is it because you consume more of it?—There is a difference in local production. The produce of the crops, as is known, is more or less considerable. It varies.

Q. That is not an answer to my question. You have stated that you export the surplus of your agricultural produce. Now, will you not admit that the exportation of this surplus has contributed to the increase of price which has taken place, because if this surplus had remained in the country, the prices which are given for this produce would have been lessened?—I cannot admit that, because the exportation which we have made of this produce to other countries has not been greater this year than it was during other years, and I do not consequently believe that the nature of the crops in foreign countries affects the character of our exportations of produce either as regards the quantity exported or the price which is obtained for it.

Q. Do you not think that a failure in the crops in foreign countries increases the price of produce?—I do not think that it would have much influence on our prices; there is too large a production of these articles in other countries to supply the deficiency.

Q. Your surplus of agricultural produce is exported?—Yes, as is usual.

Q. And has not this exportation of your surplus fixed the price of the produce in your section of the country?—No, it has not.

Q. Would not your produce be sold at less prices if a portion of it were not exported?—No.

Q. As a consequence, if it would not be sold for a less price, the exportation of this produce does not increase its price?—I do not believe that it does increase the price, speaking in a general way. You spoke just now of the effect which a failure in the crop of the United States would have on our prices.

Q. I did not speak of the United States in this relation, but of Europe?—In Europe?

Q. I spoke of the failure of the crops in foreign countries?—Well, the failure of the crops in Europe, would not in my opinion have enough influence to increase the exportation of our produce, and the price of it in this country; at least, such would not be the case in our section of the country.

Q. That does not matter. You admit, nevertheless, that if we did not export the surplus of our produce, it would not bring as high prices in this country?—Yes, I will admit that to be the case. If there were no demand for our agricultural productions; if nobody wanted them, they would be worth nothing.

Q. Have you stated that under the present Tariff, property has increased 20 per cent. in value?—Yes, that is my opinion.

Q. And you state that at the present time there are no borrowers of money in your part of the Province?—That is putting it a little too strong. There is less money borrowed than was formerly the case. There is a much less demand for loans of money.

Q. Do you think that all this is due to the effect of the present Tariff? Or do you attribute it to other causes?—I told you what my opinion was when I spoke of these things. I think that a part of these results is probably due to the money which is sent back to their friends by French Canadians, who have gone to the States from our section of the country. A small portion of it is due to this cause.

Q. To what do you attribute the increase in prices?—The chief cause of the increase in prices has been the operation of the present Tariff.

Q. Have you stated that the present Tariff has had a stimulating effect on the establishment of manufacturing industries?—Yes, I think that it has.

Q. That is your opinion?—Yes, it is.

Q. Will you explain in what manner it has had such an effect?—Yes, I will do so; it is for the same reason which has been given on the subject of the exportation of agricultural products. The same explanation applies equally to either matter.

Q. Will you give your explanation on this subject, if you please?—Before this Tariff was introduced we had our markets crowded with products of foreign countries, which came into this country free of duty. Our market was in fact inundated with foreign products. But since the present Tariff has been introduced foreign goods have been kept out of our market; and in place of them we are now engaged in making these same goods here. Our own manufacturers have taken possession of our own market, and they can sell the goods which they make cheaper here, and at less prices than are asked for the goods which are made in foreign markets.

Q. Do you wish to be understood as saying that the present Tariff has had the effect of preventing goods of foreign make being sold in this country, and that these goods of foreign make have been kept out of this country in consequence of the heavy tax which has been placed under this Tariff on the importation of these goods from foreign countries?—These products have been kept out of the country, or they have not been able to come into it, because our manufacturers have been able to supply our markets with such goods, and replace the articles of foreign make.

Q. But in what manner has the present Tariff contributed to the establishment of manufacturing industries in this country?—I think that I have given an answer to that question. I have just now answered it. Formerly, foreign goods were brought in here at low returns, and prevented the establishment of new manufacturing industries; but since the present Tariff has been introduced, and has increased the price of the foreign goods, it has caused the establishment of new industries in this country, which have supplied the market with goods at lower prices.

Q. I understood you to say in answer to one of the questions, that fowls, eggs, etc., were not exported at all in your section of the country?—No; they are not.

Q. Do you believe that the present Tariff has had the same effect on the price of these articles, which you say it has had on other things?—I cannot say as to that.

Q. I believe I understood you to say just now with regard to the question of a Reciprocity Treaty, that at the present time it was not desirable to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty on the basis of Free Trade with the United States?—A Reciprocity Treaty.

Q. You think that it would not be desirable to negotiate such a Treaty now?—If a Reciprocity Treaty were negotiated to-day with the United States, we would be in a better position to negotiate it, than if the attempt had been made before the establishment of the present régime.

Q. But you stated a short while ago that it would not be desirable to negotiate such a Treaty now?—I do not think that this would be desirable at the present juncture.

By Mr. Benoit:—

Q. I wish to put to you one question with reference to the duty on pork: I think that the questions put to you by Mr. Béchard left a false impression in connection with this subject. Mr. Béchard represented that the duty on pork was only 15 cents a barrel?—Yes.

Q. While the fact is, that under the former régime it was 1 cent per lb., and that under the present Tariff the duty has been increased by an additional cent?—I do not wish to answer that question, because at the time I was not in possession of the figures, which it is necessary to have in order to treat the matter intelligently. The moment that I am not in the possession of the official figures I do not desire to give any answers on such subject.

By Mr. Landry:—

Q. With respect to the statement that the revival of foreign trade has considerably increased the prices of our agricultural produce, is it not true that if we prevented or diminished the entrance into this country of goods coming from foreign countries, and which enter into competition with goods of Canadian manufacture, the

position of the latter ought to be improved to the extent of the benefit which is conferred in this relation by the Tariff?—No doubt that is the case; and it is what I just now stated to be the fact. Indeed the causes of the condition of things which we see to-day are many and diverse.

Then the increase which has taken place in prices in this country is not due merely to the revival of trade?—No; it is not in my opinion.

Q. But it is also due to the decrease of competition?—All our produce meet with competition.

Q. They met a great deal of competition formerly, but this is not now the case?—We have less competition than we formerly had in this country, on the part of goods of foreign manufacture.

Q. Has the present Tariff had the effect of increasing the price of farming implements?—In our locality?

Q. Yes?—On the contrary, the prices of agricultural implements have decreased since the present Tariff came into effect.

Q. Then the present Tariff has not had the effect of increasing the prices of agricultural implements?—No; it has not had such an effect.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. I think that you have stated in answer to a question from Mr. Landry, that as a general rule the Tariff has been prejudicial to the sale of foreign products in this country, while it has been favourable to the sale of our own productions on our own market?—Yes.

Q. And you say that it has prevented competition from foreign manufacturers in this country?—Yes, it has.

Q. And has the present Tariff not had the effect of injuring our carrying trade, by preventing to a certain extent the passage of foreign products through this country for the purpose of exportation to foreign countries?—The Tariff only affects the articles which are imported for home consumption.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. Foreign productions in transit through that country do not pay any duty?—No; no duty is paid on them.

At this point the examination of this witness was closed.

OTTAWA, 26th April, 1882.

The Special Committee on Agricultural Interests met at 7:30 o'clock in the evening, Dr. Orton in the Chair.

Dr. LARUE, of St. Augustin, was called and examined as follows:

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. In what county do you reside, Dr. Larue? I live in the County of Portneuf.

Q. Have you resided in that county for a long time?—I have lived there for thirty-eight years.

Q. I believe that you have always taken a considerable interest in agriculture?—I always have done so. I have not only been engaged in farming operations when I am at home; but at the time when I was a member of the Local Legislature of the Province of Quebec I took a great interest in this important subject. While I was a member of the Assembly, I was a member of the Committee on Agricultural Interests, and even then I met with opposition with reference to some projects which I presented with the object of improving the system of agriculture. During the past thirty years I have always taken a great interest in agriculture, and I have since then always been a member of the Agricultural Society.

Q. I will ask you the regular list of questions. Do you think that it would be in the interest of the farmers of Canada to admit any or all kinds of farm produce free of duty into this country?—You will be good enough to permit me to answer in French. Gentlemen, this is my opinion on this subject: that it is not in the interest

of the agriculturalists of Canada to admit foreign produce free of duty, unless reciprocal advantages are accorded; but that it is in the interest of the farmers of Canada to admit American farm produce free of duty, if our products are equally allowed to enter the American market free of duty.

Q. What has been the effect of the duty which has been placed on Indian corn and other coarse grains, on the price of the coarse grains, which are raised in your section of the country? And specify in particular what effect these duties have had on oats, rye, corn, pease, and barley?—The imposition of the duty on corn has had the effect of increasing very considerably in our section of the country, the cultivation of pease and of buck-wheat and of barley. Pease are certainly, in my opinion, considerably superior to corn for fattening purpose. The duty which has been imposed on American corn has had the effect of encouraging and largely increasing the production of pease, buckwheat, and barley, above all; and perhaps of other grains as well.

Q. What has been the effect upon the price of wheat and flour, of the duties imposed on these articles?—I confess that I do not believe that I am in a position which would justify me in attempting to give an answer to this question. I consider that this is a matter which is more within the competence of merchants and tradesmen to answer than of a farmer. It seems to me that I have not the materials at my disposition, which would warrant me in giving an answer to it.

Q. What has been the effect of the increase of the duty upon live hogs, dried hams, and bacon, and what is the average price of these articles in your market?—The imposition of the duty on pork has evidently had for its effect an increase in the price of pork, which is due in part, if not entirely, to the duty. There are other causes which, however, may have contributed to this advance; but the Tariff has clearly had something, and even much to do with the increase in the price of this article; and I may say that the increase in price, to my own knowledge, during the past two or three years, has been about 100 per cent.—I do not attribute the increase in price exclusively to the Tariff; it has also been due to other circumstances that have occurred; but it is evident that the duties which have been placed on American pork—above all, on the pork which comes from Chicago, for to my personal knowledge an enormous quantity of pork arrived at the city of Quebec some years ago from that place, when there were no duties collected on pork—have lessened competition from that quarter.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. I understood that the question put to you was so framed as to obtain your opinion as to the effect of the Tariff of the price of live hogs, as well as dried hams, and pork, and bacon?—I was just now referring especially to the effect of the duty on pork.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. The question includes pork as well. Have the duties which have been placed on horses and other live stock improved the market price of them in this country, and given to Canadians the home market, especially in the Province of Manitoba, and in the North-West Territories?—In the first place I may say that as far as concerns the section of the country in which I live, and a great portion of the Province of Quebec as well in my opinion, I do not know of any exportation of horses to the Province of Manitoba at the present time, or to the North-West Territories, and it is not to my knowledge that the imposition of the duties has changed the market value of horses in our section of the country.

Q. Do you find it profitable to breed horses?—Yes, I think that the raising of horses is advantageous to the farmer; but there is no comparison between this branch of farming and the raising of other stock. There is also an advantage in having a local market.

Q. Where do you find your chief market for cattle and for horses?—We find our chief market in the United States. It is to my knowledge that the Americans come over to our section of the country sometimes, but they do not pay very high prices for horses.

Q. Can the Canadian farmer raise, profitably, all the grain which he requires for the fattening of his stock?—Yes, Sir; I think that he can do so. He can raise all the grain of every kind that he needs for this purpose.

Q. You do not think then that it would pay him better to import American corn than to raise his own grain for feeding purposes?—No, Sir; that is not my opinion.

Q. Is the market in this country for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter, and fruit, and for other articles of that kind, improved through the operation of the Tariff?—Manufactures, and all that sort of thing, are being developed under the National Policy; but I confess that I am not in a position to answer this question satisfactorily. I have not had much experience in that sense, and I would rather not give an answer.

Q. Would the Canadian farmer be benefited by the existence of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?—Yes; I think that that would be the case. I am of opinion that we would derive a great deal of advantage from the existence of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I think that this would be desirable—indeed, very desirable.

Q. Do you think we are in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States under the present Tariff, than we were under the former Tariff?—Certainly I do; that is my opinion. We are in a much better position to obtain a Reciprocity Treaty from the United States in the condition in which we are at the present time, than we were before the present Tariff was introduced.

Q. Do you raise many sheep in your section of the country, doctor?—We do not raise many of them. We do not raise sheep on a large scale; we do not raise them for the purposes of commerce.

Q. Has the present Tariff had any effect on the price of wool?—I do not think that the Tariff has had much effect on the price of wool. Wool is not to my knowledge an article of export in my section of the country. What we raise is merely to supply the local demand.

Q. What effect, if any, has the present Tariff had on the cultivation of flax, tobacco and the sugar beet?—We do not raise flax on a large scale. Still, we raise it to supply the requirements of the local market; but I think that the Tariff has had a favourable effect on the cultivation of tobacco.

Q. I suppose that you do not raise much flax or of the sugar beet in your section of the country? You do not go into the cultivation of these products, at least extensively?—The Tariff has not had much effect on the cultivation of the sugar beet.

Q. Has the cost of farm implements been increased, or has it been decreased under the influence of the present Tariff? And has the quality of these articles remained as good as it was before this Tariff was introduced? Have harrows and ploughs, etc., and all articles which are used by the farmer, increased or decreased in price?—In my opinion, the operation of the Tariff with regard to many agricultural implements, has not produced a great change, because the moment that the agricultural implements of foreign manufacture ceased to come into this country, the market here was improved, and the factories in Canada extended their operations and made more of these articles.

Q. Can you specify any articles in this relation which have changed in price to your knowledge? Can you state whether any of these implements have been increased or decreased in price since the present Tariff was introduced?—I can state that there is a certain class of agricultural implements which appear to have diminished in price; such as spades, ploughs, etc., and I have remarked an increase—a slight increase in the price of certain implements; such as thrashing machines. I cannot say positively whether the present Tariff has had anything to do with these changes; but it is to my knowledge that the price of thrashing machines has been slightly increased.

Q. Are cotton and woollen goods and hardware in common use amongst our farmers, in your experience, been increased or otherwise in price by the present Tariff?—I know very little about those things, and I am not in a position to answer that question satisfactorily to myself.

Q. Has the home market for farm produce been on the whole increased and improved under the operation of the present Tariff?—Evidently the Canadian markets have been largely increased under its influence. I am of opinion that the Tariff has had something and even much to do with this state of things; but other circumstances have also contributed to the improvement of our Canadian market.

Q. Has the present Tariff given diversity of employment and other encouragement to our various industrial classes? And has it retarded emigration to the United States, and encouraged Canadians who had gone there to return to this country?—Yes; it is my opinion that the operation of the Tariff in developing manufacturing industries has had this effect. A goodly number of factories have been established during the existence of the present Tariff, and it has given employment to the working classes, and to more people than were formerly employed in this country, and it has certainly somewhat lessened the emigration of our people; some persons have also returned from the United States, having found work in this country.

Q. Is an increased tendency shown under this Tariff toward the investment of capital in farm property in your experience?—To my knowledge the value of agricultural land and other property has increased in value since the present Tariff has been in force: They have increased in value, because the consumption of produce has been greater, and produce having advanced in price, has necessarily given an increased value to our property.

Q. Has the general condition of the farming and labouring class been improved since the year 1878?—Yes, it has greatly improved.

Q. Is there anything which you can suggest in the way of legislation, with the view of making agriculture more profitable or more desirable?—I am not able to give an answer to that question, as I have not studied the matter sufficiently to be in a position to do so, and consequently I would not like to take upon myself the responsibility of making any suggestions.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. You say Doctor that you do not see what changes you could suggest in order to make agriculture more profitable; do you think that any necessity exists for legislation in this respect?—I say that legislation may possibly be had which would render agriculture more profitable, but I have not studied up the question, and I am not at the present time in a position that would enable me to make any suggestions in that direction.

Q. How do you find the farming class to-day? Is it in a better condition than it was in before the present Tariff came into force?—I have already answered this question. I have stated that the condition of the agricultural class has greatly improved.

Q. It has greatly improved; and you do not see anything that strikes you particularly in the way of changes which could be made with the view of still further improving their condition?—I know of nothing in the way of suggestions that I could offer in this relation; but changes with that object in view may be possible. I do not know of any, however; nothing strikes me, that if adopted might be followed by such consequences.

Q. In this relation, if I catch your meaning correctly, you are of opinion that the agricultural class has every reason to be satisfied with their present condition?—Yes; and they can afford to wait until the necessity for making other changes makes itself manifest, and they have need of them.

Q. You have referred to the price of pork in this sense; you state that the farmers in your section of the country are in the habit of fattening hogs for market and of selling them in the city of Quebec?—They sell them in the local market.

Q. What is the price for which the farmers in your country at the present time sell the hogs which they bring to market?—They obtain from \$10 to \$12 per 100 lb., for their pork.

Q. But what was the price they got for their pork before the present Tariff came into operation?—They used at that time to get \$5 and \$6 per 100 lbs.

I have already declared that I attribute the improvement in the price of this article to the influence of the Tariff, and to the high duty which has been placed on corn, and to other favourable circumstances.

Q. No doubt that is the case.—But as a matter of fact, pork has increased in price 100 per cent., during the last two or three years.

Q. You state, that you think that other classes of animals, besides horses, are more advantageous for the farmer to raise? Horses are not so profitable as are other animals?—My opinion is that the raising of other animals is much more profitable to the farmer than the raising of horses.

Q. What are these other animals?—I would mention principally, and in the first place, cows; then come cattle for beef, and then sheep.

Q. Sheep are also profitable to the farmer?—Yes; that is my opinion. Sheep are much more profitable to the farmer than are horses.

Q. Have you any cheese or butter factories established in your county, or in your district at the present time?—No; we have none of them as yet.

Q. Is any inclination shown to establish them in that part of the Province of Quebec?—Yes. There is an inclination shown to bring them into operation. I may explain that already efforts have been made in this direction, but our proximity to the market has prevented and retarded the successful accomplishment of this object as yet; but next year, in spite of all obstacles, we will establish a cheese factory. Last year the matter was well discussed.

Q. Do you consider these factories a good thing, in the interest of the farming class?—Most decidedly, yes; I think that they operate in the most advantageous manner in the case of the agriculturalist class. I consider them much superior to all other kinds of agricultural enterprise, and superior even to the raising and the fattening of animals for the market.

Q. You have just now made allusion to wool; and you say that the local demand requires all the wool which is produced in your district—or in your county? That is not only the case as regards the county in which I live, but also as regards all my district. That is about the result at all events.

Q. Are you in a position to state what the present price of wool is?—The present price of wool varies from 40 to 45 cents a lb.

Q. What was the price of wool two or three years ago?—Really there is not in our section of the country a steady market for the article of wool. When one desires, however, to buy wool, he finds it necessary to pay from 40 to 45 cents a lb. for it; but when one has wool to sell, he does not easily find an opportunity for disposing of it.

Q. Can you sell it to the woollen manufacturers of Sherbrooke and Montreal, and of other places?—Yes; that is done.

Q. You can dispose of it then, this being the case?—That is no doubt the calculation; but I have not thought of the matter on a large scale.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. Do you raise much wool in your section of the country? Is it a large business with you?—A great many people, not only in my county, but also in the County of Quebec, and in my district, send to Sherbrooke the wool which they could not sell for manufacturing purposes at home, and they were very glad of the opportunity of sending it there. The result of this portion of their farming operations were very favourable to them.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. You have stated in one of your answers that in your county more tobacco is raised at the present time than was the case in the past?—That is my opinion in this respect. I understand that the same statement holds good for the whole Province of Quebec.

Q. Do the farmers in your section of the country raise enough tobacco to supply the requirements of the local consumption?—They raise a good deal more tobacco than is needed for this purpose.

Up to the year 1878, did the farmers in your section of the country raise enough tobacco to meet the requirements of the local consumption, or were they obliged to

buy tobacco of foreign growth to make up the deficit?—Everyone, all the inhabitants, then purchased tobacco of foreign growth.

Q. And they then bought tobacco which to your knowledge was not grown in this country?—Yes, certainly; that was the case.

Q. You have stated in the course of your evidence, it is possible that there has been an increase in the price of thrashing machines; can you state whether these machines which have been sold in your neighbourhood at somewhat higher prices, were more perfect and better made than those which were sold there previously?—Yes. I stated in my answer that it is possible that the increase which has taken place in the price of them was as much due to the improvements which have been effected in the machine as to the effect which the present Tariff has had upon their price. It is not only possible, but it is probable, that these machines have been improved in their mode of construction.

Q. And what has been the effect of the Tariff upon the price of other agricultural implements?—I do not think that it has had any effect upon their price. I do not think that there is any great difference in the present and former prices of these articles.

Q. You do not think that they have changed much in price?—No. The alteration in price is practically *nil*.

Q. In any event they have not increased in price?—No. From the moment that the machines of foreign manufacture ceased to be sent into this country in consequence of the effect of the Tariff, our own manufacturers made enough machines to suffice for the requirements of the local market, the demand from which gave ample employment to our own manufacturers.

Q. I wish to put to you another question: You have referred to goods which are used in your section of the country, and in this relation, you have stated that you had not examined into the facts which this question concerns, and that you did not consider yourself competent to give an answer to it: Can you tell us whether, as a matter of fact, you are at the present time paying for those articles which a farmer needs, and, in fact, for those things which are peculiarly essential to supply the wants of the agricultural class, such as sacks for the holding of grain, &c., more than you were accustomed to pay for the same articles in the year 1878?—Will you have the kindness to re-state the essence of that question?

Q. The pith of my question is this: Has the effect of the present Tariff been to increase or to diminish the prices of woollen and cotton goods, and of all articles which are in common use among farmers; and if it has had any effect on the price of such articles, please state what articles have been so effected, and in what degree?—I have preferred to say that I am not competent to give a satisfactory answer to that question; but I may state that as far as my knowledge extends in this relation, there does not appear to have been much change in the prices since the present Tariff came into force.

Q. You have not noticed in the purchases which you have made, or the purchases which have been made by persons in your section of the country, that the people are paying more for their cottons and tweeds than they did before the year 1879?—I am not aware that prices have risen; and I have not heard the women complain of any advances in the prices of goods. I have not heard any one say that goods are dearer in price, or complain that such was the case.

Q. With regard to your own experience, have you any personal knowledge of the payment of higher prices for these goods?—Not at all. I know of nothing of the kind, I have no knowledge of such being the case at all. There are many articles which are now made in this country to meet the requirements of local consumption; but which were not formerly manufactured here; but I do not perceive any change in the prices of these articles.

Q. Can you tell us whether cotton goods have advanced in price since the duty on foreign cotton was raised under the present Tariff?—My opinion is that these goods have not advanced in price since the present Tariff was introduced.

Q. Have you any knowledge whether articles that are bought of merchants and traders by the farmers in this country, such as sacks which are made of ordinary linen, and sacks which are used in business and for wheat and grain and potatoes, &c., are dearer in price at the present time than they were before the Tariff came into operation?—It is not to my knowledge that there has been any advance in the price of these articles.

Q. Reference has been made to the question of a Reciprocity Treaty, and you have stated that it would be desirable to have a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States; now, will you tell us whether it does not appear to you that if a Reciprocity Treaty came into operation with the United States at the present juncture, it would not have an injurious effect on the developing the manufacturing interests of this country, and whether it would not in all likelihood counteract the beneficial effects, in a great measure, of the present protective policy on the manufacturing interests of this country?—That is certainly possible, that might be the effect. It would be no doubt advisable to defer for a certain time from the present the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty. I base my opinion as to the desirability of having a Reciprocity Treaty on the fact, that some years ago when a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States was in existence, it was incontestible that this country was prosperous, and it is consequently my opinion that after a certain time has elapsed and after a certain delay has been had, and when our manufacturers are well established and in successful operation, it would be better for us to have a Reciprocal Tariff with the United States.

Q. Do you understand by the term Reciprocity, that it should extend to all our products or that it should merely apply to the agricultural productions of both countries and not to manufactured goods?—It seems to me, that if we had legislation on this subject it should be general legislation applying to everything, or else that we should have no legislation at all with respect to this matter. Everything, or nothing at all, should be done.

Q. You think, then, that there should be a complete abolition of duties on all articles passing into and out of Canada between Canada and the United States; and that Reciprocity should apply, not only to agricultural produce, but also to manufactured goods?—I think that a Reciprocity Treaty should also apply to the manufactured goods of these two countries.

Q. But it would not be advisable to have such a treaty in existence at the present time, in the interest of our manufacturers?—No; I think that it would be necessary to wait a while before such a step should be taken; but once that our manufacturing interests are well established and in successful operation, it seems to me desirable that such a Treaty should be negotiated.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. I have very few questions to put to you, Doctor. You state, Doctor, if I understood you correctly, that the duty on American corn has had the effect of increasing the price of our pease and barley?—Yes, that is my opinion.

Q. Is it not so that they could do the same thing before the present Tariff came into operation? Would not the same policy at that time have been advantageous to them?—Naturally, when corn came into this country at a low price, there was no reason for the cultivation of these grains, or at least there was less reason, because there was not sufficient margin for competition in this respect, American corn being at the time very low in price, although pease are certainly superior to corn in value for fattening purposes.

Q. What increase has taken place in the price of American corn in consequence of the existence of the present Tariff?—Oh, well, I am not in a position to give you that information; but experience has shown that since the duty has been placed on corn an infinitely less quantity of it comes into this country to enter into competition with our own agricultural produce; while amongst us there has been an increase in the cultivation of pease and buckwheat, a great deal more of buckwheat is now raised. Apart from the advantage which it affords in advancing the price of grain here, it encourages the cultivation of other grains in this country, and conse-

quently keeps capital in the Province instead of sending it out to buy foreign produce.

Q. The duty on American corn is  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel; and do you think that a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel is sufficient to have reduced or wholly prevented this great quantity of corn, to which you have made reference, from coming into this country, which came in at low prices before the present Tariff came into operation?—It must have had this effect in view of the fact, that the importation of American corn is less at the present time than it was before the present Tariff was introduced.

Q. American corn is now much higher in price, is it not?—Corn is cheaper in price than pease, and it is of much less value for fattening qualities.

Q. But is not American corn higher in price than it was before the present Tariff came into operation?—Oh, yes; that is the case.

Q. It is much dearer now than it was then?—Yes; it is much dearer. The effect of the Tariff has certainly been to increase the price of corn.

Q. A concurrence of circumstances has been the effect of increasing the price of agricultural products?—Yes, to a certain extent that has been the case.

Q. If I understand you correctly, the present value of agricultural products is not entirely due to the operation of the present Tariff?—You will see what my opinion is on this subject, in the reply which I have already given to a similar question. I have stated, and I now repeat that, in my opinion, I cannot say that the Tariff is the only cause of the increase which has taken place in the price of agricultural products in this country. Evidently, it is not only due to this fact, but also to a concurrence of circumstances—such as good crops, &c., and above all to the increase of manufacturing industries in this country, which has led to a greater demand for our produce, and to improvement in trade. All these circumstances have contributed to the increase in the prices of these articles. No one can contest the progress which has been made in this country during the past few years.

Q. If in the variety of circumstances which have contributed to the increase that has taken place in the prices of agricultural produce, you include the demand for our produce which has been exhibited during the past couple of years, then it is the increased demand for our produce on foreign markets that has contributed to the advance in the price of agricultural produce?—That may be so; *cela se peut*. But you will understand that I have no personal knowledge of these exports. I admit, however, that that is possible; but I am not in a position to state that our exports of agricultural produce have been greater this year than they were during the years previous to the introduction of the present Tariff.

Q. You have made reference to Canadian tobacco. Do I understand you to say that the Canadian farmers cultivate a much greater quantity of tobacco now than they did before the present Tariff came into force?—They are now cultivating an infinitely larger quantity of tobacco than they did before the Tariff was introduced.

Q. Do you attribute this increase in the production of tobacco exclusively to the influence of the present Tariff?—No, I do not. I think that the nature of the Excise duty which is collected on tobacco, has contributed to the increase in the cultivation of tobacco in a greater degree than the present Tariff; at least it has had as much effect on its cultivation as has had the Tariff. They occupy about the same proportion in this respect. Not only has the Tariff contributed to the increased cultivation of tobacco, but the Excise duty has largely contributed to this state of things as well.

Q. You have stated that the value of property has considerably increased during the past couple of years?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Do you attribute this increase in value solely to the influence of the present Tariff? Do you think that this is the only cause for this advance in value? Or do you think that other circumstances have contributed to this increase?—I will repeat that it seems to me that the increase which has taken place in the value of real estate, is due in an indirect manner to the influence of the present Tariff, in this sense: That the improvement which has become so apparent in trade and in business, has increased very considerably local consumption; and that agricultural products having increased in value, it is a necessary consequence that farm property should increase in value.

Q. What is your opinion then on this subject?—I think that the Tariff has had not so much a direct influence as an indirect influence in this relation. I say that indirectly the value of real estate has been increased in value, owing to the existence of this Tariff; owing to the fact that the Tariff has contributed in a certain degree, to the increase which has taken place in the price of agricultural products, it follows, as a logical sequence, that real estate owes indirectly to the present Tariff, the increase which has taken place in its value.

Q. You have stated that the cause of the increase in price is the increase that has taken place in the local consumption of produce?—Yes, I think so.

Q. The increase in the consumption of agriculture produce has increased the price of it?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Are you of opinion that during the last two years the production of agricultural produce has increased considerably?—Undoubtedly, this is the case.

Q. In view of the fact that we have had better crops during the last few years?—We undoubtedly had better crops during the last couple of years, and an infinitely greater consumption of agricultural produce as well.

Q. Do you not think that the good crops which we have had during the last couple of years, which we have obtained for our agricultural produce, have principally contributed to the increase, which is exhibited in the value of real estate?—The demand from consumers for agricultural produce has a good deal to do with prices.

Q. I did not ask you that; but my question was this: Are you not of opinion that the good crops with which this country has been favoured during the last two years, and also the good prices at which our farmers have sold their agricultural produce, are not the principal cause of the increase which has taken place in the value of real estate?—That is possible; it is evident that the prosperity of our agriculturalists necessarily increases the value of real estate. Will you repeat the question?

Q. I am not endeavouring to embarrass you at all, I wish to know whether you are not of opinion that the good crops, which we have had during the last couple of years, and the good prices which since then we have obtained for our agricultural produce, are not the principal causes of the increase which has taken place in the value of real estate?—You are well aware that good crops were the commencement of prosperity, and the greatest cause of the prosperity which exists in this country at the present time; and this is one of the principal causes of the increase which has taken place in the price of real estate.

Q. I do not know whether you were asked the following question. Do you not think that the export of our surplus of agricultural products to foreign markets has largely contributed to the increased prices which we have received for our agricultural produce?—That ought to have such an effect.

Q. You have said that the condition of the agricultural class has greatly improved; but I do not remember that you specified any time since which this improvement has made itself manifested?—It seems to me that during the past two or three years the condition of the farming class has greatly improved. During the past two or three years there has been a notable change in this respect.

Q. I understand you to say that you attribute this improvement not only to the Tariff, but also to many other circumstances?—A variety of other circumstances, such as good crops, &c., have contributed to the general prosperity which exists in this country at the present time; this is unquestionable.

Q. You remember that we have had the present Tariff in force since the year 1879?—Yes.

Q. And do you remember that at the time agricultural produce was very low in price, and as low as it was during previous years?—Yes. I remember that such was the case.

Q. You have stated that you think that cotton and woollen goods are not higher in price under the present Tariff?—They are not higher in price to my knowledge.

Q. Are you positive on that point?—Undoubtedly, I am.

Q. Have you any information on this subject which would enable you to establish positively that these goods are not higher in price?—No. I declined to reply to the question regarding this matter in the first place; but an answer was insisted upon, and I then stated that, in my opinion, there had been no advance in the price of these articles. It appears to me that such is the case. They have not increased in price in my opinion.

Q. I believe that you have stated that, in your opinion, a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, negotiated on the basis of Free Trade, would not be desirable in the interests of the country at the present moment?—Oh, well; many of our manufacturers have only commenced operations, and I think that it would be desirable to wait for a certain time before such a Treaty was obtained; but from the moment that our manufacturing industries are firmly established—an epoch which I am not at this moment prepared to fix—it seems to me that it would be better in the interests of this country to have Free Trade with the United States, and a Reciprocity Treaty negotiated on that basis, than to have the barriers and walls which at the present time exist, with respect to the commercial intercourse that takes place between these two countries.

Q. Then we are to consider that you are, in principle, a Free Trader, rather than a Protectionist?—Undoubtedly, I am.

Q. But you allege that it would be injurious to our manufacturing interests to have Free Trade at once brought into operation?—It would not do to have Free Trade immediately.

Q. For what reason would Free Trade have an injurious effect?—Well—

Q. Do you think that if Free Trade were immediately established, it would have an injurious effect upon our manufacturing industries?—That is my opinion; but as long as our manufactories were not firmly established, if we had Free Trade, the Americans would flood our market with their productions.

Q. Can the Americans manufacture more cheaply than we can, and undersell our manufacturers?—At the present moment I think that they could do so; but at a later period, we will be in a position to compete with them on fair terms.

Q. And if the duties which are placed by the Canadian Government on the goods which are manufactured by the Americans did not exist, then those goods could be bought at a less price in this country than the goods which are manufactured by our own people in this country?—Undoubtedly that is the case.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. Dr. Larue, if these duties were removed and foreign competition were allowed free course in this country, is it not your opinion that the Canadian farmers would have to pay duties on other articles in order to meet the demands of the Treasury? If the duties which are to-day placed on American products, were taken off, or if, in other words, we had Free Trade with the United States, is it not your opinion that the Government would be obliged to raise the duties which are collected on other articles in order to obtain sufficient revenue to meet the ordinary expenses of the country which must be defrayed?—It seems to me that this is a question which is not in my province. It is a question to which I do not think that I should answer. It is a question which relates to political economy, and to answer it the study of political economy would be necessary.

Q. You say it is desirable to have Free Trade; but if we had Free Trade we would not have prohibitory duties on American produce?—No; we would not.

Q. These duties would in that case be removed?—But we would have the American market.

Q. These duties would be removed if we had Free Trade with the United States; and in taking off these duties you would deprive the revenue of the receipts which are obtained from these duties?—We are speaking of the American market.

Q. I will proceed slowly; I am asking you this question: you declare that, in your opinion, free trade with the United States would be preferable to the present state of things?—With the United States.

Q. You say that at a certain period Free Trade with the United States would be preferable?—With the United States.

Q. That at a certain period yet to arrive this would be preferable?—Yes; I think it would.

Q. And I am now asking you whether if Free Trade was established with the United States, is it not true that the Treasury would be found to be deprived of a certain amount of its receipts from duties?—That is quite evident.

Q. Well then, the duties which are at present imposed in order to meet the requirements of the Treasury, would have to be put on other articles under such circumstances?—Undoubtedly that would be the case.

Q. And the consequence would be, that after all the country would be always obliged to pay a certain amount in duties in order to meet the expenditure?—The people would have to raise a certain amount in the shape of duties—certainly, there would have to be in operation a Tariff which would establish different duties in the Tariff to which I am making allusion.

Q. There would have to be Customs duties.—And Excise duties.

Q. There would be Excise duties on tobacco and on some other objects. Then, in your opinion, in taking off the duties on goods coming into this country from the United States, it would be necessary to place them on something else?—Naturally that would have to be done.

Q. Now, Dr. Larue, do you admit that the present Tariff has two effects; that is to say, that it has a general effect, and also a special effect on the articles to which it relates?—Yes; I do.

Q. That is what understand?—Well.

Q. The Tariff has a general effect and it has a special effect?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Given any article whatever, can the imposition of a duty on that article have as its result an increase in the price of the article, to the amount of the duty which is placed on it, and further, can it have the effect of increasing the price in a general sense? That is to say, if the number of consumers is increased, and there is an increase in the number of manufacturing industries?—Evidently that is the case.

Q. There will be two effects produced?—Yes.

Q. There will be a special effect and there will be a general effect?—Undoubtedly, that will be the case.

Q. Now, given the present value of agricultural produce, and the increase which has taken place in the price of it during the past few years, do you believe that if the present Tariff was taken away—if the duties which are placed on these articles to arrest foreign competition, were removed—that all these articles would be sold in this country at less prices than is the case at the present time? Is this your opinion?—Undoubtedly it is, that is the natural consequence of my answer.

Q. You were asked a question with respect to the bearing which the export of our surplus of agricultural produce has had upon the increase in the price of it; is it not your opinion that the export of this surplus is due to the greater production of agricultural produce which has taken place in this country?—Well?

Q. And that this greater production of agricultural produce is due to the effect of the Tariff on the productions of this country with regard to foreign competition in agricultural produce which is thereby restrained?—Certainly, that is the case.

Q. And in your opinion the export of this surplus of our agricultural produce is the consequence, if not directly, at least inevitably, of the present Tariff? You have been asked whether you had not noticed that in the year 1879, when this Tariff began to come into force, agricultural produce was very low in price?—Yes, I was.

Q. Could it, in your opinion, be reasonably expected that the prices of agricultural produce would be increased before the general effects of the Tariff were experienced?—Undoubtedly, that could not be expected.

Q. The beneficial effects of the Tariff could not make themselves felt in an instant?—Undoubtedly not.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Is it to your knowledge that in the year 1879, before the present Tariff was introduced and put in operation, the Americans sent over into this country a great quantity of corn, and sold it? And is it not your opinion that this importation of foreign produce kept down the prices of our agricultural produce?—That is not to my knowledge.

Q. Now, another question Doctor, you have just now spoken about Free Trade; and I believe that you are in favour of Free Trade between the United States and Canada?—Yes, that is the case.

Q. Are you not of opinion that if the duties were removed from American agricultural products, the American farmers with their superior facilities for the cultivation of corn would flood our market with this corn, as was the case before the present Tariff came into operation, and that under these circumstances the cultivation of agricultural produce would be rendered unprofitable in this country? That such a policy would not be fair to our farmers, and that it would tend to discourage the growth of our cereals? And that our farmers would not raise so much oats, barley, rye and pease, as they now do, if American corn was again allowed to come in and flood our market?—Naturally all these questions are hypotheses. My opinion is, that under such circumstances our farmers could to an equal degree flood the American market with pease and oats, and above all with the article of hay.

*By Mr. Bichard :—*

Q. We could flood the American market with those things?—Yes; we could unquestionably flood the American market, under the system of Free Trade, with our pease, and grain also, and above all with hay. I think that we would then increase our exports in those particulars. At the present time a duty is collected in the United States on the hay, which is sent in there from this country, but you may have remarked that recently the amount of this duty has been reduced. It is now only one-half of what it was, I believe.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. At the same time, you are of opinion that if the market of the Dominion of Canada were open to the Americans, and if they could flood our market with corn as they did before the present Tariff came into operation, and if their market were open to our farmers, the effects of such a policy would be as favourable to the one party to it as to the other party?—You will understand that that is a question which requires particular study; and it cannot be expected that one could reply to it in all its details at a moment's reflection, but I am of opinion that we would derive as much advantage from such a policy as they would; we would derive great advantages from the sending of our meat and animals into the markets of the United States free of duty. We could also send grain into that market, and we would export more hay to them than they would send to us; in point of fact, they are not in a position to export hay, they are buyers of it.

Q. You stick to hay?—That is an important point.

Q. Are you prepared to sacrifice the growth of all other cereals in order to be able to send hay into the market of the United States free of duty?—Cereals can be raised as cheaply by us as they can be raised in the United States. I base my answers in this connection on the experience which we obtained during the period when the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation. It at that time contributed notably to our welfare, and I conclude from that fact and from our experience at that time, that such a Treaty, if again in existence, would be beneficial to us. It seems to me that we would be in such a position that we could compete on equal terms with the Americans.

Q. Do you think that the Americans would send corn into this country, and exchange their corn for our pease? Where would we sell our surplus of pease if a Reciprocity Treaty existed? In what country would we dispose of them?—I do not know where we would sell them.

Q. Do you know whether we would send them to England or to the United States?—I do not know very well what we would do with them; but we would have

one market placed against the other, and I think that a Reciprocity Treaty would be found to be a benefit to this country.

Q. Where have we sold our surplus production of pease?—We have sold them in England or some place else. I do not know where we have sent them.

Q. As to oats, do you know whether we export a large quantity of oats to the United States?—Yes; we send some oats there now. We export oats to that country in spite of the Tariff.

Q. Do you know the quantity of oats which the Americans sent into Canada to compete with our production of coarse grains before the present Tariff came into operation?—No, I do not.

Q. Do you know the quantity of corn which was sent into Canada to compete against our pease rye and oats, before the present Tariff came into operation?—No; I do not know the exact quantity which was then sent into this country, but I am aware that a great quantity was at that time sent in here.

Q. And, nevertheless, in spite of all this you are of opinion that, in order that we may merely be able to export hay to the United States, we should expose ourselves again to that competition?—No, no; I do not say that.

Q. You are ready?—Hold! I expressed myself in a different manner from that, I said, that in reference to all kinds of grain, we could compete advantageously enough with the Americans, but above all, in the matter of hay. This is an undoubted fact.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. If I properly understand your system of Free Trade, it is not a free trade which would include all products; but which would refer to certain products that would be placed against certain other products?—If I were making such a Tariff, I would have all articles free of duty, if such a state of things could be brought about; but I really do not know how the thing could be accomplished.

Q. You would admit certain articles free of duty in order to obtain the admission of certain other articles into a foreign market on the same terms? Your Free Trade would be total or partial?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. It would be based on a system of compensation?—It would be a Reciprocity Treaty.

Q. Would it refer to certain articles, or to all articles? Would you remove the duties from certain articles merely, or would you remove them from all articles?—I understand that a Reciprocity Treaty should refer to all articles.

Q. You would have it include everything?—A Reciprocity Treaty ought not to be a partial Treaty.

Q. In fine, you take the basis of your opinions on this subject, the Reciprocity Treaty which was in operation some years ago. Was it not your experience that, during the Civil War, the scarcity of labour made the cultivation of the soil less profitable than it would otherwise would have been in the United States, and that we, in consequence of this fact, sold our agricultural produce at better prices? When the Reciprocity Treaty existed, this was not before the Civil War?—Yes, it was.

Q. When did the Reciprocity Treaty terminate?—I do not remember the date when it ended, only I have a remembrance of that period. It is with me a *souvenir*; that period is still spoken of with regret; but I have not made of it a particular study. I however, remember that when the Reciprocity Treaty existed this country was in a state of prosperity, and that we made every possible effort to obtain a renewal of it. And I am of opinion that if a Reciprocity Treaty were again brought into existence, it would have a beneficial effect upon the best interests of this country.

Q. I suppose that the conditions were favourable?—Certainly; that is a matter of experience. If we demand it *apropos*, we could impose duties on certain articles.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Supposing that a Reciprocity Treaty could be negotiated on a basis which would be advantageous to this country. You would support such a proposition?—

Certainly, I would do so. But we could have duties on certain articles. This thing cannot be decided with "supposings."

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. It would require a good many "supposings" to put it on a proper basis?—Yes, it would.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think, Doctor, that the taxation of the farmer is reduced under the operation of the present Tariff; and is it desirable that those who send goods into our market should be made to contribute to the revenue of the country? If foreigners want to supply our markets with manufactured goods, we can make them also contribute to our revenue, and does this relieve our farmers from taxation?—

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. The question is, whether in your opinion the taxes of the Canadian farmer are diminished by the fact that those who send goods to our markets have to pay taxes on them?—Undoubtedly; no doubt this policy has that effect.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think that it is an advantage to the farmer to live in a country where his children can have a choice as to the employments they would like to follow?—

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. The question is, whether it is an advantage to the farmer to live in a country where his children can obtain employment—where a choice of careers is open to them?—Certainly; that is my opinion.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think that this Tariff has a tendency to give them that choice of employment?—Yes; that is my opinion.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. The present Tariff affords diversity of employment?—Yes; that is the case.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. And when our manufacturers are in a prosperous condition, and when the other industries of the country are in a similar state, it is generally a benefit to the farmer?—Certainly; this is a great benefit to the agricultural class. It is the greatest benefit which they can hope to obtain.

Q. Do you think that the removal of the duty from the articles of tea and coffee have conferred an especial benefit upon the farmers of this country?—Yes; this has been a great benefit to the Canadian farmers.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Do you think, doctor, that those who send goods into this country, pay the duties and taxes which are imposed on them by our Government?—It is always the consumer who pays the duty.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. In the case of an article which is not increased in price in consequence of the Tariff, after a duty has been placed upon it, as frequently happened with manufactured goods, where the manufacturer in the United States will sell to the Canadian buyer lower than he does to the people in his own country, and will say: "There is a duty upon this article if it goes into Canada, and we will make the price so much lower, in order that you may not feel the effects of the duty," who then pays the duty?—I assure you that question is so long that I cannot catch the sense of it in English.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. The question is this: in case the American manufacturer who is selling goods, comes into this country, and who wishes to compete with the similar goods of our own manufacture, sells them at a lower price to the Canadian than he does to the American buyer, in order that he may pay the duty, and thus compete advantageously with goods of Canadian manufacture; if he sells the goods to Canadians less than he does to Americans, thus paying the duty, who then pays the duty?—That is a supposition.

Q. It is a fact. Who in that case pays the duty? Is it the consumer?—Evidently it is the producer, the manufacturer, who in that case pays the duty.

At this point the examination of this witness was closed.

OTTAWA, 27th April, 1882.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock. Dr. Orton in the Chair.

SAMUEL PAQUIN appeared before the Committee, and was examined as follows:—

*By Mr. Landry;—*

Q. Where do you live Mr. Paquin?—I live in the parish of Deschambeault.

Q. You are engaged in the business of farming, I believe?—Yes, I am.

Q. And you are engaged in no other occupation?—No, I am not.

Q. Will you tell the Committee whether it is in the interest of the farmers of Canada to admit free any or all kinds of American agricultural produce?—In my opinion, it is not advisable in the interest of the Canadian farmer that we should do so. I do not think that we should allow American agricultural produce to enter this country free of duty.

Q. Can you tell the Committee what effect the placing of a duty upon American corn and on other American coarse grains has had on the price of the same class of grains which are raised in the section of the country in which you live?—In the district of Quebec the price of corn has raised.

Q. And what has been the effect of the imposition of the duty on American corn?—I believe that it has had the effect of raising the price of corn.

Q. And has it had the effect of advancing the price of other cereals, coarse grains, which our farmers grow?—Yes; it has, all other cereals have increased in price within a certain period.

Q. Have oats, barley, rye and peas increased in price?—Yes; they have.

Q. Can you tell the Committee what has been the effect of the duty on the price of flour?—The flour which is imported into the Province of Quebec from the United States has certainly advanced in price.

Q. And what is the fact in the case of wheat? What effect has the duty had on the price of wheat?—Wheat has also advanced in price.

Q. And the imposition of the duty upon wheat has not been prejudicial to the production of wheat, has it?—Do you refer to the Province of Quebec?

Q. The duty has not had an injurious effect on the price of wheat?—It has not been injurious to the production of wheat.

Q. Do you think that the imposition of the duty on American wheat has had the effect of increasing the cultivation of wheat in the section of the Province of Quebec from which you come?—It has not had such an effect in the district in which I live.

Q. Do you cultivate a great deal of wheat in your section of the country?—We do not raise much of it.

Q. What has been the effect of the increase of the duty on the importation of live hogs under the present Tariff?—It has had no effect in our neighbourhood, because we do not raise hogs for the purpose of supplying the demand in outside markets, but simply to supply the wants of local consumption.

Q. Then you only fatten pork to be used in local consumption?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Has the effect of the duties which are imposed under the present Tariff on the importation of horses, horned cattle, and other live stock, increased or decreased the price of these animals?—The prices of these animals have been improved since the present Tariff came into operation.

Q. And do you raise many horses in your section of the country?—We raise a few of them, but not a great many.

Q. Then you do not, in your neighbourhood, make a specialty of the raising of horses for the market?—No; we do not.

Q. Does it pay the farmer better to raise horned cattle for the market?—In my opinion the raising of horned cattle pays the farmer better than does the raising of horses.

Q. In your section of the country do the farmers devote themselves particularly to the raising of cattle, and to the exportation of the productions of the dairy? Do you fatten many cattle for the market? Are you interested in either one of these occupations, or in both?—We are engaged in both, but not on a very great scale. We produce, however, a good deal of butter.

Q. Do you export horses? Do you sell many horses?—We sell a few of them.

Q. Where do you find your market for horses?—People come into our section of the country and buy them from us.

Q. Do the buyers of your horses come from other parts of the country into your neighbourhood; do they come from Montreal, or do they belong to the United States?—They say that they are Americans when they are buying our horses.

Q. In your section of the country, do the farmers raise to advantage the grain which they require for the fattening of their stock?—Oh, yes; with the exception of the article of corn. Indian corn is not grown in our section of the country.

Q. Is it more advantageous for the farmer in your section of the country to import corn than to raise it for his own use?—That is not the case in my opinion. I do not think so.

Q. Do the farmers in your section of the country export vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter?—They sell those articles, but I am not aware whether these articles when sold are exported or not.

Q. But these articles when they have been purchased from your farmers are sent out of your neighbourhood?—Yes. They are sent to the city of Quebec, and to other places.

Q. Since the present Tariff has been introduced, has the price of those articles increased in value, and have you had a better market for them?—The market has been better since the present Tariff came in operation. The demand for these articles since that time has been more active.

Q. Do you think that the Canadian farmers would find it advantageous to their interests to have a Reciprocity Treaty in existence between this country and the United States?—That is a question, Sir, which is rather difficult for a mere farmer to answer. Farmers do not study this question very closely, and are consequently scarcely in a position to answer a question which has so many bearings at a moment's notice; but my opinion with reference to this matter is this: that if such a Treaty were confined to the exchange free of duty between these two countries, of cereals and other agricultural products, it would have a beneficial effect.

Q. Are you in favour of Free Trade with reference to certain articles merely, or to all articles of farm produce between Canada and the United States?—I think that a Reciprocity Treaty which included all our agricultural products would have a beneficial effect on this country; but I would not have much confidence in any beneficial effects following the extension of a Reciprocity Treaty to farm implements.

Q. In your opinion the introduction of manufactured goods would not be a benefit in any way to this country?—I do not think that it would be a good thing for this country.

Q. Supposing that Free Trade in agricultural products would be advantageous to the Canadian farmer, do you not think that our present position enables us to negotiate such a Reciprocity Treaty on more advantageous terms; that is to say, at the present time duties are imposed under the present Tariff on the agricultural products which are imported into this country, and do you think that the fact that we impose duties on American agricultural products, places us in a better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty than we would be in if these duties did not exist?—Yes. I think so.

Q. And these duties would enable us, if the opportunity presented itself to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty more easily and more advantageously than would otherwise be the case?—Yes, that is my opinion.

Q. Can you inform the Committee what effect has been produced by the present Tariff on the price of wool which is raised in your locality?—The farmers in our section of the country produce very little wool.

Q. Do you export any wool?—We do not export any of it in my opinion.

Q. What effect has the present Tariff had on the cultivation of tobacco?—We have cultivated more of it since the present Tariff came into operation than we did previously.

Q. The growth of tobacco by French Canadian farmers during the past few years has assumed considerable proportions, has it not?—I cannot say that it has attained considerable proportions, but it has increased in extent.

Q. Do you raise enough tobacco in the part of the country in which you live to supply the requirements of home consumption?—Yes, I think so.

Q. And some years ago, to your knowledge, a greater part of the tobacco which was used in your part of the country was imported, was it not?—That was the case in my youth. I think that was the case at that time; but it was a long time ago, when that state of things existed.

Q. But more tobacco has been cultivated during the past few years than was the case under the former Excise law, which imposed a duty of 10 cents a lb. on Canadian grown tobacco? Before the year 1879, 10 cents was paid by the farmer on each lb. of tobacco which he sold, and there was not as much tobacco raised in the Province of Quebec three or four years ago, as is the case to-day?—The quantity of land which is devoted to the cultivation of tobacco in the Province of Quebec has always been increasing in extent during a certain number of years back.

Q. Can you inform the Committee whether the farm implements which you are in the habit of using in the cultivation of the soil have increased in price, or have they decreased in price since the present Tariff came into operation?—I think that agricultural implements have remained at about the same price, since the year 1879.

Q. You think that there has been no change since 1879?—Yes; they have remained at about the same price.

Q. The Tariff has not then had the effect of increasing the price of agricultural implements?—No; it has not had such an effect.

Q. And you are not paying for reaping machines more than you did three years ago?—No. They are about the same price.

Q. And have agricultural implements, such as spades and shovels, &c., been increased in price?—Perhaps they have increased in price a little; yes.

Q. I am referring to articles of the same quality as those which were placed on the market before this Tariff came into operation?—At the present time these agricultural implements are better made than they were. They are greatly improved in respect to quality and finish.

Q. Is it to your knowledge that the farming implements which are made in this country at the present time are better finished than they were before the present Tariff was introduced, than they were some years ago?—They are more perfect, and they are improved in point of quality.

Q. What is the price at the present time of woollen and cotton goods, and of other articles which you purchase? Has the present Tariff affected them at all, increased or decreased the price of them?—The goods which we buy we get from the merchants. Cotton good, I think, have increased slightly in price.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Can you inform the Committee to what extent they have increased in price?—The advance in price has been slight.

Q. What price did you pay in the year 1876 or in 1878 for these goods, and what are you paying for them at the present time? What are you paying for bags, &c.?—We are paying a little more for cotton goods than we were.

Q. And what is the fact with respect to tweeds, for instance, as well?—We find that they are also a little dearer at the present time.

Q. You cannot state, however, what has been the exact extent by which they have increased in price?—I have not looked into the matter from that point of view.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. What is the price of labour? Have the wages which are paid to agricultural labourers increased? Is the price of labour much higher now than it was before the year 1879?—We are paying much higher wages at the present time than we were.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Have the wages which are paid to agricultural labourers increased a little or a great deal?—They are much higher than they were.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. Has the present Tariff had the effect of increasing and improving the demand in the home market for the products of the farm?—Do you mean in a general way?

Q. Yes; speaking in a general way?—I think so. I think that the Tariff has had this effect.

Q. Can you inform the Committee in what manner the Tariff has had such an effect? For instance, has it not prevented in this particular, foreign competition and increased the market for our agricultural products, enabling the Canadian farmer to cultivate his land more freely and with less restraint? And has it not, in consequence, increased the production of agricultural produce in our country, and also increased the extent of our exports of this produce? In point of fact, is not your experience that the present Tariff has led to all these results?—Do you refer to my country?

Q. In what manner has the market improved with respect to our agricultural products?—There are several manners in which this result might be produced. Has the home market been improved for instance, owing to the cessation of competition in agricultural produce from the United States?—The present Tariff has had a beneficial effect in my opinion, in this relation. American agricultural produce is not now being imported, and we are getting better prices for our agricultural products.

Q. And we have also exported largely to foreign markets of our agricultural products?—I do not know personally about that; but I believe it has been the case.

Q. And there has been a greater production of agricultural produce in your section of the country since the Tariff has come into operation than was the case previously? The area of land under cultivation is greater in extent at the present time than was the case before?—We are raising more agricultural produce than we were.

Q. And then the production of agricultural produce has been greater than it was?—It is a little greater than it was.

Q. Do you know whether the present Tariff has given increased employment and other encouragement to the different classes of workmen in this country; and whether, owing to this fact, it has retarded the immigration of our people to the United States and induced a number of French Canadians to return from the United States to this country?—I think so. The state of prosperity which our industries are enjoying at the present has improved the condition of the labouring class.

Q. Has the current of immigration to the United States taken away many people from your section of the country?—Oh, yes; it has drawn away a good many persons from our neighbourhood.

Q. Has this current of immigration begun to decrease; or has it increased in extent since the present Tariff came into operation?—It remains about the same. It has not, however, increased.

Q. But, on the other hand, it has not diminished in extent?—A certain number of our people is constantly going to the United States.

Q. They remain there during the summer season, and then they return to this country?—They sometimes remain in the United States longer than that. I know many persons who go over there and get work for a time.

Q. They go over there, work for a time, and then return to this country?—Yes, that is the case. But this is not always the fact.

Q. I am referring to the mass of the French Canadians who go to the United States?—Oh yes; that is the case.

Q. Has the value of real estate increased in your section of the country?—Oh yes; it has increased.

Q. It is greater than it was?—Yes, it is.

Q. Can you inform the Committee about to what extent real estate has increased in value?—It has increased in value from 20 to 25 per cent.

Q. Has the general condition of the farmer improved since the present Tariff came into operation?—Certainly it has improved.

Q. Have you any suggestions to make with respect to legislation, by which the condition of the agricultural class could be further improved?—Oh, no; I have not I have nothing to state to the Committee on that subject.

Q. Is it your opinion, that at the present time the condition of the agricultural class is such that it does not urgently demand any change to be obtained in the shape of legislation?—It is not to my knowledge, that any legislation with this object in view is required.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. I understand you to have stated that the present Tariff has increased the price of horses?—Yes; I think that it has had such an effect.

Q. Is it your opinion, that prior to the existence of the present Tariff, horses were imported into this country from foreign countries, in sufficient number to affect the price of horses in our own market?—That has not been the case in our section of the country.

Q. You cannot speak then in this connection, from the point of view of the whole country, or even from the point of view which relates to the interests of the whole of the Province of Quebec?—I can speak with a knowledge of the facts as far as they relate to the district of Quebec; but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the state of trade, for instance in the whole of the Province of Quebec, to speak positively in this relation.

Q. In your opinion then, before the present Tariff came into operation, we did not import enough horses to come into competition with the horses which were for sale in your district?—Yes; that was the case.

Q. We did not then import a sufficient number of horses to depreciate the price of horses?—No, I do not think that we did.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. This was not the case in your district; a sufficient number was not imported to depreciate the prices of horses in your district?—I do not think that such was the case, at all events.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Am I to understand that you have stated that the horses which have been sold in your district have been sold principally to American buyers?—Strangers come into our section of the country, and they represented themselves to be Americans.

Q. Are you aware whether the sales of horses which were made in your section of the country, were made to supply the demand from the American market?—The horses were taken away from our locality, but I do not know whether they went to the United States, or whether they were taken elsewhere.

Q. Are you aware whether the buyers of these horses remained in this country, or whether they went out of it with their purchases?—They spoke the English language, at all events, and they said that they were Americans.

Q. Do you think that these American buyers took the horses which they purchased to the United States?—They said that they were Americans; if they lived in the United States, it is probable that they returned to that country.

Q. Then you are not able to state positively, whether the market which absorbs the surplus of our horses is found in the United States or not?—No; I cannot state positively whether this is the case or not.

Q. In what way do you think that the present Tariff has increased the price of horses?—I think that the present Tariff has had this effect. Speaking in a general sense, it has interfered with the importation of horses into the Dominion of Canada. And the placing of a duty on the horses which are brought into this country, necessarily increases the price of them.

Q. Are you in a position to state, Mr. Paquin, that the horses, before the present Tariff came into force, were imported in sufficient numbers into this country to injure the prices of horses in Canada?—No; I cannot say that such was the case.

Q. You are not able to state that this was the case?—No; I am not.

Q. Have you heard it stated that this was the case?—I saw in the newspapers the statement that we had imported horses from the United States.

Q. You have stated, I believe, that the Canadian farmer can produce all the grain which he needs for the fattening of his stock?—Yes; I think that he can do so.

Q. Is it not the fact that this has always been the case; has not the Canadian farmer always been able to raise what he required for this purpose?—He has, under ordinary circumstances, been able to raise what grain he wanted. Only this fact requires to be noted: Before the present Tariff came into operation we imported a little corn from the United States in our section of the country, but we do not import any of it at the present time.

Q. Are you of opinion that we then imported a sufficient quantity of American Indian corn to injure the sale of other grains, which were of our own growth?—I cannot say that such was the case.

Q. I will now submit to you a question which perhaps you have never thought of, and which a great number of farmers have not thought of: in the event of American corn being imported into this country at a low price, is it not to the advantage of the Canadian farmer to purchase it for the purpose of fattening their stock and to sell his peas, which as a rule command a higher price than American corn can be obtained for?—That is to say, if American corn could be imported into this country at a low figure.

Q. You pretend, do you not, that American corn was always brought into this country at a low price before this Tariff came into operation; and do you not think that it would be to the advantage of the Canadian farmer to buy this corn for the purpose of fattening his stock, at a cheap price, and to sell his peas, which generally bring a higher price than corn?—Certainly, that would be in the interest of the Canadian farmer.

Q. I am not exactly sure whether you have stated that, since the present Tariff came into force, the market for the sale of vegetables, and fowl, and eggs, &c., has been improved?—Yes; I think that this has been the case. I think that we have at the present time a better market for these articles.

Q. Do you think that these effects are due to the influence of the present Tariff, or are they simply concurrent with the revival of business which has taken place?—I think that both these facts have had something to do with the improvement which has made itself manifest in this connection. Both the operation of the present Tariff and the revival of business have had the effect of improving our market in this respect, and the prices of these articles.

Q. And do you think that before the present Tariff was introduced, fowl and eggs and articles of this kind, were imported into this country?—I do not know that this was the case.

Q. Are you aware whether we export fowl and eggs to the United States? Do you know that there is no duty collected on these articles?—I do not know anything about that.

Q. It is your opinion, is it not, that a Reciprocity Treaty, negotiated upon the basis of Free Trade with the United States, as far as agricultural products are concerned—I believe that you limited it in this sense—would be beneficial to the farmers of Canada?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. Do you think that it would be an advantageous thing for this country, if such a Treaty were negotiated at once, immediately?—It is my opinion that the existence of such a Treaty would be beneficial to the interests of this country. I think that the reciprocal exchange of these products would be beneficial. I would favour such an exchange.

Q. But you do not believe that it would be to the advantage of this country that such a Treaty should include manufactured goods? You do not think that there

should be Free Trade in manufactured goods between Canada and the United States? That we should have a market in that country for the sale of our manufactured goods, and that they should have a market in this country for the sale of their manufactured goods?—I do not think that such a state of things would be so beneficial to this country.

Q. You do not think that this would be so advantageous in its effects for this country?—No; and for this reason, our manufacturing industries are not so well and thoroughly established as theirs are. Our industries have not been so long in existence and are not fixed on as firm foundations, and our manufactured goods are not so perfect as theirs.

Q. But do you not think that the competition which such a state of things would bring about would have a beneficial effect. You allege that our manufactured goods are not so perfect as theirs; but are you not of opinion that the competition which our manufacturers would experience at the hands of the American manufacturers would force them to bring their goods to a state of perfection?—Oh, that might be the result of such a policy.

Q. Would not such a state of things have a stimulating effect on our manufacturing interests, and would not the consequences of such a policy confer a benefit upon this country?—Yes; but still I think that to commence with, it would be better for this country not to have Free Trade in manufactured goods with the United States.

Q. You think that if such a Treaty were at the present time in existence it would be very detrimental to our manufacturing interests?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. Why do you entertain that opinion?—I think so, because our manufactures have been too recently established. They have not been long enough in existence.

Q. Do you think that the reason why with Free Trade the American manufacturers would injure our industrial interests, is this: That the American manufacturers can sell their goods cheaper than our manufacturers can?—They can do so, because they have the best machinery. Their machinery is better than ours; and I think that they would under Free Trade flood our market with their goods, which they would sell cheaper than our manufacturers could, because the latter not possessing as perfect machinery could not manufacture as cheaply.

Q. Do you think that if their machinery was superior to the machinery which exists in our factories, the prices of their goods would be higher than ours?—In that case it would be about the same thing I suppose.

Q. But if possessed of the most perfect machinery they could make their goods cheaper than our manufacturers could; then in that event such a policy would be ruinous to our manufacturing interests?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. And for that reason you think that a policy of Free Trade in manufactured goods would be injurious to the interests of our manufacturers?—Except in the case of those who introduced them, and the most perfect machinery, our workmen not being so competent as the American artisans, I think that under such a policy our manufacturers would not be on an equal position with the American manufacturers, who would have an advantage over their Canadian competitors.

Q. You think that we would not occupy as advantageous a position as they would in this respect, and that the disadvantages which they would experience in this respect would be due to the fact that we occupy an inferior position in regard to machinery, &c., which would enable the American manufacturers to place cheaper goods on the market, than the Canadian manufacturers would be able to do?—Will you explain that question? I do not catch your meaning very well.

Q. You state that you believe that Reciprocal Trade in farm implements and in manufactured goods, between this country and the United States, would have the effect of injuring our manufacturing industries?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. And I ask you, then, the reason why Free Trade in these articles would be injurious to our manufacturing industries? I ask you, is this because you believe that the American manufacturers would be able to sell their goods cheaper than our manufacturers could?—Well, their manufacturing industries have been in operation for a long time; the American manufacturers have had much longer experience in

their lines of business than ours have; they can manufacture their goods quicker than our manufacturers can, and better than we can; and it is for that reason that I think, that at the present time our manufacturers could not compete successfully with the American manufacturers under a system of Free Trade.

Q. Could the Americans, in your opinion, sell their manufactured goods, which you say are more perfect than ours, at the same price that our manufacturers sell their goods on our market?—I do not know anything about that. I cannot say whether they could do so or not.

Q. Can the American manufacturers not sell their goods at about the same price as our manufacturers sell their goods; for if the goods made by the former were dearer than ours, how could they injure our manufacturing interests, if they were brought into this country free of duty? If their goods were not cheaper than ours, how would the effect of their introduction be injurious?—They have a better market for their goods than we have for ours. I say that our products being inferior to theirs, would not sell as well on our market as theirs would.

Q. That is your opinion?—Yes, it is.

Q. Would they sell their goods on our market at higher prices than our manufacturers ask for their goods?—I do not know whether they would sell their goods at prices which would be higher than those which are asked for Canadian goods; but I do know that their goods are better than our goods.

Q. Have you stated that the cultivation of tobacco has increased in the Province of Quebec during a great number of years?—Yes; I think that this has been the case.

Q. The area of land which was devoted to the growth of tobacco in this Province, was in that case increasing in extent before the present Tariff came into force?—Yes; it was also increasing before the present Tariff came into operation.

Q. The growth was also increasing at that time; and do you not believe that if there was no Excise duty placed on the production of Canadian tobacco, the cultivation of this tobacco would be developed, and would increase more rapidly than is at present the case, if there were no duty at all imposed by the Government on Canadian tobacco? Do you not think that the cultivation of Canadian tobacco would be more rapidly extended, and would make greater progress, than is the case at the present time?—I think that it would be better if there were no Excise duty on Canadian tobacco at all. I think that this would bring about a better state of things in this relation.

Q. Are you of opinion that this branch of agricultural industry has reached a stage at which the abolition of the Excise duty would develop it to a great extent, and render it much more advantageous to the country?—I think so; but I did not know much about that aspect of the case. I have not studied it, and I would not like to give on it a positive opinion.

Q. You have stated in a general way, if I understood you correctly, that the effect of the present Tariff has been to increase and improve our home market for our agricultural produce?—I think so; that is my opinion.

Q. What is your reason for entertaining this opinion; in what way do you think that the present Tariff has improved our market for agricultural produce; what has caused these results; what reason do you give for this state of things?—The effect of the imposition of duties on foreign agricultural produce has naturally rendered the price of our agricultural produce higher in price than would otherwise be the case.

Q. This opinion is based on your belief that, before the Tariff came into force, foreign agricultural produce came into this country and competed with our own agricultural products on our own market?—All sorts of things have led to these results.

Q. But that is your reason for holding that opinion?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Are you not of opinion that the price of our agricultural produce has risen considerably, not owing to absence of competition from American produce, but in consequence of the failure of the crops which took place last year in Europe, and then

to the greater demand which has been exhibited for our agricultural produce?—That may have had something to do with the increase in prices which has taken place.

Q. But these facts have contributed to this increase in the price of our agricultural products?—Oh, certainly; that is the case, no doubt.

Q. You have stated, I believe, that the export of our agricultural produce has been greater during the last couple of years than it was previously?—Yes; I think that this is the fact.

Q. Perhaps that is due, in your opinion, to the greater demand from foreign countries for our produce, and next to the greater production of this produce, which has taken place of late years in this country, and to the surplus of this produce which we have had during the last few years?—Yes; that is perhaps the case. I think that this, too, has had an influence on the prices of our produce.

Q. The better crops which we have enjoyed, the greater abundance with which this country has been favoured, and the greater demand for our agricultural produce on the European market have led to the increase in prices. Is not this the case?—That may have had an influence on prices. I think that the present Tariff and the revival of business have had a good deal to do with the high prices which agricultural produce has commanded during the past couple of years.

Q. And the foreign demand for this produce has had its effect in this connection?—That circumstance, too, has no doubt had its effect.

Q. That is the case without doubt?—Yes; I think so.

Q. You have alleged, I believe, that the cultivation of land has improved generally speaking, since the present Tariff came into operation?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. But you do not pretend that this is due to the influence of the Tariff. You do not imagine, that if the land is cultivated in a superior manner at the present time, better than was previously the case, this is due to the effect of the present Tariff?—It is a fact that the cultivation of land has improved, but I think that this is not due to the influence of the Tariff. I do not say that the Tariff has caused these results.

Q. You said, speaking in a general manner, that the cultivation was better to-day, than was formerly the case; but have you pretended that more land is cultivated at the present time in the Province of Quebec, than was the case before the present Tariff was introduced?—More land is cultivated at the present time, and it is better cultivated, than was formerly the case.

Q. And the cultivation of the land is better than it was?—It is a little better.

Q. Has the present Tariff caused the land to be cultivated in the Province of Quebec, in a better manner than was the case previous to its introduction?—I do not know that the present Tariff has had a strong influence in that direction.

Q. Do the farmers of the Province of Quebec not exhibit a tendency to improve the cultivation of their land every year?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Was not this the fact before the present Tariff came into force, as well as since?—It did exist before the present Tariff came into force.

Q. And the growth of agricultural produce has been greater during the last few years than was the case previously?—Yes; such has been the case.

Q. And has this not been due in great part to the circumstance that the seasons and the temperature have been favorable to the growth of agricultural produce?—This, no doubt, has had something to do with that state of things.

Q. But formerly we had a bad year, due to a too great dryness of the season, which led to a great reduction in the production?—Yes.

Q. And then we had another year, when we had too much rain?—Yes.

Q. Are you of opinion that not only good cultivation, but a favourable temperature have contributed to a large production of agricultural produce in this country?—These things have undoubtedly had their effect.

*By Mr. Landry:—*

Q. And a good Tariff and a good Government have a good deal to do with the prosperity of the country?—Those are important matters.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. You state that the duties which have been imposed on agricultural produce have increased the growth, in this country, of coarse grains, and you allege that the present Tariff has led to a better cultivation of the soil?—I think that such is the case.

Q. You have spoken of the emigration of our people from this country; but has this emigration of our people been less in extent under the operation of the present Tariff than was the case before this Tariff was introduced?—It is about the same in extent at the present time that it formerly was.

Q. Consequently the present Tariff has not contributed to the stoppage of the stream of emigration?—About the same current of emigration has prevailed in my district during the past four or five years.

Q. You have stated that the general condition of the farmers in this country has improved. Since what time has this been the case?—It has been principally observable during the past two or three years.

Q. Do you think that this state of things is due to the operation of the present Tariff, or do you attribute it to the influence of the present Tariff?—It is not due exclusively to the influence of the present Tariff; but I think that this Tariff has had something to do with it. The revival of business has also contributed to this state of things.

Q. And the good crops have had their effect in this relation?—Of course that would have a beneficial effect on the condition of the agricultural class.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. When you just now, Mr. Paquin, answered the question of Mr. Béchard with reference to the Reciprocity Treaty he asked you whether it should not only extend to agricultural products, but also to manufactured goods; but is it not the fact that the Reciprocity Treaty which existed from the year 1854 to 1864, only included agricultural produce. But are you in favour of the extension of a Reciprocity Treaty to manufactured goods, such as stoves and tweeds and cotton goods?—As to stoves and cotton goods, I do not know much about them. I would not like to express an opinion on that subject.

Q. Do you not remember, Mr. Paquin, that about the year 1875, the Americans sent tweeds and other goods into our market, and sold them at a great sacrifice, and cheaper than they did in the United States to their customers there, to the great injury of our manufacturing interests?—I do not know about that; but I know that a great quantity of their goods were sent by them into our market. I was made aware of that fact by the newspapers.

Q. Can you inform the Committee, whether the Americans made these sacrifices, and even did more than that to sell their goods on our market, to the injury of our manufacturing interests?—I do not know anything about that matter at all.

Q. Do you know that these American manufacturers had their customers—*leur clientèle*—in the United States to sustain their operations, to whom they sold their goods at a profit, while they sacrificed a portion of their goods in Canada to the great detriment of our manufacturing interests?—I heard that stated at the time by merchants, and I saw it mentioned in the newspapers.

Q. Mr. Béchard just now asked you a question with respect to the Excise duty on Canadian tobacco—as to whether, in your opinion, tobacco would not be cultivated to a greater extent in the Province of Quebec, and be better cultivated in case the Excise duty was abolished, and you answered—Yes; now not only is the Excise duty levied by the Government to regulate the production of tobacco in this country, but there is also a Customs' duty, which Mr. Béchard has not mentioned. This duty amounts to 20 cents a lb., and it is collected on foreign tobacco. Now, are you of opinion that this duty of 20 cents a lb. which is collected on American tobacco, and which is much higher than our Excise duty, and which is imposed for the protection of the home production of our tobacco should be removed?—No, I do not think that this should be done.

Q. Are you in favour of taking off the Excise duty, and the duty of 4 cents a lb., which is placed on roll tobacco, and of allowing it to be sold in this country free from the onus of any duty whatever? But you are not in favour of the removal of the Customs' duty?—Yes, I would favour the removal of the Excise duty, but not the Customs' duty.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. I put to you just now a question which I would like to put again; I asked you whether it would not be to the advantage of the Canadian farmer to sell his pease at a good price, and to buy corn for the fattening of his stock, which he could buy at a less price?—I think that it would be to the advantage of the farmer to pursue such a policy.

Q. What is the price of corn at the present time?—I do not remember precisely the price of it, but I suppose that it is now worth about 80 cents a bushel.

Q. And what are pease worth at the present time?—They are worth about \$1 a bushel.

Q. What is the difference in the fattening qualities of these two articles of corn and of peas?—I cannot tell you as to that, I do not cultivate either corn or peas.

Q. Which is the preferable for fattening purposes?—I think that peas are better than corn for that purpose.

Q. You do not then know what is the proportion of value for the purposes of fattening stock between these two articles of food?—No; I cannot tell you what it is.

Q. You do not know whether the difference in value for fattening purposes between peas and corn is one-fifth?—I do not know; I am not able to express an opinion on that subject.

Q. Is not the market for your farmers, in connection with the sale of live hogs, been better and has it not improved?—I do not know much with respect to that branch of agricultural industry.

Q. How much were the farmers in your section of the country paid for the pork which they brought to market in the year 1875?—I do not remember the exact figure which was paid for pork at that time; but I do know that it was then much lower in price than it is at the present time.

Q. The price of pork is higher at the present time?—Yes; it is the case in the District of Quebec.

Q. Is it higher in price in your section of the country?—In the District of Quebec it sells to-day for as much as \$9 and \$10 per 100 lbs.; and it has kept this price during the past year. It has varied during this time from \$8 to \$10 per 100 lbs.

Q. Can you state, however, what was the exact price of the pork that was placed on the market in the year 1875?—I do not remember what was the price of it at that time.

Q. Is it higher in price now, or is it lower in price than it was in the year 1875?—It is lower in my opinion; it was lower in the year 1875 than it is to-day.

Q. If American corn came into this country free of duty for instance, and if live hogs were admitted into this country free of any imposition of duty, what would be the effect of such a policy on the fattening of hogs in this country? Could our farmers fatten hogs as advantageously under such circumstances, as is the case at the present time?—I am not acquainted with the details which appertain to that business. The fattening of hogs is not engaged in extensively in our section of the country.

Q. The farmers in your part of the country do not fatten many hogs?—They only fatten hogs to meet the requirements of local consumption.

Q. Every year they raise a few hogs, but not many?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Do you remember that in the year 1874, or later, up to the year 1879, the fattening of hogs was abandoned by the farmers in the Province of Quebec, owing to the great lowness of the price of pork?—The price of pork at that time was much lower than it had been, and pork was placed on the market on a smaller scale.

Q. There was no profit to be made in it at that period?—No; there was not.

Q. But to-day this state of things has greatly changed?—Yes; there has been a great change in that respect.

Q. And the farmers are generally engaged in the fattening of hogs?—Yes; they are now producing considerable pork.

Q. And they are making more out of it than they did then?—Yes; and it gives them more satisfaction.

Q. To what circumstance do you attribute this fact—that the farmers of the Province of Quebec are engaged in the fattening of hogs at the present time and are making a greater profit out of it than was the case during the period mentioned?—This is the fact, because pork sells better now, and commands a greater price. The demand for pork is more active and more extensive. If American corn came into this country free of duty, and if the hogs produced in the Western States were also allowed to be sent into Canada free of duty, do you believe that our farmers would fatten the same number of hogs, as they now do, when duties are placed on these articles?—I do not think that they would fatten so many of them under these circumstances.

Q. Then you are of opinion that the present Tariff, with reference to animals, and particularly with respect to hogs, has produced a beneficial effect in the interests of the Canadian farmer?—I think that such has been the case.

Q. And it has worked to the advantage of our farmers?—I think that the present Tariff has been advantageous as far as the interests of our farmers are concerned.

Q. You have just now spoken of a Reciprocity Treaty. Do you think that the circumstances which exist to-day in this relation, are the same as those which prevailed when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force. Are circumstances as favourable now for the negotiation of a Reciprocity Treaty as they were when the treaty, which lasted from the year 1854 to the year 1864, was negotiated and was in force?—I do not remember much very distinctly with respect to the period when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force. I was at the time quite young, and I did not then interest myself much in these matters.

Q. Do you remember whether the Reciprocity Treaty—and we had only one of them—was advantageous in its effects to this country, and favorable to the interests of our farmers?—At the time it was an excellent thing for this country; this was shown by the desire which was exhibited on the part of this country to secure a renewal of its conditions.

Q. Do you remember the circumstances which then existed; do you know whether at that time the Eastern section of the United States were great consumers of the agricultural productions of Canada, for which they paid good prices, as the means of communication at the time between the Eastern and the Western States were limited?—I do not know anything about that matter.

Q. You are not acquainted with those circumstances?—I believe that at the time it was advantageous for the people of the Eastern States to buy their agricultural productions in Canada.

Q. But at the present time, when the Eastern portion of the United States, the great centre for the consumption of agricultural produce grown outside of it, is closely united with the Western States, as to means of communication for the transportation of farm produce, by means of railroads, at a slight cost, do you think that a Reciprocity Treaty between this country and the United States would have the same beneficial effect on the farming interests of Canada as was the case between the years 1854 and 1864?—I think that the results which might flow from it would not now be so advantageous from the reasons which you have given.

Q. Do you think that the action of the Government in putting duties on grain, and thus preventing the introduction of American corn and grains into this country, has had a beneficial effect on the interests of our farmers?—I think that this has been the case.

Q. It has rendered the market for our produce larger, and the prices of these articles have improved.—I think that this has been the case. That ought to be the effect, anyway, of these duties.

Q. These duties ought to have that effect?—Certainly; that is my opinion.

Q. If we admitted American farm produce into this country free of duty, do you not think that this policy would be injurious in its results to the interests of our farmers?—I think so.

Q. If American corn was lower in price than pease, would not this be the case?—If corn was cheaper than pease, this would be injurious to the interests of our farmers.

Q. This would be detrimental to the interests of the great agricultural class of this country?—Certainly, it would be so. If the Americans sent their farm produce into this country and sold it at lower prices than we could raise it for, the effect of this would naturally be prejudicial to the interests of our farmers.

Q. And it would reduce the price of our farm produce on our own market?—Yes; that would be the case.

Q. Our agricultural produce would be lowered in price, and our farmers would make less out of the sale of it?—That ought to be the result of such a state of things.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. Are you aware of the fact that our farmers in Canada produce every year a greater quantity of agricultural produce than is usually required for home consumption?—I believe that this is the case.

Q. Under the same conditions—when we produce more agricultural produce than we require—do you think that there is any necessity for us to import from the United States any of such produce?—But we do not always raise the same articles that they produce.

Q. But when we raise more of an article than is needed for home consumption, is there any necessity for us to import of that article from the United States?—No; there is not.

Q. Hence you do not believe that when we raise more oats than we require we need import oats to supply the want of home consumption?—No; naturally we would not have to import oats under these circumstances.

Q. And this is the case with all those grains of which we produce a surplus?—Yes; I think that such is the fact. When we have a surplus of any article we would not import any of it.

Q. I believe that I understood you to say that corn was about the only article which we imported of farm produce?—Yes; that is my opinion.

Q. This is the chief article of farm produce which we import, because we do raise it?—We do not raise it in my section of the country.

Q. You do not raise enough of it to supply the needs of home consumption?—No, we do not; but we raise other grains which replace it.

Q. Without doubt, Mr. Benoit put to you a question with respect to the price of pork—what has been the price of pork? Do you know by what amount the duty on pork was increased under the present Tariff?—No; I do not know that.

Q. Do you know whether the duty on pork has been increased under the present Tariff to the extent of 15 cents a barrel? There was a duty on pork under the former Tariff?—I do not know about that. I believe that I did see the figures, but I have not specially remarked it.

Q. If the increase in the duty on pork has been to the extent of 15 cents a barrel, do you think that this would have had a great effect on the price of this article?—That amount of increase would not have had a great effect on the price of pork. I do not think that such would be the case.

Q. In that event, you do not attribute the increase which has taken place in the price of pork principally to the influence of the Tariff; but rather to the greater demand that there has been for it during the past few years?—If the increase in the amount of the duty were only 15 cents a barrel, I think that this must be the case.

Q. Was it not the fact that before the late commercial crisis broke over this country—and this crisis as you must be aware, lasted some five years—pork commanded a good price in certain cases?—It was then sold at a high price.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. You were asked about the price of pork, and the duty being only 15 cents a barrel.

*Mr. Béchard :—*I referred only to the increase in the duty.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Now, should it be forgotten that the duty on American corn is 10 cents a bushel? Should not this fact be borne in mind? Not only has the duty on pork been increased 15 cents a barrel, as Mr. Béchard puts it, but a duty of 10 cents a bushel on the corn which used to be imported into this country for the purpose of fattening hogs?—I think that such is the case. I am told that it is the fact.

Q. A Protective duty exists both with respect to pork and corn, and it is necessary to bear both these facts in mind in order to explain the increase which has taken place in the price of pork. Now, you have stated that we produce a surplus of oats, and that oats should not be imported into this country, because we do not require them; but is it not to your knowledge, Mr. Paquin, that in the year 1876 our oats, which we had for sale in Lower Canada, remained unsold, because corn was brought into these districts of the Province of Quebec from the city of Chicago at a low price?—I saw this mentioned in the papers at the time. I also heard it spoken of by merchants; but I know nothing personally about the matter.

Q. This, then, is not within your personal knowledge?—No, Sir, it is not.

Q. Nor is it to your knowledge that as soon as the present Tariff came into force, the distillers in Upper Canada, instead of bringing the oats which they required from Chicago and Milwaukee, obtained them in the city of Montreal in Lower Canada?—I do not know anything about that.

*By Mr. Béchard :—*

Q. Is it to your knowledge that the distillers to whom Mr. Benoit has referred, instead of employing oats for their purposes, use corn?—I do not know whether that is the case or not.

Q. With regard to pork, Mr. Benoit has observed that the duties upon grain have increased the price of these products of the farm in this country; that as a consequence of this fact, grain is higher in price, and that the increase in the price of pork is to be in part attributed to this fact?—Yes.

Q. Then in this event the increase in the price of pork is due in part to the operation of the present Tariff, to the extent of 15 cents a barrel; and Mr. Benoit has drawn your attention to the fact, which I forgot to mention, that is one of the causes of the increase which has taken place in the price of pork, but it is not the only one attributable to the increased price of grain which is due to the advance in the price of corn?—Yes, of course.

Q. If the production of pork is in this manner rendered dearer to the farmers of this country, it necessarily follows that they must sell it at a higher price?—Of course, that would be the result of such a state of things.

Q. And then this fact has to be taken into consideration, although he sells it at a higher price, it costs him more to produce it?—Certainly, if he pays a higher price for the grain which he buys in order to fatten his hogs, it would cost him more to produce the pork, and he must necessarily sell it at a higher price.

Q. Could it not happen—I do not say that it has happened—could not the case arise, that owing to the fact that the grain which was used for the fattening of hogs would be very dear, pork would cost a great deal to produce, and the farmer would not make much profit out of it?—The thing might occur.

Q. And that he would not in such a case make any more profit than he did, when the grain which he used was cheaper, and pork brought a less price in the market?—It is very clear that that could be the case.

*By Mr. Benoit :—*

Q. Who engage in the fattening of hogs for the market as a rule?—The farmers generally do this.

Q. Are farmers persons who buy grain, or do they raise the grain which they require?—In our section of the country they generally raise the grain which they need.

Q. What difference do you consider that there is with respect to profit between the selling of grain on the market, and the conversion of this grain into pork, which can be sold at a high price? Which is the most profitable operation?—What is your question?

Q. Mr. Béchard says that the fattening of pork costs more to-day than it did; do you think that this is the case, or is it rather your opinion, that the farmer who fattens his hogs with the grain which he himself has raised does not produce pork at a higher cost to himself than was the case ten years ago?—It costs him the same price to produce at the present time that it did then?—Yes, I think that it costs him no more now than it did then.

Q. But instead of selling the grain which he raises on the market, he converts it into pork, which he can sell at a higher price than was formerly the case under the late Tariff. Do you not think that it costs him no more to produce the pork now than it did then, and that he makes as much profit out of this manner of disposing of his grain as if he had sold his grain, or more profit?—If the grain which he uses did not cost him any more, that would be the case; but Mr. Béchard spoke of the farmer buying the grain which he used.

Q. Mr. Béchard was referring to the circumstances in which the ordinary farmer would find himself in such a case?—I understand that he spoke of the man who bought grain for the fattening of his hogs.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. But is not the grain which a man raises worth the money which it would command if it were placed on the market, because if he did not feed it to his hogs, he could sell it and obtain the cash for it. For instance, if a man has grain for which he can get \$10, and he feeds it to his hogs, is it not the same thing as if he paid \$10 for grain for the purpose of feeding it to his hogs?—Yes; that would be the case.

Q. That would come to the same thing, would it not?—It would be about the same thing.

Q. And if the grain was higher in price, would it not necessarily follow that if he sold his grain he would get more for it; but there could happen cases where pork being very high in price, it would pay better to fatten his hogs than to sell his grain?—If the thing compensated itself, the result would be about the same.

Q. I have another question to put to you. I forgot to ask you about the price of labor. Have you stated that the price of labour is higher than it was?—Yes; that is the case.

Q. Do you think that this state of things is due to the effect of the present Tariff?—I think that this is due to two things.

Q. It is due to the effect of the present Tariff, and what else?—It is also due to the revival of business.

Q. Do you think that the emigration of our people from the country has raised the rate of wages?—That has also had its influence on the price of labor.

*By Mr. Benoit:—*

Q. Have you any manufacturing industries established in the County of Portneuf? Have you any cheese and butter factories in operation in it?—We have no butter or cheese factories; but we have some manufactories.

Q. Manufactories of what, tweeds?—We have no manufactories of woollen goods.

Q. What manufactories have you?—We have paper factories and thrashing machine manufactories.

Q. Since when have these industries been established?—The paper factory has been in existence during a very long time. But when it began operations it was on a very small scale.

Q. And what is the case at the present time?—It has greatly increased the extent of its operations.

Q. Since when has this been the case?—This has been the case during the past two or three years.

Q. Since when was the factory for the making of agricultural implements established?—One has been in operation in the Parish of Deschambeault during the past twelve years I suppose.

Q. And do you think that they are doing more business at the present time than was the case then?—Yes.

Q. They have been doing more during the past three or four years than was the case previously?—They are doing a much more extensive business at the present time than they were.

Q. Do you know how much capital is invested in this enterprise?—I do not.

Q. This factory is situated in your county?—Yes; but a good deal of capital is invested in the paper mills.

Q. How many of these mills are there?—I think that there are four of them in operation at the present time. They make paper pulp.

Q. Are many persons employed in these mills?—Yes; a good many people are employed in them, but not a very great number.

Q. But in all of them considered together, how many persons are employed in your opinion?—Do you refer to this year particularly.

Q. About how many persons are now employed in them?—A couple of hundred persons obtain employment in them.

Q. A couple of hundred?—Yes, that is about the number.

Q. Is not the establishment of butter cheese factories mooted at the present time in your country?—Such a thing is spoken of. It is projected.

Q. But nothing has as yet been done in this direction?—No, nothing has been done as yet.

And the examination of this witness at this point was closed.

G. G. KING, M.P., called.

*By the Chairman?—*

Q. Where do you reside?—In New Brunswick.

Q. What part of New Brunswick?—Queen's County.

Q. Are you engaged in farming?—Farming and lumbering.

Q. To what extent are you engaged in farming?—As much as an average New Brunswick farmer.

Q. Would it be in the interest of the farmers of New Brunswick to admit American farm produce free of duty?—Not all kinds.

Q. Would it be in the interest of the farmers of your Province to admit farm produce free? If so, name the articles?—Articles which were admitted free under the former Tariff. It would make no material difference to the farmer if they were admitted free at the present time. It would not be to the interests of the farmer to admit pork free of duty.

Q. Would it be in the interests of the farmers of New Brunswick to admit oats, pease and corn free of duty?—It is to the interests of the farmers to admit corn free of duty.

Q. You do not think it would be to admit oats and pease?—I do not think if the duty were taken off oats, that there would be any imported, because I do not know where outside of Canada we can buy them cheaper than in Canada.

Q. Would it be in the interests of the farmers to admit the product of oats—oatmeal—free of duty?—There is very little oatmeal manufactured in the Province. Of course, when I speak of the interests of the farmers, I refer to the farmers of New Brunswick. I am speaking simply from the standpoint of my own Province, and not from a Dominion standpoint.

Q. Do you think it would be to their interests to admit oatmeal and oats free of duty?—I do not think it would affect them. I think we would purchase the oatmeal in Ontario if it was admitted free.

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of a duty on Indian corn and other coarse grains; what has been the effect on the price of coarse grains?—We do not raise very much corn in the country. It has not affected the price of corn grown in the Province, except, perhaps, to a very trifling extent.

Q. How has it affected your coarse grains?—I do not think it has increased the value of oats. There has been as much coarse grain, including corn and Indian meal, imported under the Tariff as when it was duty free. There has been as much imported under the Tariff as in 1878, when it was duty free.

Q. Does it not cause oats and pease and other coarse grains to be more sought for?—The only article it would be likely to compete with in our Province would be buckwheat meal, and it has not advanced the price of buckwheat meal. The average price for the last three years is not so high, compared with the price of wheat flour, as formerly.

Q. Does not the shutting out from Canada of oats and corn cause the lumbermen of your Province to seek more for Canadian oats?—We do not import oats. With the exception of some brought from Quebec to the North Shore of the Province, and some from Prince Edward Island, we do not import any.

Q. You never imported Indian corn or oats for feeding purposes?—We import corn for feeding purposes.

Q. Does not the exclusion of corn raise the value of oats?—Oats are not so high at present as is usual when the lumbering business is prosperous.

Q. Do you not think that is owing to a larger crop than usual?—No, Sir, it is not.

Q. What has been the effect of the duty upon wheat and flour coming from the United States?—It has been to decrease the importation of flour from the United States.

Q. Is there more flour brought in from Ontario now than formerly?—Yes, more flour from Ontario than formerly, but not very much more. In 1878 New Brunswick imported, in round numbers, 50,000 barrels of American flour; in 1881 the importation was reduced to 14,000.

Q. What has been the effect of the increased duty on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard—the effect on the prices of these articles?—The effect has been to increase the price to the farmers of bacon and ham.

Q. And is it the same with regard to live hogs and lard?—Well, I do not know how that might apply in New Brunswick. The effect, I suppose, would be the same on lard, but in live hogs I do not think it would make any difference.

Q. Have the duties imposed on horses and other live stock improved the market price?—No; We imported none except for breeding purposes.

Q. Do you send more to the West?—More to Manitoba and the North-West.

Q. Do you find it profitable to breed horses?—Yes, now that there is a demand from the United States, and a good demand in the home market.

Q. Is the demand in the home market at present large?—Yes; it is very good indeed.

Q. Owing to the lumbering operations?—Yes; the price is regulated though at the present time, by the price in the American market.

Q. Can the Canadian farmer raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock? That is all the feed, including turnips and hay?—The New Brunswick farmer can raise grain required to fatten his stock, but in New Brunswick, my opinion is it does not pay to feed that grain to stock, it is worth more for other purposes, oats for instance. I may say I think that, on the whole, we have a better market for coarse grain in New Brunswick than is to be found elsewhere in Canada, and I do not think it is profitable to feed our coarse grain for the purpose of fattening stock.

Q. What are they used for?—For food purposes for the lumbering woods. There are times when the lumber interest is depressed; then oats and other coarse grains are low, and in such times they have been used for the purpose of fattening stock.

Q. Is yours a good root growing country?—Yes; I should judge so.

Q. Could not your farmers obtain sufficient fodder for calve feeding purposes by growing a root crop and feeding a moderate amount of pease and oats?—Pease are not grown extensively; I do not know, though, what might be done. Turnips grow very well there.

Q. Has the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter improved as a result of the present Tariff. I would include in that question, fruit?—No; not in New Brunswick.

Q. Has fruit, or have any of those articles been imported into the United States from your Province?—Yes; apples have been imported.

Q. Has the duty encouraged the growth of apples in New Brunswick?—It has not checked the importation of American apples. I think the people are turning their attention more to fruit growing than formerly, however——

Q. It has increased the price of apples, I suppose?—Of course; to the extent of the duty.

Q. Therefore to that extent it has encouraged the New Brunswick farmer to go into the raising of more apples?—I do not think it has; I do not know that I can say it has.

Q. But you say they are going more extensively into the growing of fruit?—Yes, but there has been a gradual change in that respect for years past. I do not think they have taken any fresh start since the introduction of the Tariff.

Q. Do you not think it likely that if it be to some extent excluded, the raising of prices would make it more profitable to the New Brunswick farmer to raise fruit?—No. Most of the apples imported from the United States—and apples are the only fruit we can grow successfully in New Brunswick—are early apples, apples which do not come into competition at all with apples grown in the Province.

Q. Do early apples not grow in your Province?—Not so early as they grow farther south. Our apples are apples that will ripen in the last of August or first of September, and we can get apples from the United States a month earlier than that.

Q. Do you not find that the American apple grower floods the market with early apples?—No. There is not the slightest danger of that. The early apple commands a higher price, and the moment our apples get ripe they draw the early apples out of the market. No dealer would import early apples to come into competition with apples grown in the Province.

Q. Would the farmer be benefited by Reciprocity with the United States?—The farmers of New Brunswick would.

Q. Do you think we are in a better position by reason of the Tariff to negotiate a Treaty than we otherwise would be?—So far as the duties upon American farm produce are concerned it will make very little difference to the Americans I think.

Q. But taking the Tariff as a whole do you think we are in a better position to negotiate. For instance, do you not think the duties on American coal, manufactures and so forth, will have a tendency to create a larger party in the United States favourable to a Reciprocity Treaty?—I daresay it would have that effect, but I think in the Dominion the effect would be to create a party opposed to Reciprocity.

Q. You think then, the effect of the Tariff is likely to make us more independent of the United States?—That is not what I said.

Q. I understood you to say the effect of the Tariff would be to create a party in the Dominion opposed to Reciprocity?—The imposition of a duty on coal and other articles might give rise to a feeling on the part of some people on the other side favorable to Reciprocity; but, on the other hand, I say the Tariff would be likely to develop a feeling in this country opposed to Reciprocity on the part of manufacturers.

Q. That is to create a feeling that we can do without it?—Yes; but I think no greater boon could be conferred upon the farmers of New Brunswick than Reciprocity with the United States, because the United States is the only market for the surplus of their farms. We have no other market, except the home market, which is afforded by the lumber interest of the Province.

Q. What is the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool?—We are exporting more wool from New Brunswick than before the Tariff.

Q. Do you raise any fine qualities of wool—Southdown for instance?—Not very much. I think wool is higher than it was a year ago, but not higher than the average price some years back.

Q. Do you raise any flax, tobacco or sugar beet?—Very little flax; no tobacco or sugar beet.

Q. Has the price of farm implements increased or decreased under the Tariff, and is their quality as good as it was before?—Well, the duty has been increased from  $17\frac{1}{2}$  to 30 per cent., and we are importing in New Brunswick from the United States largely of farming implements under the 30 per cent. Tariff.

Q. Have the duties imposed upon these implements encouraged you to buy from the Canadian manufacturer?—They have made a slight change. We purchase as many thrashing machines in the United States as before the Tariff was changed; we purchase as many scythes from the United States as we did before the Tariff was changed. There has been some reduction in the extent of our purchases of spades and shovels.

Q. Reapers and mowers?—They were largely purchased in Ontario under the old Tariff. Thrashing machines are purchased in the United States, and I see that in St. John, by late papers, that an agency has been established there for the sale of American thrashing machines; and that is the machine that will hold the market, until something is introduced there quite as good, and at a lower price.

Q. Is it a steam thrashing machine?—No; a tread power; it is made in Pennsylvania.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. That class of machines is popular with you?—It is the only kind used. Some are manufactured in our own Province, and I think there have been a few sold from Ontario.

Q. Do you use two horses?—Two horses in the machine. The machine I refer to is made in Pennsylvania. I bought one myself last fall, and paid the duty on it.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think the general tendency of the Tariff will be to cause the farmers of New Brunswick to deal with the Canadian manufacturers?—When the Canadian manufacturer produces just as good articles at a price which will compete with the Americans; but I know myself that our dealers in St. John, and our retail dealers in the country, sell largely American forks, rakes and hoes, on which a duty of 30 per cent. is paid. These sell alongside of the Canadian manufactured article and get the preference in many cases.

Q. Do you think the Tariff has had the effect of increasing to any extent inter-provincial trade?—I think it has—one side of inter-provincial trade. I am not aware that we have sold more to the Upper Provinces than we did before; but I am satisfied we have bought more from them.

Q. Are the prices of woollens, cottons and hardware increased?—We think they are.

Q. Can you specify any article that is higher?—Cotton warps are higher.

Q. Any woollens that are higher?—Do you mean higher than they were before the introduction of the Tariff; or higher than they would be if the Tariff was lower?

Q. Of course, you can only compare between what they were then and what they are now?—I do not think that would be a fair comparison. I think the fair question would be whether they are higher than they would be if the Tariff was lower?

Q. Higher than they otherwise would be, in consequence of the Tariff. You can use your own judgment?—I think they are higher in consequence of the Tariff.

Q. Can you give some proof that they are higher?—I think what I have said in reference to farm implements would apply equally well to cottons and woollens. I have told you that the people of New Brunswick find it to their advantage to import from the United States—and pay the duty of 30 per cent.—forks, rakes, hoes, thrash-

ing machines and some other farm implements ; and they do the same—(they do not import very largely of woollen goods from the United States)—but they do the same in reference to woollens and cottons both from Great Britain and the United States. Many persons are satisfied they can import as cheaply as they can purchase the home manufactured article or else they would not do it.

Q. Have you had any experience in buying woollens and cottons—of course, you are engaged in some commercial business?—Yes ; I have for thirty-five years.

Q. Do you import direct yourself?—No, I do not.

Q. You have no particular knowledge on the subject of importing?—No personal knowledge.

Q. You cannot state positively whether prices of imported goods have risen in consequence of the Tariff?—Many of the importers tell me they have.

Q. Can you give me any idea of the extent to which they have risen, of your own knowledge?—All imported goods, I fancy, have risen to the extent of the increase of duty.

Q. What is your opinion as to the price of goods hitherto imported, but now manufactured in Canada?—My own opinion is that manufacturers in Canada take advantage of the duties and fix prices accordingly.

Q. You do not think the manufacturers of the United States or Great Britain lower their invoices to Canadian importers in consequence of the Tariff?—I am not prepared to speak from experience as to that ; but I think it would be very unreasonable, indeed, if they would do so for the sake of the small trade they can do with us.

Q. You can only specify one article that is higher, that is, in reference to cotton goods ; you cannot specify any class of woollen goods?—Yes ; I can specify other goods. We sell largely of gray flannels to the farmers and persons engaged in the lumber business, and I am satisfied that they are considerably higher in price than they were three years ago.

Q. In consequence of the Tariff?—I do not know that the Tariff has not had as much to do with it as anything else. The prices have gone up anyway. There is another article we are obliged to import. It is not an article that affects the farmer so much, but it is largely imported into New Brunswick, and upon it a duty of 70 per cent. is paid. It is coarse blanketing for the lumbermen. We import it and pay the higher duties upon it.

Q. What is the increase of duty upon that article ; what is the difference between the duty now and the duty before the Tariff?—The duty was  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. before the Tariff ; I think it will run up to 70 per cent. now.

Q. Seventy per cent?—Yes. It is a very heavy blanket, called a camp blanket. There is nothing made in Canada like it. We have some very good blankets made in Canada, but for what we call camp spreads— $2\frac{1}{2}$  yards wide, and cut any length to suit the berth in which the men sleep—I know of nothing yet made in Canada to take its place.

Q. Has the home market for farm produce been, on the whole, improved by the operation of the Tariff?—It has not. We exported last year, double, the quantity of farm produce.

Q. What do you export?—Potatoes and eggs—largely potatoes and eggs.

Q. Has not the market for coarse grains improved?—Do you mean in the last three years?

Q. Yes ; since the introduction of the Tariff?—Yes ; but it is not due to the effect of the Tariff ; it is due to the improved condition of the lumber trade ; it is due to the revival of the lumber trade, which makes a market for oats in the Province.

Q. Do you think the present Tariff has given diversity of employment or any other encouragement to our industrial classes?—In so far as anything has been done, it has been in the way of giving employment in the cotton factories of St. John, St. Stephen and Moncton ; but so far as they are concerned, the additional employment they give is scarcely perceptible.

Q. Has it not retarded emigration to the United States or other countries?—No ; it has not.

Q. Do you think giving diversity of employment is an incentive to people to remain in this country?—I say what has been has not been an incentive to people to stay in the country. There is a greater exodus now than ever before.

Q. But you say these factories have given employment?—It has to some; but in my district I do not know anyone who has employment there. From my parish, out of a population of 1,700, 50 per cent. of the able-bodied young men have gone to Minnesota. Half of the young men of that parish are to-day in and around Duluth, and what I say regarding the exodus from that parish would apply to some other parts of the Province, though perhaps the exodus from that parish is greater than from other parts.

Q. Do you not think that is due to the fact that there is not sufficient diversity of employment in their own country?—It is due to the fact that they can get better pay in the country to which they have gone than at home.

Is the country to which they have gone not a highly protected country?—Yes, it is.

Q. Then, it would seem that highly protected countries are very attractive to young men?—It does not seem so, so far as our country is concerned; Protection does not induce them to stay.

Q. The highly protected United States seems to attract the young men?—I do not think it is the Protection; but the fact they can get better wages than we can afford to pay in our Province that attracts them.

Q. Have wages not improved under the operation of the present Tariff?—They have improved since the price of lumber has gone up. In New Brunswick we have been obliged to pay higher wages than formerly, in order to get the labour of that country; and if it was not for the advance in the price of lumber the business would have come to a standstill. But owing to the advance, we can pay higher wages, though not sufficiently high to keep the labour in the country. I may say here that just now there is a great scarcity of labour in New Brunswick on account of the exodus.

Q. Are there any leaving for the North-West?—Only two from my county have gone to the North-West, and they went some years ago.

Q. I presume those who went to Duluth have gone lumbering?—Yes, they have; they are largely engaged in the lumber woods. They are used to both lumbering and farming.

Q. Do they not pass backward and forward?—They do not from our country. We expect some of them to return, but the most of them purpose remaining there, at least they say so.

Q. Has the value of farm lands increased or decreased in your section of the country?—There has been a gradual decrease in the price of farm lands for the last ten or fifteen years, but the decrease has been greater during the last two or three years than formerly.

Q. Yours does not seem to be a very attractive country for agriculture then?—Under certain circumstances I think farming could be carried on there successfully. If we had Free Trade relations with the United States, I am satisfied that Reciprocity would increase the value of every farm in the Province. What we want is the American market for the product of our farms,—for our meat and vegetables.

Q. Do you not think that now we have something to offer the Americans, such as the free admission of their coal and their manufactures, it has placed us in a better position to secure Reciprocity?—I have not seen, so far, any indications on their part that they are more anxious for Reciprocity than they have been heretofore.

Q. It does not strike you from a business point of view that we are in a better position to secure Reciprocity?—I do not see that, so far as relieving farm produce of duty is concerned, it would be any great inducement to the Americans to give us Reciprocity.

Q. But I am speaking of the whole Tariff?—Well, from an American standpoint, perhaps it might have some effect. I am very doubtful though; I do not think they care enough about our trade.

Q. Do you think the general condition of farmers and the labouring classes has improved since 1878?—I do.

Q. Can you suggest any changes in legislation that you think would be advantageous?—I think the general condition has improved since 1878, it did not improve any in 1879. It did not improve until there was a rise in the price of lumber, and in the price of some kinds of farm produce in the American market. For instance, last year we shipped, and this year we are shipping, largely of potatoes to Boston and other parts of the United States, and our farmers are getting good prices and are making a profit.

Q. The Americans charge you 15 cents a bushel duty on your potatoes?—They do.

Q. Do you think it would be fair to admit their corn and other produce free, while they impose a duty on your produce?—Yes; if we wanted it.

Q. Do you think it would be fair to the New Brunswick farmers?—Yes; it would be to admit corn free of duty.

Q. Would it be fair to admit American farm produce generally, free of duty?—Anything that comes into competition I do not think it would be fair to admit free; for instance pork upon which the duty has not been increased. If the duty on pork was increased to \$4 a barrel instead of \$2, it would be a benefit to our farmers, and we might get Reciprocity; but imposing duties on articles we do not import will not assist us in getting Reciprocity; and that is the case as it stands now.

Q. The fact is the Americans have not used your market very much?—No; we use theirs.

Q. Then you have not imported largely of flour, for instance?—Oh, yes; we have imported flour.

Q. Was not that using your market?—That was; but it was to the advantage of our farmers and people.

Q. Can you not grow wheat there?—It is a very uncertain crop in New Brunswick. We have found it all along more to our advantage to grow other crops and purchase large quantities of wheat flour instead. The Americans, I may say, give us a better price for our potatoes than we can get in our home market—a great deal better price.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Is it on account of the Tariff that these young men are leaving the country?—On account of the increase in the Tariff do you mean?

Q. Yes.—That has something to do with it, but I do not think it is the sole cause. I think there are other causes.

Q. Do you import much flour from Ontario?—Yes; I sell perhaps 1,000 or 1,500 barrels retail, and it is all Canadian flour, and it has been for the last ten years. I have not sold a barrel of American flour except some higher grades of flour in ten years.

Q. You are aware that there has been a great deal of American flour imported?—In 1878 about 50,000 barrels; and they were largely imported at the small ports along the coast where it suited traders with small vessels to bring it in in the way of a return cargo.

Q. Is the decrease in farm property owing to the Tariff?—I think it is in part due to the increased taxation imposed upon the farmer. We are told that the Tariff has increased the price of labour, but I am satisfied it has increased the price of the implements the farmer uses and many articles he consumes.

Q. But has not the Tariff improved the price of grain?—No; because we did not import grain before the Tariff was raised.

Q. It has not increased the price of flour then?—I do not think it has very materially. I think there are times when it would. I think if there was a scarcity of wheat in Ontario the probability is that the speculators would take advantage of the people of the Maritime Provinces and make them pay more for flour than they would have to pay if there was no duty; but ordinary circumstances does not make any difference to us in the cost of wheat flour.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Are you engaged in the lumbering business?—Yes; and have been engaged in it for the last fifteen or twenty-five years; doing more or less in it.

Q. Is that branch of industry flourishing?—It is at present.

Q. How many years is it since it was not good?—Three years ago the price of lumber was very low in New Brunswick.

Q. By what percentage has it advanced in price?—Fully 50 per cent. Spruce logs were selling at St. John at \$1 a 1,000 three or four years ago. I am getting \$7.50 for the same article now. That makes a difference in a year's operation of 5,000 ft., of \$15,000.

Q. But has the business increased in proportion to the increase in price?—No; it has not.

Q. You have not extended your business?—No; I have not. I do not think there will be any more lumber produced this year than when prices were low.

Q. Where do you find your market for your lumber?—About two-thirds in Great Britain and the continent, and one-third in the United States. A few years ago the market in the United States was very limited, and there was very little shipped. In fact, nearly all our pine goes now to the West Indies, and that market is very dull at present.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Is there no home market for lumber?—Yes; we have a home market for our lumber, but the principal part of the lumber used in the home market is lumber that is not for shipping.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have you many men employed in winter in the woods preparing for the mills?—Not a great many directly employed by myself. I generally have a few teams of my own in. I supply parties and make contracts with them to cut and haul on my land.

Q. Do you furnish those whom you employ with axes, saws and articles of that description?—We furnish axes.

Q. Where do you purchase them?—At St. John.

Q. What make are they, American?—No, Canadian make.

Q. Are they enhanced in price?—No. They are no higher than they were before the increase in the duty on the raw materials. We have bought Canadian home-made axes for a great many years.

Q. Do you think the exodus from New Brunswick is as large in other places as it is with you?—No, I do not think it is quite so large in other places as in the place to which I refer, although from every county besides there are a large number of people leaving the Province. From Carleton County, I see by the papers to-day, 150 are to leave next week for Montana.

Q. Are a large number going to the United States?—Up to the present, so far I am acquainted with the country, there are only two who went to the North-West or to Manitoba.

Q. Do you approve or a retaliatory policy in regard to grain or other articles between the United States and the Dominion?—I do not.

Q. Will our imposition of duties upon specific articles have a tendency to bring the Americans to terms?—I do not think the imposition of duties upon American farm crops will bring them to terms; nor do I think that the imposition of duties on American lumber will cause them to open their markets to us because we do not import any.

Q. You do not think that four millions of people can coerce fifty millions or bring them to terms in regard to the Tariff policy?—I think the case would be a very doubtful one.

Q. Do you use much corn in your locality?—I do not use any corn at all, but corn meal.

Q. Has the increase of the duty on that benefited the people?—Well, it increased the cost to the extent of 40 cents a barrel.

Q. That is to the extent of the duty?—Yes; just to the extent of the duty.

Q. Where do you find a market for your surplus oats?—We have no surplus oats.

Q. Is it principally used among the farmers or the lumbermen?—Farmers and lumbermen are largely the same in New Brunswick. It is the farmers who do a great deal of lumbering, and they feed their own grain.

Q. Is the price of oats as high with you as it is on the other side of the line—

*Mr. King*:—In New Brunswick?

*Mr. Trow*: Yes.—Oats are not as high in New Brunswick as they are in Maine. I cannot, however, speak positively on that point; but I have understood that they are higher in Maine than in New Brunswick.

Q. Would there be any object in bringing oats to New Brunswick if there was no duty?—The price of oats to-day in Boston is 62 cents a bushel. I am not aware just what the freight would be, but I think they could be shipped at the present time to Boston without subjecting the shipper to any loss.

Q. Do you think it would be to the interest of the farmers of this country that American produce—corn principally—should be allowed to come into this country free?—I think there would be some advantage in connection with it. It would give us the carrying trade; that would be my opinion. It would give our railways and carters more business.

Q. Would the introduction of American lumber into your market affect the price if you had a surplus?—I do not think it would. I know in New Brunswick large quantities of lumber from the State of Maine pass by rail and water to the mouth of the St. John River. It does not affect the price of our lumber. It is in fact a very great advantage to our people. It brings a large amount of money into the country. A large portion of this is manufactured and shipped to England. This is regarded by the people as a great advantage to the Province. I think the same thing would apply to American grain, such as wheat, corn, &c.

*By the Chairman*:—

Q. Is there a duty on lumber coming into this country?—There is.

Q. Does that duty interfere with the carrying trade?—No; it is allowed to pass through free of duty, under treaty.

Q. Do you not think it is the same with regard to other produce? Could it not be carried through just as well under the bonding system?—I do not know. I think not.

Q. As far as your experience goes, does it interfere with the lumbering trade?—Well, there is no bonding system in connection with the lumber trade. It passes through free of duty under treaty.

Q. But there is a duty?—There is a duty, but no duty is imposed on lumber passing through under treaty. This is re-shipped again to the American market.

Q. But there must be some security given that it will be re-shipped again?—Provision is made for it being returned; but there are no bonds.

*By Mr. Bain*:—

Q. There are some special arrangements with reference to St. John, are there not?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin*:—

Q. How does the bonding system affect the carrying trade?—Well, I could not speak from my own personal knowledge on that point. I know we would consider it an advantage to have farm produce or anything else, pass through Canadian territory.

Q. That is, if it passed through in bond?—Yes.

*By the Chairman*:—

Do you export cattle from New Brunswick?—We export cattle from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to a limited extent. The Trade and Navigation Returns do not show that we exported any last year.

Q. Does that trade go by Halifax?—I was looking at the Returns yesterday and I think what we exported last year was sent by the Intercolonial to Point Lévis and shipped from there. There has never been any shipped from St. John direct. I

think there are some from the eastern part of the Province that have been shipped from Halifax.

Q. From your point of the Province they would naturally ship from St. John?—Well, they ought to be shipped from St. John. That is certainly the most convenient point for us, but we have not up to the present had any facilities for shipping from there.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. How much land do you cultivate?—Do you mean by cultivating under hay or crop?

Q. I mean cultivate as a farmer?—I have got some forty or fifty acres ready for crop next spring, and I am not aware just how many acres are under hay.

Q. Have you ever known oats to be imported from the United States into your country?—Do you mean imported direct?

Q. Either direct or indirect?—I am not aware though there may have been. I am not sure, I think some oats were taken down. I know some oats were taken down from Canada. They might have imported American oats for what I know.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. From what part of Canada were those oats imported?—They were bought in Montreal or Quebec, I believe. I did not buy any myself.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. How much have cotton warps increased in price?—They are 25 per cent. higher on our side of the lines than on the other side of the lines.

Q. I ask you how much they have increased in price?—Well, I could not state positively, but I know they have increased some.

Q. But you said they were much higher?—I said they were higher. I think from 10 cents to 15 cents.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. When did the increase take place?—I could not give the exact date.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Is that increase due to the Tariff. Is it the result of the Tariff?—I think it is.

Q. Why?—For the simple reason that their importation is prevented under the Tariff.

Q. Can we not manufacture them as cheaply as they do in the United States?—I think we ought to.

Q. Then the Tariff would not interfere with goods manufactured in this country would it?—Well, it would depend largely on what view the manufacturer took of it. If he was disposed to put his price up and take advantage of the Tariff it would interfere with it. If he was satisfied to sell at a fair profit it would not interfere with it.

Q. Is there any competition in Canada in this line?—I am not aware that there is any.

Q. You do not know what the increase is?—I think it is from 10 to 15 cents; an increase of about 10 per cent.

Q. How much has grey flannel increased in price?—It has increased I think about 10 per cent. since 1878. It was as low perhaps, I think, in 1879 as in 1878.

Q. How many young men have you known to go to the United States from your neighbourhood?—I could give you the names 150, if I had time, who have gone from the parish I live in.

Q. Did these people go to Michigan to engage in lumbering?—Yes, largely.

Q. Have none of them ever returned?—Yes, one of them got chills and fever and came back sick.

Q. Have you only known one of those young men to return?—Yes, two others also came back on account of their health.

Q. When did these 150 men go?—Within the last two years.

Q. Within what period?—Within two years.

Q. Within one year?—No, they have been going for the last two years.

Q. How many have gone within the last six or eight months?—Well, I should say that within the last year half that number had left.

Q. How many have left within the past six months?—Well, it would be pretty hard to tell just exactly the number that have left within the last six months. I have not kept a record of the exact time of their departure, and I could not answer that question, I could not give you the exact number.

Q. Did many go to Michigan to engage in lumbering last winter?—A good many went to Michigan, but I don't suppose they all went there.

Q. Where have others gone to?—Some I have no doubt went to Minnesota and other places.

Q. You say farming implements have increased in price?—I say that we import very nearly to the same extent as before the Tariff.

Q. I am not asking you that question, I am asking you if they have increased in price?—I say that they have. They have increased to the extent of the increased duty.

Q. How much has the increase been?—The increase of duty?

Q. No; I am asking you how much the articles have increased in price?—What percentage?

Q. Yes.—I fancy about 13½ per cent.

Q. What is the difference between the Tariff now and what it was?—I think it is 13½ per cent.

Q. Is not the duty on these articles 30 per cent.?—I think it is; I may be mistaken. I think it is 30 per cent.

Q. Where do you sell your surplus farm produce?—Principally in the United States.

Q. Is that the only market that you send your surplus to?—There has been some shipments of potatoes to England, but they have not been successful. In fact, it was done at a great loss. The principal crop for export raised in that Province is potatoes.

Q. The farmers of New Brunswick cannot raise flour enough for themselves, can they?—The farmers of New Brunswick have not heretofore raised enough to supply themselves. We do not raise a sufficient quantity of wheat in any one neighbourhood to establish a first-class mill.

Q. Is it profitable for a farmer to buy any farm produce?—Well it would be better for every farmer if he had not to buy any.

Q. Do you import Indian corn?—Yes.

Q. For what purpose do you import it?—Largely for feeding purposes.

Q. Does it pay for a farmer to buy produce to feed his stock with?—Well, I have never fattened any stock myself. I do not know.

Q. You are a farmer are you not?—Yes; I am interested in farming. I do not work it myself, however.

Q. Do you rent the land?—No.

Q. If you cultivate it by hired labour you ought to know whether it pays to buy farm produce with which to fatten stock?—I tell you I have not been engaged in fattening stock, because I find it better to use what I raise for other purposes.

Q. It pays you better to sell your farm produce than to use it?—It pays me better to use it in my own business.

Q. Would not the importation of American corn interfere with the price of oats?—I do not know. We have imported a good deal of corn since the imposition of the duty.

Q. I am not asking you that. I am asking you if the importation of corn for feeding purposes would interfere with the price of oats and hay?—It might have that effect, but I think it would at certain seasons of the year.

Q. Then the importation of American corn would be an injury to farmers that have hay and oats to sell?—The farmers themselves make use of large quantities of corn in the shape of cornmeal. They use it for both purposes, as food for themselves and feed for their stock.

Q. Would it not be more to their advantage to raise their food for themselves?—I do not know. If they can buy it as cheaply as they can raise it themselves, I do not know that it would be.

Q. Then the farmers of New Brunswick had better give up farming and buy their feed from the United States.—The farmer of New Brunswick had better raise what produce they can raise with advantage and buy what produce they can with advantage from the United States.

Q. Is it the business of a farmer to buy produce from the United States?—It is, if he wants to do so.

Q. Should he want to?—I do not see why he should not.

Q. Is he not a poor farmer who has to buy food for himself or his cattle?—There are a good many poor farmers in Canada then.

Q. It is better to import produce than to raise it.—I say it is better to import some kinds than to raise it.

Q. Which is the best, cornmeal or oatmeal?—I prefer oatmeal.

Q. Can you raise oats more cheaply than corn?—I do not know that you can.

Q. How much does it cost to raise a bushel of oats?—That depends upon circumstances. It would cost more now than it would three years ago.

Q. What is the average crop of oats in your Province?—An acre?

Q. Yes.—Well, thirty bushels an acre would be a good crop.

Q. How much do you consider a fair average?—Last year the average would be about 15 bushels an acre. Two years ago the crop was very much better. I raised myself, the year before last, 33 bushels to the acre.

Q. What do you consider a fair average crop of wheat for your Province?—I think 15 bushels would be a fair average crop.

Q. Then 30 bushels of oats and 15 of wheat would be a fair average crop in your Province?—Yes.

Q. Do you raise any pease?—Not very many. There are no pease grown where I reside.

Q. Do you raise a good deal of hay there?—Yes.

Q. How many tons do you consider an average crop?—At intervals, perhaps 2 tons an acre. On high land, perhaps 1½ tons an acre would be the average. I would like to say here, in reference to the whole question, that if we are to have a Protective Tariff, in justice to the farmers, I think there should be an increase of the duty on hides, pork and wool. At present the duty on pork is only 10 per cent, while the duty on agricultural implements is 30 per cent.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Is not the duty on pork upon the barrel of pork?—Yes; but at the present time it is about 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Q. Has not the price of pork increased 15 cents a barrel?—Yes; and that was a benefit as far as it went, but it did not go far enough if we are to have a Protective Tariff at all.

Q. Has not the protection on hams, bacon, &c., increased the price of pork?—It has. It has, I think, been beneficial to the farmer. I think an increase of the duty on pork would be a benefit to the farmer.

Q. Then the farmer has not protection enough?—Not to put him on an equality with the other industries of the country.

Q. Have agricultural implements increased in value in your Province?—Well, most of the farm implements formerly imported are imported still. In my own business I sell American forks and rakes altogether.

Q. Do you import any reapers and mowers?—We do not import many American reapers. We import more American thrashing machines than we did formerly.

Q. Where are the reapers manufactured that you use in your Province?—I think that they mostly come from Ontario.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What market governs the price of corn?—That year?

Q. Yes; we will say in the Dominion?—It depends upon circumstances. I think the home market would govern the price when there is a scarcity, but if there is a large surplus, the English market.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. When does the surplus go out of the country?—When it commands the best price I think.

Q. Then it is not sold shortly after the harvest?—Well, I do not know. I think farmers—most of them—are in the habit of disposing of their grain soon after the harvest. I do not know that they hold it until the next summer. Speculators I dare say hold it.

Q. You have known prices to be higher than the Liverpool prices would warrant, have you not?—Yes, we have known it to our cost in New Brunswick.

Q. Before the duty was imposed you could get your breadstuffs from the United States?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. As a practical man, Mr. King, engaged very extensively in business of various kinds, what is your opinion as to the payment of the duty. Who pays the duty as a rule, the producer or the consumer?—Well, I think the consumer pays the duty on cornmeal for instance. I never knew Americans to sell it for anything less to us than they would to their own people, and I think what would apply in that case would apply in others. If I import 100 barrels, I put 40 cents a barrel more on it than I would if the duty was not on it.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. We ship a great deal of stock to the American market from Canada, is it the Americans or the Canadians who pay the duty on the stock we ship to the United States?—You mean from the Dominion of Canada to the United States?

Q. Yes.—Well, I should think the same thing would apply as applies here. I think the American pays the duty.

Q. Does the American pay the duty upon our potatoes?—I should say so.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You think the potato growers in New Brunswick and the Lower Provinces would receive more if the duty of 15 cents was removed?—Yes; I think if the duty were taken off to-day, the potato grower would receive the advantage to the full extent of the duty, but I think that inside of five years—and that would not be a long time in the history of a country—if the duty were reduced, it would have the effect of lowering the price materially in the United States. I think we could grow about all the potatoes they would require in that market.

Q. You think it would be no benefit to have the duty taken off?—I think the duty would be divided, I do not think we would get a benefit to the full extent of the reduction.

Q. Then you contradict yourself?—No, I give an instance in which I think the producer would pay the duty or a part of it. I do not think it applies in most cases.

Q. You do not think the producer pays it, nevertheless you think he would receive the benefit of the full amount?—I said he would if it were taken off to-morrow, because there is a scarcity in the United States. They are bringing potatoes from Scotland and Ireland now. I think if the duty was to be taken off at a time like the present, it would be an advantage to the farmers.

Q. In consequence of the duty on potatoes going to the United States, you think the producers in Canada are losing 15 cents a bushel?—I do not think that they are losing that, but they are not getting it.

Q. Do you think they would get 15 cents a bushel more if the duty was removed?—Just at present I think they would. I do not see why they should not.

MR. LONGLEY, M.P., examined.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. You live in the Province of Nova Scotia?—Yes.

Q. What part of the Province, Mr. Longley?—In the Western part.

Q. Are you engaged in agriculture?—Yes.

Q. To what extent?—Do you mean what do I raise or cultivate principally?

Q. Yes. To what extent do you cultivate?—I do not know that I could tell you exactly the quantity; I have a very good farm in a good locality.

Q. Do you make it your chief business?—Yes, in one sense and no in another. I am also engaged in trade, but I think I may say that farming is my chief business.

Q. How many acres have you under cultivation?—You mean only what I have under culture. You do not mean pasture lands as well.

Q. Yes.—Well, say 170 acres perhaps.

Q. How much of that is under plough?—Oh, not a large portion, some five acres.

Q. Then it is mostly pasture?—If you were to ask me how much I mow, &c., of course my last answer would not be correct. What I meant was what I actually had under plough.

Q. You are chiefly engaged in fruit growing and hay growing, are you not?—Yes; fruit farming is a very considerable feature of my farming operations. I suppose I mow over thirty acres, and I have some marsh hay besides. I am very familiar with the best portion of Nova Scotia, namely the Annapolis Valley which is not exceeded by any part of Nova Scotia for the general purposes of agriculture. It is not very far behind some parts of Ontario. It would be only fair of me to state that farming, no close analogy or resemblance to farming in Ontario. Ours is of a more mixed or diversified character. We are not accustomed to plough and sow. Orcharding is the principal feature connected with the farming of the section of the country from which I come.

Q. Would it be to the advantage of agriculturalists in Canada to admit farm produce free from the United States?—It would be very inimical to our interests to do so. In proof of that I might say that looking back some twenty or twenty-five years I call well recollect that for all our smoked meats and things of that sort we did not obtain anything like a fair price. We were always shut out of our own market in consequence of American produce coming into our market. Our markets are limited there and it is very essential that we should have control of them. I may also add in the same connection that years ago our early apples were scarcely worth gathering to send to market, when there was a plentiful crop in the United States. This is one of our principle products, and now we know comparatively little about imports of that sort from the United States.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. How far are you from Halifax?—One hundred and ten miles from our place.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of the duty on Indian corn and other coarse grains coming from the United States, in your section of the country?—I should say the effect upon oats was most marked. We had last year one of the most abundant hay crops that I recollect for twenty years past, and the general impression was that oats for instance, and the coarser grains would rule low, whereas the reverse has been the case. Oats which usually have been bought at from 35 to 40 cents, have been 50 cents a bushel.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. When?—Ever since last December.

Q. Are they worth 50 cents with you now?—Yes, and I should not be at all surprised if they are worth 60 cents before the season is over.

Q. Were they worth 50 cents a month ago?—Yes.

Q. What were they worth in the United States?—The effect of the duty on corn has been to direct the attention of our people to the cultivation of coarse grains which we can raise better than we can raise wheat.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. So you are bound down to oatmeal by the effect of the Tariff?—I think that is as good a thing as anyone can eat.

Q. You think the Tariff has stimulated the production of coarse grains?—Yes.

Q. That benefited the hay-growers in that sense?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What has been the effect produced by the Tariff on the price of wheat and flour?—Well, I should say it has had no very perceptible effect. We raise comparatively little wheat. In years ago we did not raise enough to make it worth talking about. Latterly we have been sowing wheat more generally, and now a portion of our farmers supply themselves with flour. Still I should not say that the Tariff had had any particular effect upon wheat or flour. Most of us consider Canadian flour good enough. There are a few who prefer American flour. The quantity of American flour which come in, I should say, was very small, although I do not exactly know what the relative proportions are.

Q. What has been the effect of the Tariff on live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard in your Province?—The effect has been good so far as relates to the farmer, although, perhaps, not so very marked. I am not aware that there is any perceptible quantity imported from the United States now at all. I know the reverse was the case a few years ago. I cannot say just what effect the Tariff has had upon that though.

Q. Has the increased duty on horses, live stock, &c., improved the market?—Well, if the increased duty has had the effect of keeping these things out of the market, we can readily understand it would, speaking generally, have had a beneficial effect on those articles produced in this country.

Q. Do you find it profitable to breed horses in your Province?—Well, that is not an interest that is of a marked character with us at all.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Can the Canadian farmer, in your section of the country, raise profitably all the grain required to fatten his stock?—Well, that is a pretty nice question. A good many people that are much better posted than I am question whether a farmer ever gets the price of the feed by feeding cattle, but we can understand how indirectly he may get it, because his farm is being improved in that way every year, and in the end he is doubtless largely compensated for what may seem for the present a loss.

Q. Do you think he can grow what is required?—Yes, I do.

Q. And grow it more profitably than buy it?—I believe that the more a farmer can live within himself, that the more he grows for himself and the less he buys, the better it is for him, and I believe it would be precisely the same in reference to a nation.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Has the market for poultry, eggs, butter and fruit improved from the imposition of the present Tariff?—Yes, I think so.

Q. In reference to that I would ask, has the benefit by the duty on American fruit stimulated the fruit industry as your section of the country particularly applies?—Well, I may say that we depend largely upon the English market, and but for the Tariff, I am afraid that with the extension of our orchards, we would not find fruit growing very profitable, although, as you are aware, there is nothing more profitable than orchards, even when the price of fruit is very low. The tariff has been beneficial to us in the sale of our fruit in the way I before stated. It keeps American fruits out of our markets in a large measure, and especially their early apples.

*By Mr. Tron :—*

Q. Do you raise much fruit yourself?—No not very much. I raise between 200 and 300 barrels of apples, and I have a prospect of raising 500 or 600 barrels of apples annually in a few years.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What kind of fruit do you mostly grow, summer or winter?—That which I raise now is not such as I should raise if I had planted my own orchard.

Q. I am speaking of the orchard you would have planted?—Well, nonpareil apples are the favorite apples on account of their keeping qualities.

Q. Then it is winter fruit which is popular with you?—Yes. It is more profitable with us and will become more so on account of the length of time it will keep.

The other day we shipped between 8,000 or 9,000 barrels of fruit to England and it is expected these apples will bring about \$40,000.

Q. Somebody, the other day, told me that the peculiarity of your fruit—and I was not aware of it before—was its keeping qualities, and that the growers make a specialty of keeping it until the rush is over and shipping late in the season?—Yes, and especially the particular variety I have named, the nonpareil.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What do you get for your apples?—Well about \$3.50 on the average.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Delivered in Halifax?—No, delivered at the station, you may say taken from the sellers.

Q. Have you any idea of the value of wool?—Last year was one of the worst we have had both in regard to the quality and quantity.

Q. How was it before?—We had a bad crop.

Q. Then you were in the same boat as we were?—Yes. We are shipping from the valley of Annapolis more than 100,000 barrels a year, and one would put it at 150,000 barrels. We can ship from our own county alone 50,000 barrels.

Q. Do you remember how many you shipped a year ago when the crop was abundant?—I do not remember.

Q. You do not remember the actual figures?—No; but I should think it could be returned. I used to do something in the way of speculating in apples, but I paid no attention to the quantity.

Q. Where did you send them?—We used to send them mainly to Halifax, St. John and the United States. In the spring of the year we would send the particular kind of apple I have spoken of to the United States—the Boston market principally. We sometimes get very good prices there. I recollect getting seven or eight years ago \$5.50 per barrel for 400 or 500 barrels, taking them just as they ran.

Q. I suppose you have a really choice article, and for such a place like Boston, it will give you the best market you can reach?—Yes; although in our own market, St. John, we get \$4 or \$5 for this particular kind of apple. This apple we can keep in perfect condition until the month of June.

Q. The local demand for them is only limited?—Yes; only limited.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Would the Canadian farmer be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?—Well, that is a pretty large question, and I only express my own private opinion. I would not have Reciprocity with the United States if we could get it because I think it would hinder national development. We have set up for ourselves now and I think the best thing for us to do is to make the best of the situation.

Q. How would it affect your own locality?—Do you mean in regard to the whole of our products.

Q. Simply to you as an industrial farmer on the spot?—Well, I rather agree with my friend Mr. King in that respect. For instance, in the matter of potatoes, I think, under certain circumstances, it would be a benefit to us as a matter of course, to have the duty taken off. We would get that much more now, but after a while the duty would be divided. I think there are times when the duty on potatoes makes no difference, or very little. For instance, last season such was the demand for potatoes at some American houses that they were almost regardless of the expense.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. They were so anxious to get them?—Yes; I do not consider the Tariff had any perceptible effect one way or the other.

Q. But I suppose it will make some difference on choice apples this time of the year?—Well, I think it would make a difference in regard to apples, because it is essential that we should protect them from American apples.

Q. At this season of the year of course they would not trouble you because your apples would be better than theirs?—Yes; our duty is also somewhat higher than theirs, although there is not much difference. I think about the average duty

that we pay in the United States is 30 cents per barrel. That would be something less than they would have to pay us.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think a dealer would offer you the same price he does now if the duty were removed?—There is no doubt he considers the duty in buying, but I do not think it would make any difference. Still, speaking generally I think the duty is divided.

Q. Do you think it would make a difference of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel?—Well, yes. The speculator knows that he has to pay a certain amount of duty for every bushel he buys, and of course he takes that into account to some extent; yet we all know when prices are really high people hardly stop to think about a few cents per bushel duty on potatoes or anything of that sort. That, however, is a thing I do not pretend to have studied closely at all, but I give you my general impressions. I think the consumer sometimes pays the duty and sometimes he does not, and it is very difficult to tell under some circumstances, who does pay it. In reference to cornmeal, I do not believe we pay the whole of the duty.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. A business man must make a close calculation when he is buying, and take all these things into account?—I admit that; but we are all aware how reluctant Americans have been to relinquish our market, small as it is, comparatively speaking. I think that if a dealer says, in the case of cornmeal, that unless he gets a concession upon current prices he cannot take it, that he will get it.

Q. He is more likely to get it on the manufactured article?—Well, my opinion is that we might go very much farther. I think the Americans are quite disposed to sell to us all description of goods at a price lower than they would be willing to sell to their own people. That is my impression.

Q. Have you had any experience in buying cornmeal from them?—No.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have you ever compared the prices of corn in the United States and your Province?—No, not closely; I do not have occasion to buy much of it.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You are not in that line?—No.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You do not grow enough wheat in your own Province to supply your needs?—No; but then we are improving in that respect. In 1878 we imported from the United States, 97,527 barrels of flour; in 1881 we only imported 20,129 barrels of flour.

Q. I suppose if you had no duty, you would import still more from the United States, instead of Ontario?—Undoubtedly we should import a larger proportion from the United States. From the time of Union, or a few years after it, we have been importing more and more from Ontario.

Q. Then we would import more from the United States if we had not this duty?—It is undeniable that a great many people years ago had a preference for American flour, and a good many who still have that preference would continue to buy it if it were not for the duty. I think, therefore, that the consumption of American corn has been reduced under the Tariff.

Q. And Ontario flour has been consumed in its place?—Precisely.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are there many sheep reared in your part of the country?—No, not many; but I would say that I think the operation of the Tariff has been favourable, as far as it goes, upon the price of wool. Certainly all our woollen manufactures have increased their product considerably under the operation of the Tariff, and to that extent wool has been in better demand, although it is not an important interest with us by any means.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What kinds of wool are imported?—I do not know much about that.

Q. You do not know any of the particulars in reference to the trade?—My impression is that our common wool is manufactured very largely. I really do not know what wool is imported, or what quantity.

Q. Do you know if there is any duty at all on the wool that is imported?—I do not know that; I know nothing about it.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You do not keep any sheep yourself?—No.

Q. Are there many kept in your locality?—No, not many.

Q. Farmers do not raise wool there?—No, dairying is followed mostly there.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. What is the price of wool in your section of the country?—That I do not know.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has the cost of agricultural implements increased?—I would first say in reference to a previous question, that there are scores of farmers who do not keep sheep. Very few keep considerable flocks. In regard to the price of farming implements, the price has not increased. I am pretty well satisfied of that, from my own personal knowledge, and from assurances that I have had from dealers in whom I have perfect confidence.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You do not require any yourself?—Yes, I do, why should I not.

Q. I should have thought a spade would have been ample for you, as you only farm five acres?—You seem to cling to that five acres, which is not just the thing. Now, as regards hay forks, manure forks and mowing machines, I can buy them as cheap as ever I bought them, and I have been told by an extensive dealer, that farm implements of most descriptions are from 5 to 10 per cent. cheaper than they were a few years ago.

Q. A good deal lower?—From 5 to 10 per cent. lower. Now, a good deal is said about the superiority of the American article, but you can scarcely fancy a better manure fork than that produced in Canada, and you may say much the same of hay forks of every description.

Q. Are you in the trade?—No.

Q. You use one occasionally?—Yes, and very frequently I use it. I might not do so much with it, if I had the skill of some men I know of to make money in other respects. There is one thing I would state in this connection. To be frank about the matter, I do not think the rakes made in Canada are of the very best description. My own opinion is that they are decidedly inferior to the American rake. What I should like to see very much would be, that in the rake and anything else that has not been brought quite up to the standard, that it should very speedily be brought up to the standard.

Q. Do you mean the horse rake?—No, I mean the hand rake. It is an indication of our being fifty years behind the times. We are obliged to use the hand rake on the marshes where the land is heavy. It is used there and must be used.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. You think our Canadian horse rakes superior to the American rake, do you not?—I would not say superior, I think it is just about as good as it can be. And so are the mowing machines. I have used Canadian mowing machines, and they are just as good as any one can desire, and when I say that, I do not disparage the American product.

Q. Are they manufactured or imported into your Province?—There has been a good deal of talk about an agricultural implement manufactory being started at Amherst in Nova Scotia. The last I saw in the papers about it, was such as to give the strongest assurances that it would be started soon, and if it is not now in the course of preparation, I am assured that it will be soon. That I take to be one of the legitimate outgrowths of the Tariff.

Q. At present, I suppose you get most of your agricultural implements in Toronto?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Are there many young men leaving your part of the country? Are there any farmers selling out and going to the United States and Manitoba?—No, there is very little selling out, but I am sorry to say a number of young men seem disposed not to stay in the country. They go some to the United States and some to Manitoba; so we really have not the labour necessary to cultivate our farms.

Q. Are there many farms offered for sale?—No; I cannot say there are any large number for sale.

Q. Has land depreciated in value of late?—No.

Q. Is it on the increase?—No; I think land is worth about the same now as it was five years ago.

Q. What is the average price of a farm of 100 acres?—That would be difficult to say. You find some farms with productive orchards small in area, which are nevertheless considered very valuable; while other farms, in less favourable locations, might be bought cheaply. A farm of 100 acres in our locality would be worth £1,000 to £2,000, or \$4,000 or \$8,000.

Q. Are there any of these wonderful farms in the market now?—Well, I have no doubt but what men with a long purse would find farms enough to buy, but in our locality they would have to pay pretty good prices for them.

Q. I suppose you read the local papers? Have you seen any advertised for sale?—No; it is a rare thing to see a farm advertised for sale in our locality.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. Loan societies have not operated much there, have they?—No. I am glad to say we are not troubled very much with loan societies.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You are not a borrowing community?—I would not say that there may not be some farms which are mortgaged; still, I think though none of our people are very rich, almost all of them are comfortable.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Where do your young men find an outlet?—A considerable part of them go to the United States. Last winter a number of them went lumbering in the woods, where the wages are such as to tempt them. There seems to be a restlessness among them to know more of the world.

Q. You think it is not on account of the National Policy that they are leaving the country?—I know it is not. I believe a great many more would leave if it were not for the National Policy.

Q. Was it not intended to keep them at home?—Certainly; and it has had that effect.

Q. But notwithstanding the National Policy they are leaving?—I say a good many of them are going.

Q. More than usual?—I would not say that. Looking back for a period of twenty-five years, I can call to mind seasons when more have gone than during the last three or four years. You cannot keep farmers' sons at home through the instrumentality of the National Policy. With the National Policy, as with everything else, we derive its benefits gradually, and we experience those benefits the more we adhere to it.

Q. I thought it was to take immediate effect?—The worst of it is that we drifted so far leeward, that it will take a long time for us to get back.

Q. What demand is it likely to create in your neighbourhood?—What—employment do you mean?

Q. Yes. Has any manufactory been started?—Yes. Manufactories have sprung up to some extent, and those already in existence have been enlarged. In that way we have kept a number of skilled artizans from going to the United States. Now, I will give an illustration. There is a somewhat extensive furniture factory located in a thriving little town about five miles from my place. I had some conversation with the proprietor recently, and he gave me full information in regard to the effect of the

Tariff upon his business. I may briefly say the result was that in a few years he doubled his business.

Q. How many hands does he employ. Does he manufacture the goods he sells, or does he just sell?—He just sells.

Q. How many hands does he employ?—Not a great many; perhaps forty. He makes an excellent description of furniture and he meets with a very ready sale for it, and the best of all is that he offers to sell at 10 per cent. less than he did before the Tariff came into operation.

Q. What has been the effect of the Tariff with him?—Why, to increase his business as a matter of course. For instance, if a man could manufacture \$30,000 worth of furniture before the Tariff at a profit, and if he could manufacture \$60,000 worth afterwards, it stands to reason that being able to conduct his enlarged business in the same building with the same machinery that he could sell lower. I do not look upon that as the chief benefit derived from the Tariff. It also saves thousands of dollars from going away out of the country. If a furniture dealer sells a thousand dollars worth of furniture in this country he has to pay a large portion of it to those he employs, and they in turn pay it to the farmers for the various things they want. In that way the market of the farmer is brought to his own door and he gets about as much at his own door then as he would if he sent his produce 100 or 500 miles.

Q. I suppose the local manufacturers had the market before?—Well they had half the market.

Q. Did you import American furniture into that town?—Yes, we were importing American furniture and American manufactures of various sorts—musical instruments, &c.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Now those importations have almost ceased?—Yes.

Q. Was not 17½ per cent a sufficient protection for the local manufacturer?—It seems not. I doubt whether 20 per cent. would protect us from American manufacturers of that sort.

Q. Why?—Because they manufacture for such an extensive sale. They have had for twenty-one years the Tariff we have had for three years.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Have you any cotton mills in your section of the country?—We are just getting them into operation.

Q. You are getting one started are you not?—Well there is a cotton mill going up in Halifax, one in Windsor, and one in Amherst.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are woollens, cottons, &c., increased in price in consequence of the Tariff?—Well I cannot speak positively about that. I never pay much attention to prices. In conversation with two importers I have been given to understand that the prices of cotton and woollen goods which we manufacture successfully in Canada have not been enhanced.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Have you a woollen mill in your country?—No; they have at Yarmouth I believe.

Q. Was there one some years ago?—A woollen mill?

Q. Yes.—There was one two or three miles out twenty-five years ago. I suppose there is a mill where we press cloth some twenty miles from my place. I understand that the business of that concern, which though now comparatively small, has been very considerably enlarged during the past three years.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think the Tariff is likely to create a competition among farmers in this country which will lower prices?—Why, certainly. When did it ever have any other effect anywhere.

Q. Do you think that eventually the effect of the Tariff will be to lessen the price of woollen goods?—Yes; most decidedly.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Have what?—Have the effect of reducing the prices.

Q. That is, when there is over production?—I do not know that you should say that, when the demand of the country is fully met.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. That means that prices have been increased then?—My own impression is that in our section on certain articles the effect of the duty has been to slightly increase the price at first. If so, I believe we have reached a point where, if there is any increase at all, it is almost imperceptible. But I am satisfied that, in regard to certain products, we do not pay one cent more for them under the Tariff than we did before.

Q. Well, in the case of new industries being established, there is some prospect of gain or they would not be established?—Certainly.

Q. And it is in the future that there is a likelihood of there being a reduction?—It is not all in the future. There are some things already produced as cheaply as we can get them in any part of the world.

Q. In what lines?—Say, for instance, in the coarser kinds of woollen goods. And in regard to cottons, I do not know that we can buy such goods as gray cottons any better in the London market than we can buy them in Montreal to-day. Of course, I cannot speak from actual experience, but in conversation with importers I have frequently been assured that, in respect to many kinds of goods, we get them just as cheaply from Montreal as we would get them from England.

Q. You do not know, from your own information, whether they are cheaper or dearer?—No.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Do you know that we have to import the machinery for cotton mills?—Well, I know there are certain kinds of machinery we do not produce in Canada, and which we have to import.

Q. What becomes of the extra price for the transportation of the raw material to the manufacturer; freight charges, &c., and interest on capital invested?—The cost of transportation on these articles is not very great, and it would not be much at all spread over 100 yards of cloth.

Q. It must be something, and it must be added to the cost of producing the article.—Yes; but I have no hesitation in saying that, individually, I prefer to pay 10 per cent. more for goods of our own manufacture for this very good reason, that it is better to pay a little more for an article if it is produced in our own country, because we get the benefit of the labour bestowed upon it. It is much better to keep this money in the country than to send it away to a foreigner. I cannot understand how a country that is dependent on a foreign country largely for its supply of goods can ever get rich.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Are you interested in the shipping trade?—No.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Has the home market on the whole been improved for agricultural produce since the operation of the Tariff?—Yes, I think so.

Q. Can you name any particular items?—Well, barley and the coarser grains.

Q. Has the present Tariff offered a diversity of employment and other encouragement to our industrial classes?—Yes. I have answered that question generally.

Q. Do you think that the effect of the Tariff will be to retard emigration to the United States?—Yes, to a certain extent, but I am afraid that in respect to the older Provinces we must prepare ourselves to have a very considerable portion of our population go away, a few to the United States, and a good many to the North-West. You cannot hold the population in the older Provinces in view of the attractions out West. I think that in three years the exodus so much talked about to the United States will disappear.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. That is when all the people have left?—Oh no, not by any means.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think the result of the Tariff will be to encourage some Canadians who have left to return from the United States?—I think so, but I think it is a pity that our friends who talk so much about the exodus should not always bear in mind that these people are going to a country very highly protected, and that it is Protection mainly that has made it so attractive.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. But protection in the United States does not mean protection in the Dominion. They have unbounded resources and climatic advantages?—I do not know in what respect it differs essentially from this country. We have a broad country quite as diversified as the United States, and I cannot see why the application of the same principles in Canada should not be productive of the same results. I think one of the most important things with regard to the Maritime Provinces is the supplying her own wants independently of the markets abroad. It would not seem as though there were any brilliant prospect before the Maritime Provinces of supplying the North-West, though there will doubtless be many things that the Maritime Provinces may manufacture and send to a distance with profit, because it cannot be denied that we have local advantages in the way of manufacturing for other parts of the Dominion.

Q. What lines of manufacture are you likely to develop. You say you are going to keep your young men at home in the future?—The same may be said of the other Provinces. I suppose nearly as large a proportion of the population have from year to year gone to the United States from Ontario and Quebec as from the Lower Provinces.

Q. I was asking simply as to what lines you thought would be developed in consequence of the Tariff. What lines you were specially adapted to produce?—We are specially adapted for instance to the production of glassware. I know of no place in the Dominion where that industry can be carried on as where circumstances are so favourable to carrying on that industry as at New Glasgow, right in the immediate vicinity of the coal which is used in a considerable degree in that manufacture.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you know, Mr. Longley, whether they have the sand for the manufacture of the ordinary black bottle there. It requires a particular kind of sand?—I do not know. Under a more protective system we ought to manufacture iron largely. We are under very favourable circumstances there with the coal and iron near together. The Londonderry Works are not far removed from the coal region, and will be brought considerably nearer if certain projected railway are constructed, and they doubtless will be.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How far are they now from the mines?—Well by railway, the Londonderry works would be separated from the mines by fifty miles perhaps.

Q. They have to carry the coal fifty miles?—Yes, and they will be brought much nearer I think. Then coke is also manufactured in the same place.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Is there not an increased tendency to the investment of money in farm property under the present Tariff?—I should think there was a slight increased tendency in that direction although not very marked. I think that farm property is more valuable than four or five years ago.

Q. Has the removal of the duty from tea and coffee benefited the farmers?—Yes, doubtless, if the theory that the consumer pays the duty it is true. If the duty is divided it would doubtless benefit him also.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Would the consumer not pay the duty on corn meal if you do not produce it?—Precisely, I want to see the production of corn more general in our section of the country. My experience is this, and I have paid some attention to the growth of corn. My experience is that corn may be considered a safe crop upon the average. Take an interval of ten or fifteen years, and under certain conditions you may rely

on a good crop of corn, with almost as much certainty, with quite as much certainty I may say, as potatoes or turnips.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Supposing England was to put a duty on apples, what effect would it have, would it affect the price of your apples?—It would have an effect no doubt.

Q. Who would pay the duty, the consumer or the producer?—I think it would be pretty hard to tell; the consumer might pay it, or he might pay it in part.

Q. Has the general condition of the labouring classes improved since 1878?—Yes.

Q. Are there any changes in legislation that you would suggest as applied more particularly to farmers?—No; I do not know of any special legislation except in the way of trying to induce emigration to the older Provinces to supply the depletion that is going on. We are very much in need of an immigration of farm labourers in the Lower Provinces now; in fact, I feel so much upon this subject, that I prepared a resolution which I proposed to move in the House, but I thought afterwards it would not perhaps be the best way of arriving at it. I hope that the Government will turn their attention in that direction. There is a very strong feeling in this matter among the farmers in the country, and I really do not see how we can get along without something of that sort.

OTTAWA, 28th April, 1882.

MR. J. H. PARKS examined:

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. You reside in New Brunswick?—St. John, New Brunswick.

Q. What industry are you engaged in?—I am a cotton manufacturer.

Q. How long has your establishment been in operation?—Since 1861; twenty-one years.

Q. How many hands do you employ?—I think, at present, about 400.

Q. Have you lately increased the number of the hands you employ? Have you increased the number since the inauguration of the Tariff?—Yes; within the last two years we have very largely increased the number of our hands.

Q. Can you give us any idea of the extent of your increase?—Speaking from recollection, without having the figures before me, I should judge that in the last two years we have increased from 150 to the present number, 400.

Q. Do you find a ready market for your cotton goods in Canada?—Yes.

Q. What classes of cotton goods are you engaged in manufacturing?—We make cotton yarns. In fact the principal part of our work is in spinning yarns for weaving purposes, which are sold through the farming districts. We make both single and double yarns and carpet warp, and warp for woollen mills which is getting to be largely used in Canada. I also do something in grey cottons and striped shirtings, but the spinning of yarns is the principal part of our work.

Q. Can you provide the Canadian consumer of your cotton as cheaply since the present Tariff came into operation as you could previously?—That is, are the prices as low as they were before?

Q. Yes.—I think you may say so. As a rule they are, considering the price of raw material.

Q. Has the raw material increased in price lately?—It has; it is higher now than it was in 1878.

Q. Could you furnish us with a statement of the price of cotton previous to 1878 and since?—I happen to have some figures with me which give that information. I made them up a few months ago from my books. I find by these that the cost of raw cotton in January, 1878, was 10 cents per lb.

Q. At what point?—Delivered at the mill. In January, 1882, it was 12 cents per lb. I was in Boston on Monday, and they were asking 13 cents.

Q. Have you the intermediate quotations for 1878 and 1880?—I have not. I have just January, 1878, and January, 1882. Cotton is constantly varying in price from day to day and month to month, and it is difficult to make a comparison unless you take some certain dates and compare the figures.

*By Mr. Coughlin;—*

Q. It was 13 cents last year?—Thirteen cents in Boston on Monday.

Q. And it would be higher than that delivered at your mills?—Well, it is only probably one-eighth of a cent from Boston to St. John.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Have you the quotations for the finished warp at the same date?—Cottons, yarns, &c., was seven to ten, these are what are generally used in the Lower Provinces and all over Canada for wearing purposes by farmers—in January, 1878 they were 23 cents a lb. less, our discount of 10 per cent. to the trade—our business is entirely with the wholesale trade, and there is a discount of 10 per cent. taken off, which would make the net cost at that time 20·7 cents. The present price of that yarn is 25 cents per lb., less the 10 per cent., making 22·5. I find there is a difference between the two prices of 1·8 cents per lb., as raw material was 2 cents a lb. higher, the manufactured article was three-tenths of a cent relatively cheaper in January, 1882, than in January, 1878. I have some other figures which, if you desire it, I will read. Carpet warp is another article which we make. It is largely used for the manufacture of domestic carpets, particularly in the west of Ontario. The price in 1878 was 25 cents, less 10 per cent., 22·5; the price now is 27 cents, less 10 per cent. 24·3; showing the same difference as there was in the yarn of 1·8 cents between the price in January, 1878, and the price in 1882; the cost of the raw material having increased two cents. I may mention that lately there has been some change made in the western trade, and figures have been reduced to a net basis, which eventually is the same thing. Carpet warp sells now in the West at 25 cents net instead of 27; and I make an allowance for freight from St. John to Toronto, which brings it down to the same amount as these figures I have given you, 24·3c.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What is the difference in the price of cotton warps now, compared with 1878, and taking into consideration the cost of the raw material?—The same as in cotton yarn—1·8 cents higher, and cotton is 2 cents higher.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. The advance in the price of raw material was 2 cents a lb., and the advance on the manufactured article, 1·8 cents?—Yes.

Q. Compared with the cost of raw material, it is cheaper?—It is a shade cheaper. In 1878 the price of beam warps (there is a very great variety of them, and for the sake of comparison, I take a number most commonly used in the woollen mills, No. 10 of 1030 ends)—in 1878, the price of these was 3½ cents a yard, or 28·5 cents per lb. net. The price now for the same article is 4¼ cents a yard, less 10 per cent., making 3·83 cents a yard, or 31·24 cents a lb, showing an advance of 2·7 cents per lb. on the article. I also make ball knitting cotton, which is largely used all over Canada. I do not know that it is specially used by farmers; it is perhaps more used in cities; but is used all over the Dominion. I commenced lately to make that article, and I am selling it at the same price at which it is sold by the manufacturers in the United States, and am allowing a similar discount, bringing it as cheap to the trade in Canada as it is to the trade in the United States. I have the price of one description of it, which I took to compare. It is No. 6 white ball knitting cotton, 50 cents per lb. Our discounts are 10, 5, 5 and 2½ per cent., which taken off the article, reduces the price to 39·61 cents per lb. That is the net cash price delivered in Montreal, Toronto, London and Hamilton. As I am so far away from those western towns, I make an allowance which will cover the freight. I have special freight arrangements, and I find it facilitates business to make an allowance equal to the freight, so that parties in the trade will know what the cost will be delivered. By information I have obtained from different sources, I find that these articles were selling by Morse, Kesley & Co., large manufacturers of these goods in Milford, New Hamp-

shire, last year—and in fact I adopted their price list—at 50 cents. Their discount to wholesale houses was 20 per cent, which would make the article cost 40 cents per lb., not cash delivered at their mill in Milford, New Hampshire. On that article it seems to me that the consumers here are saving all the duty, besides the cost of freight I have also a comparison of the cost of beam warps made by us, with those made by Adams Bros. & Co., of Massachusetts, No. 10 of 1030 ends, which we are selling at 31<sup>24</sup> cents a lb. net. Adams Bros. & Co. are selling to their customers in the United States at 30<sup>60</sup> cents per lb. net. So that in that article our price is  $\frac{6}{10}$  of a cent per lb. higher than the price of the United States manufacturers.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. How do your cotton yarns compare with the American yarns as to price?—That I am not able to give you. I do not know at what price they are selling, and it specially depends upon the quality. I have not heard lately their price for cotton yarns. I think it is about 20 cents. It depends a great deal upon the quality. We consider that we make a better quality of yarn than they make, and I doubt very much whether yarn of the same quality as ours could be bought cheaper than we sell it for.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. You say you manufacture shirtings in your establishment?—In a small way; I have lately started. I have no comparisons, as I only started a few months ago.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Can you obtain the raw material as cheaply as the manufacturers in the United States can?—The price would be  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a cent. per lb. higher.

Q. In consequence of freight?—Yes.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. What difference in price is there between the freight on the raw material when imported, and the freight on the manufactured article?—I do not suppose there would be any. Freights are so much per 100 lb., so that the freight would be the same on manufactured goods as on raw cotton.

Q. So that it does not make any difference whether you import the raw material or the manufactured goods?—Of course, in importing the raw material there is a loss of 15 to 20 and sometimes more, on the cotton, owing to the very great use of sand. This year the loss has sometimes run up as high as 25 per cent. on the month's work. On some bales you get, you lose 30 or 40 per cent. in weight. Of course, that makes the difference in freight, so much the more against raw cotton.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. A pound of manufactured cotton is worth more than a pound of raw cotton, so the freight would be relatively greater on raw cotton?—Yes.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. When did you commence business?—In 1861.

Q. Does your business belong to a joint stock company?—No, it is my own; my father was associated with me in starting it.

Q. Have you increased the business much of late years?—During the last two years I have increased it very much; making it probably three times what it was before.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. In 1861, and for some years after, did you find 15 per cent. sufficient protection?—We did not make any money for the first few years. We lost money. I cannot at this time just say whether it was owing to the want of Protection, or want of knowledge of the business that we lost money.

Q. I suppose the American war operated to some extent as a protection to you at that time?—Yes, but we started in 1861, in a very small way, and were not in a position to take much advantage of the war. At that time I did not know much about the business, and we were not in a position to benefit much from it.

Do you think the Canadian consumer would obtain the class of goods we manufacture as cheaply as he does were there no manufacturers of that class of goods in Canada?—No; I think he would pay more. I am sure he would pay more.

Q. Why?—Well, take the article of ball knitting cotton for instance. The price has not been changed for several years. It is the same now as it was three or four year ago. The discount is now 20 per cent. Two or three years ago it was only 5 per cent, but when I commenced to make it they increased their discount. They seemed to make a strong effort to prevent its being made in Canada, and increased their discount to endeavour to retain the market. I believe the article is now cheaper than it would be if it was not made in Canada.

Q. You think the American manufacturer, by giving a larger discount, virtually pays the duty?—I think so; I think the same thing would apply to other articles.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. I do not quite understand that; who pays the duty?—I say the American manufacturers have increased their discount on the articles I speak of since I commenced to make it, so that it would appear as though they were really selling the article cheaper to Canadians on account of the duty.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Will they make the same discount to Americans as to Canadians?—I think they make more to Canadians than to Americans. In fact I have been told lately that the article in question offered is so much lower to Canadian houses that they can almost get it in as low as I am selling it, and I am selling it at the same price at which they are selling to their American customers. I have seen some price lists lately in which they offer to sell to houses in Canada—for a purpose—so much less the amount of the duty, which would about double the discount or reduce it from the present price—40 cents net they are getting on the other side—to about 30 cents to Canadian houses. But I am not aware of any quantity being imported.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What are the duties upon manufactured cottons at present?—I could not state at the moment. The duty on cotton yarn is, I think, 15 per cent., and 2 cents a lb. on white yarn. Ball knitting cotton I presume would come under the same head and would be 15 per cent. and 2 cents a lb. on the unbleached, or 3 cents a lb. on the bleached or colored.

Q. Do you know as a fact that American manufacturers are selling to Canadians goods cheaper than they sell them to their own people?—I know as a fact that they have quoted this ball knitting cotton that much lower than they are selling it for on their own market. I do not say they are selling it, but I know they have offered it. I am not sure whether any orders have been placed, but I think it possible that in Montreal there may have been some sold. I know it has been offered, because I have seen the price list.

Q. In fixing the rates of your manufactured goods, are you not governed very materially by the duties imposed upon American manufactured goods by the Tariff?—Well, that is a question somewhat difficult to answer. In some cases we are governed by the competition, the price other mills are charging, the quantity made, and the demand for the article. I think that rules the price more than the Tariff does on articles largely made in the Province. On some articles only started or made in a small way, in which there is no competition, the cost of importing would probably be taken as a guide in fixing the price; but in most articles of ordinary cotton manufacture now, such as grey cottons and cotton yarns, there is considerable competition among Canadian manufacturers, and I think that guides the price more than the Tariff.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are there many cotton mills in Canada now?—Yes; there has got to be quite a number.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. What would American carpet warp cost laid down in this country, taking the American price list and adding the duty to it?—I do not know what the American price is. The last price I saw of American carpet warp was 23 cents; White Star A, I think, is the brand

Q. Add the duty, and what would it be worth, laid down here?—28·8 cents.

Q. What do you sell it at?—The price is 25 cents, delivered in London, Toronto or Hamilton.

Q. 25 net?—Yes; delivered at those places.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You say 28 cents is the net selling price of American cotton warp here just now?—I say the last quotation I have seen of it, two or three weeks ago, was 23 cents for American carpet warp in New York, and, with the duty and freight added, it would cost, laid down in Canada, 28·8 cents. That is the White Star carpet warp, a good brand which would probably compare with a good priced Canadian carpet warp.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. And you deliver it to your customers at Toronto, London and Hamilton at 25 cents?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. And 23 cents is their wholesale rate delivered the same as yours?—Yes; probably cash at sixty days. Mine is at three months or 2½ per cent off for cash. Theirs would be sixty days I think. The terms are generally sixty days in the United States.

Q. Yours would be a trifle cheaper then, in consequence of the longer credit?—Yes mine is ninety days and theirs sixty days.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. How do the wages you pay compare with the wages paid by the Americans?—Well, in some things I pay quite as much as they do in the United States. For weaving I believe I am paying as much as they pay in the mills of the United States. In some other branches probably my wages would be lower; spinning and card loom work probably would be a shade lower, but not very much lower because I find it is necessary in a place like St. John which is only a few hours distant by rail from Lewiston (Lowell), Fall River and such places, to give good wages or the hands will go over there. Of course, there is always a preference by parties living in a place to live at home, and they will work a little cheaper at home than elsewhere; but when once they get on the move they will go where they get the best wages. But to hands not belonging to St John, or coming from the country it is a matter of indifference to them whether they live in St. John or Lewiston, so long as they are paid good wages.

Q. Your raw material costs you more than it costs at Lowell?—One-eighth, or a quarter of a cent per lb.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What amount of wages do you pay per week?—My wages would average \$1,600 per week, that would be leaving out a number of hands such as book-keepers, and clerks who are paid by the year, and whose wages would not go into the weekly pay roll. The weekly pay runs up to from \$1,500 to \$1,600 a week; in addition to that there are others—a manager, book-keepers, clerks and others who would be outside of that.

Q. Can you give me an idea of your total output in the year?—I am spinning now 30,000 lbs. a week—about that on the average—a few hundreds one way or the other. That would be about 1,500,000 lbs. a year of goods turned out.

Q. What would be the value of that?—The different articles vary in value and price; but I suppose that would run up to \$150,000 or \$500,000 a year.

Q. Deducting the raw material from the cost of the manufactured material, could you give us any idea of the amount of money that is really expended in this country in consequence of your industry being here. Of course what you pay to the United States for raw material has to be deducted?—The principal expenditure in the country, of course, would be wages. Cotton comes from abroad; dye stuffs come from abroad; coal comes from Nova Scotia, certainly. Then there are constant repairs going on in which machinists, mechanics and tinmiths are engaged.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. The raw material would cost you about half your output?—That would not be difficult to get at. One and a-half million pounds of cotton a year; you have to

add to that for waste one fifth which would make 1,800,000 lb. at 12 cents per lb.; that would be \$234,000 for raw material.

Q. And the difference between that and your output would represent the money spent in the country?—Of course, dye stuffs would amount to a great deal; but I could not form an idea just now.

Q. About half of the total output is a pretty close estimate of the amount spent in the country?—Probably half.

Q. How do you estimate the yearly wear and tear of your cotton mill?—5 per cent. for machinery. Machinery should be reduced in value 5 per cent. per annum. Twenty years is the life of a machine.

Q. Is twenty years the life of a cotton mill taking it all through?—The buildings, of course, would not depreciate so much.

Q. Well, when they declare a dividend of 10 per cent. on cotton mills, do they take into account the depreciation in the value of the mills?—I do not know; I only know about the management of my own mill. I do not know about others; but I question whether they do.

Q. In taking stock yourself do you take that into account?—I always consider 5 per cent. as the amount of the depreciation. I am constantly putting in new machinery to replace the old.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What amount of coal do you use?—Ten tons a day. That is 3,000 tons a year.

Q. Your industry assists the coal industry considerably?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. You say you are turning out of cotton yarns about 30,000 lb. a week?—Yes.

Q. How many operative does it take for that class of work?—About 400.

Q. Do your operatives turn out now more per head than formerly? Have you adopted any new machinery which enables you to turn out more per operative than formerly?—I am trying to keep to the front as regards machinery.

Q. There are frequent changes?—Yes, constant changes.

Q. And the tendency is to turn out more per hand?—Yes.

Q. Can you tell me the difference in the increased output per hand, compared with five years ago?—I have not estimated that.

Q. It has increased, has it not?—There is a new machine called the ring frame, which will spit more yarn per spindle than the old fly throttle frame, and when that is introduced into mills the output will be greater per spindle. Of course, the carding machine will remain as it was; but if you turn out more yarn, you must have more carding machinery. I myself am using some of the old fashioned machines, and I consider I can produce yarn about as cheaply with them as with the new machines, although I do not take out so much per spindle.

Q. You take into account, I suppose, the necessary capital for putting in new machinery?—Yes; some of my machinery is new and some old.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. What do you pay for coal now; more or less than in 1878?—I am paying less than I paid at that time. I do not recollect what I paid. I think I have been paying for stock coal during the past year (it has been advanced during the past month) \$1.52 per ton delivered at the mill. Now, I believe it has been advanced 10 cents a ton lately, that will make it \$1.62 delivered in my own yard.

Q. How much was it before 1878?—I do not recollect.

Q. What do you think, from your knowledge of the way revenue is obtained, the effect of the present Tariff and the encouragement it gives to manufactures, has been upon the taxation of the farmer. Do you think the Tariff increases or reduces the taxation. Do you not think the revenue obtained from those engaged in your industry, and in similar industries to yours, relieves the burden of taxation on the farmer; or do you think that the farmer by reason of the duties is compelled to pay more than his share of taxation?—Well, so far as my business is concerned, as I have shown you from my figures, the farmer should not be paying any more now for such goods as I

am making, than he paid four years ago. Of course, my place being increased from 150 to 400 hands, that increases the market for farm products to that extent. That and the increased consumption of agricultural products must necessarily be a benefit to the farmer.

Q. Are your employes revenue payors to a large extent. Do they buy articles which contribute to the revenue?—I fancy they spend all their money as fast as they get it.

Q. Are not artizans as a rule large revenue contributors?—Cotton mill operatives, being two-thirds of them females, will buy in a place like St. John a good deal of imported goods, and will spend a good deal of money in finery, ribbons and such things.

Q. Do you think that those employed in your industry would remain in this country if it were not for such establishments as yours?—I think a great many of them would not. I brought out a good many last year from England, and I am also getting back from time to time some from the United States.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. How much training does it take for your business on an average?—To make a good operative?

Q. Yes?—It takes a long time to make a really good one, but an intelligent girl going into a mill in the course of a few months, is able to be very useful. For the first few weeks she is really more trouble than she is worth. To start a new mill with entirely green hands, we would be for the first six months working at a big disadvantage and at very great loss; but into an old mill where there is a staff of well-trained hands, you can take a considerable number of new ones constantly, and gradually get them into the work without feeling it.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. And you work them among the others?—Yes; and after two or three months they become able to earn good wages.

Q. But your skilled hands you bring from England?—Yes; I brought a number of people out from Bradford, and I have a number coming out now. It takes a long time to teach operatives to become really good weavers. It is a slow process. This is one of the most difficult branches of the work.

Q. What proportion of your hands are foreigners. Are there many who belong to your locality?—They mostly belong to the place. My foremen are mostly Canadian or American. I am endeavoring, as far as I can, to teach our young men and get them worked up into foremen. I have succeeded in doing so in many instances. I try to do so because I like to be independent of foreign help as much as I can.

Q. I suppose you find Canadian hands less troublesome than foreign hands?—Yes; the women that came out from Bradford last year are some of them very hard tickets, and I was not sorry to get rid of them.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. How does the price of coal compare with the price in 1878?—That is a difficult question for me to answer from recollection, but I can say with a good deal of positiveness, that my coal for the last year, or two years, has been the cheapest coal I ever used.

Q. You cannot give us any statement as to the prices?—I could not state the difference, but I am sure of what I have stated.

Q. From what mines?—From the Springhill Mines.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. How do you account for that cheapness?—Additional railway facilities may account for a part of it. I cannot say there has been much alteration in the low grade of coal. I do not know that there has been any change in the price of Springfield stock coal until the last month, when it advanced 10 per cent. I do not know that there has been a change for several years. The demand has increased during the last few years. There is a large quantity used in the United States. The proprietors are fully employed supplying their customers

with it. They had a strike among their operatives a few weeks ago, and they had to advance their wages considerably. In consequence of that the price of coal was advanced 10 per cent.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you import any American coal?—No, I do not use any.

Q. Did you import any before the Tariff was imposed?—No, I never imported any American coal.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think, on the whole, that the present Tariff is in the interest of New Brunswick as a Province?—Decidedly so in my opinion.

Q. Are other industries likely to spring up?—We are building another cotton mill at St. John, I am the president of it. I gave the orders for the machinery last week to an English house of machinery makers.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is it a stock company?—Yes.

Q. What is the capital proposed?—\$200,000.

Q. How many men do you propose to employ?—About 250 hands when it is first started. It will contain about 11,000 spindles. The establishment is large enough to employ double that number.

Q. When do you intend to have it in operation?—We intend to have it started as early in the fall as possible. The building is now going up. In November it ought to be ready for running. The engine has been ordered from Stratford, Ontario.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. From where?—From Stratford, Ontario.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. What class of goods do you propose to make in the new establishment?—Grey cotton. We are going on the principal of making everything we can in Canada for this new mill. I have one of Rose-Brown's engines in my place for the last year and I am well satisfied with it. I advised the company to get their engine in Canada. They are cheaper and quite as good as anything you could import.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Do you know the number of cotton mills established in Canada?—I do not recollect.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. I suppose the bulk of your expensive machinery comes from England or the United States. There is not much machinery made in the Dominion?—No, there is no machinery made in the Dominion, although I have had some simple machines made in the Dominion. A machinist has, in several instances, taken one of my machines and made one like it. I always try to do so when I can. It is a great advantage to be able to get a machine made at home if you can do so. Most of the machinery for the manufacture of cotton has to be imported from England.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. Do you import your carding cloth as well?—I am using lately carding cloth made in Montreal by Mr. MacLaren.

Q. Where do you propose to get your supply for your new mill?—Well, that question has not come up yet; if it is as good, and will answer our purpose as well we will get it in Canada.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What could an establishment similar to the one to which you have reference be put up for in England. Have you any idea?—I could not tell you.

Q. Well, in the United States then; I mean would it cost very much more here than in the United States or in England to put up a similar establishment?—It would cost more here than in England, but it would not cost so much here as it would cost in the United States.

Q. Could not a similar establishment for 200 or 400 hands be put up cheaper in the United States than in Canada?—No, Sir.

Q. Not as cheap as in the United States?—It could be put up a good deal cheaper here than in the United States. Building materials are cheaper with us—I am speaking of St. John where buildings can be put up cheaper. The machinery has to be imported from England, whether the mills are in Canada or the United States. Of course, in the States they make a certain amount of their own machinery, but they also import a certain amount, and they have to pay a much higher duty than we have. Their duty is 33 per cent. and ours is 25 per cent.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. They still import large quantities of their cotton machinery, do they?—Yes, a friend of mine in Fall River has imported most of his spinning machinery.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Can you manufacture cotton cheaper in England than in either the United States or Canada?—Oh, yes.

Q. Much cheaper?—I could not say how much, but they can make it cheaper. Wages are somewhat lower and the hands are better trained than they are yet in Canada, and they have a larger supply of efficient, well trained hands to draw from than we have got. It is a considerable expense to us yet in the way of labour. It is not altogether what you pay for labour, but the amount of work you get done that constitutes its cheapness.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. If you got labour cheaper, it would be money in another form?—Yes.

*By Mr. Bain:—*

Q. Have you any Canadian competition in cotton warps?—I have driven it all out long ago. When I commenced making cotton warps the supply came from England, but it was so bad that people were glad to get an improved manufacture.

Q. The quality was poor?—Yes; there has been none imported from England I think for a long time.

Q. I suppose that applies also to the cotton goods?—Yes; generally their grey cottons are heavily sized. They are not so good as those made in the United States and Canada.

Q. Do they continue that practice still?—Yes.

Q. It does not look as if they were very perpendicular in their transactions there?—It is a recognized thing to put 30 or 40 or 50 per cent. of sizing in their cottons, just as the purchasers wish it.

Q. Then I suppose they sell at correspondingly low figures?—Yes, they sell at correspondingly low rates.

Q. Then I suppose they do furnish a good quality of cotton all the same?—They can do so, and in that case their prices would not be much, if any lower than those of the United States and Canada.

Q. How would they compare with our prices here?—Of course, they would have to pay the duty before they came into the market. I think from my knowledge of English goods, grey cottons at Manchester would be 1s. a pound, that is, the better quality would range from 11½d. to 1s. a pound or about 24 cents.

Q. I am speaking of warps, the goods that compete with your own?—I could not tell you what they are worth.

Q. It is American competition that you have chiefly?—Yes; only American competition.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. The English yarn is not as good as the Canadian or American?—No. Such as they send to Canada is not so good, I suppose better yarn could be bought if buyers would pay the price for it.

---

JOSEPH RYMAL, M.P., examined:

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. You have been engaged in farming, Mr. Rymal, for I suppose the chief part of your life?—Ever since I was able to do anything.

Q. To what extent are you engaged in farming?—I have about 185 or 190 acres under crop.

Q. How much altogether?—About 250 acres.

Q. Do you think it would be in the interest of the agriculturalists of Canada to admit any kind of farm produce free of duty; if so, why?—I do not think we would gain anything by keeping them out.

Q. Would it be in their interest to admit it free?—I think Indian corn should be admitted free.

Q. Why?—Because we use a great deal of it.

Q. Can you not grow Indian corn in your section of the country?—Yes, we can, and we do grow considerable.

Q. Would not the introduction of American corn compete with the coarse grains in your section of the country?—I suppose it would, to a certain extent; but we never grow any Indian corn for sale, and we want to buy rather than sell.

Q. But could you not grow it?—I think we could better grow other crops, and if American corn was admitted free, we could buy that and sell our other grains. I have tried that a few times myself, and found it pay well.

Q. I suppose Indian corn can be grown in almost any part of Ontario?—Oh, no, if my opinion is worth anything, I think, after you get north of the Great Western Railway, you have gone out of what you might properly call the corn-growing belt. The land in that section is not calculated to grow corn to advantage.

Q. Cannot corn be grown north of Lake Huron?—They do not do it, and if it could be grown to advantage there, I fancy they would do it.

Q. Is it not more on account of Indian corn having come in so cheaply from the United States, that they only made it one of their rotation crops?—Well, some three or four years has elapsed since the duty was put on American corn, and I do not think the people in that section are growing any more corn now.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. Could you sell your coarse grains and purchase corn, with advantage, for feeding your stock?—Yes, I have done it.

Q. What was your experience?—Well, on one occasion, I took a couple of sleigh loads of barley to Hamilton. It was a very nice sample of barley, and I think I sold it for \$1.05 per bushel. I then turned round, went to a feed store, and bought the same quantity of Indian corn; and I had some \$60 in my pocket going home, and as many pounds of corn as I had of barley before.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. That is higher than the general price of barley?—Yes, it is higher than the general price.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Could barley to day be exchanged for corn with advantage?—I do not know what the price of corn is now. I sold some barley last winter for, I forget whether it was 76 cents or 78 cents a bushel. At that time I think corn was about 60 cents.

Q. Is not corn to-day nearly as high as barley?—I cannot say what the price of barley or corn is to-day.

Q. Do you not consider it necessary in making a comparison of the kind you have made, to consider the relative value of barley and corn for feeding purposes?—Well, I have fed more or less barley, for instance if my pea crop was a failure, I have fed barley.

Q. But you did not grow it for feeding purposes?—No, not specially for feeding purposes. I would prefer to sell my barley and buy corn.

Q. Do you find it to your advantage to have as large a variety of crops as possible to rotate?—You want to have a regular course. You cannot afford to have the same crops on the same grounds for a series of years.

Q. Do you grow Indian corn yourself?—Yes, from two to five acres a year.

Q. Do you find it a fairly profitable crop?—Yes, fairly so.

Q. What is the average yield of corn?—I have got from 25 to 100 bushels of corn to the acre, that would be from 35 to 50 bushels shelled.

Q. Would not that pay you as well as growing oats or pease?—Well, there are a good many things to be taken into consideration. Many pieces of ground that would grow a fair crop of pease, would stand a poor chance of growing a good crop of corn, the raising of a crop of corn entails a great deal more labour than a crop of pease, oats or barley.

Q. Have pease been a good crop with you of late years?—No; during the last few years the pea crop has almost been entirely destroyed by the pea bug.

Q. Has not corn here grown more extensively on account of that?—I dare say the area of corn has been increased in consequence.

Q. Has not the duty on Indian corn made inferior barley more valuable. Do you not think it has made dark barley more valuable?—That is for feeding purposes?

Q. Yes.—Well, perhaps dark barley. Coloured barley would be bought for feeding purposes, but barley and corn cannot be fairly said to come in competition in that respect.

Q. Except damaged barley?—You must understand me, for feeding purposes, there is no comparison between the two. It is not so valuable for feeding purposes as corn.

Q. How does our corn compare with United States corn for feeding purposes?—I have never used a great deal of corn for feeding purposes, but I never could see that there was any material difference between the two.

Q. How does corn compare with pease?—There is very little difference. I see by the tests made at the agricultural farm at Guelph, I think it was a year ago last fall, a series of experiments were made in feeding pigs on dry oats and clear water first, and dry corn and clear water second. There was a very trifling difference discovered, they were as near as well could be, and I would not make any difference at all for feeding purposes between 60 pounds of corn and 60 pounds of oats.

Q. What has been the effect produced on the price of wheat flour by the duty imposed on these articles?—I do not think it has had any effect at all.

Q. Do you grow any red fall wheat in your section?—No, I do not. There is some little grown in the neighbourhood, but not much.

Q. Are you aware whether red fall wheat is higher proportionately than it was previous to the imposition of the duty?—I think that since the failure of spring wheat that red winter is now a little higher than the varieties of red wheat.

Q. Does not spring wheat to-day command a higher price than it did a few years ago?—Well, I cannot say; comparatively you mean?

Q. Yes.—I do not know. Our local millers, who are manufacturing bakers' flour, desire a very strong flour, and they will sometimes pay more for spring wheat in order to mix with other varieties.

Q. Has not that been the case of late years more than you have known it before?—Yes; because spring wheat is much scarcer with us about Hamilton than it was a few years ago.

Q. Did you ever know spring wheat to be higher than fall wheat until the present Tariff came into force?—Yes; about seven or eight years ago. Then I got more for my spring wheat—3 cents I think—than I got for my fall wheat. The miller told me he wanted it for mixing, and it was a very fine sample of spring wheat. I think it is the only case I can recollect.

Q. Do you recollect the year?—No; it was a number of years ago.

Q. Was there any American spring wheat imported into Canada about that time?—I presume there was; but I do not know.

Q. The price that ruled at that time was higher than would pay to send it to Liverpool?—I cannot say.

Q. Do you think spring wheat could be bought to-day at the price it is worth here and be profitably sent to Liverpool?—I do not know anything about the Liverpool market for spring wheat flour. I know more about growing corn than I do about handling it afterwards.

Q. What do you think has been the effect of the duty on live hogs, dried hams, bacon, lard, &c. Do you think the increase of duty has been beneficial, or otherwise?

—Well, I could not say. I have had no experience in that line, and I do not care to talk about things I have not made a particular study of.

Q. You have not noticed yourself particularly?—I only sell about 1,500 or 2,000 lbs. of pork annually, and I do not think there has been any material advance. It is a little higher this last fall than usual, because feed was scarce.

Q. But do you not think the Tariff affects the price?—I do not think it has much to do with it.

Q. You never compared the Chicago, Hamilton and Toronto prices of hogs?—No.

Q. Has the increased duty imposed on horses and other live stock, improved the price of this class of stock, especially for Manitoba and the North-West?—I do not think it has. Our best horses go to the United States. The inferior horses from our neighbourhood are shipped to Manitoba and the North-West.

Q. Do you not think the Americans would compete in sending an inferior class of horses to Manitoba if it was not for the duties?—I do not know what they might do. I know that we can sell our best horses to better advantage to American buyers than by shipping them to the North-West. During the last six months a better class of horses are being shipped from our section of the country to the North-West than previously.

Q. This spring, I believe, the difference is very marked?—I could not say. I have not been at home to see the shipments made. I have seen some very fine horses sent there. I would not sell my horses either to the Yankees or send them to the North-West. I send my horses to England.

Q. You must have a better class still.—Yes.

Q. Do you find it profitable to breed horses as compared with other stock?—Well, a good class of horses, for instance, good strong draught or farm horses pay well. There is a class of driving horses which is profitable to breed; as profitable, perhaps, as any other kind of stock. I think sheep are among the most profitable.

Q. What kind of sheep do you think the most profitable at the present time?—I think some big strong variety of Lincolns or Leicesters are the most profitable.

Q. You do not think it would pay better to grow Southdown and the different branches of short wool sheep?—No, I do not think it would pay as well.

Q. Is not the mutton better?—It is of a little finer quality, but you do not find much difference when you go to sell it to the butcher.

Q. Where is the chief market for sheep and lambs?—Well, I could not say much about that, because we do not raise many. The sheep raised in the county of Wentworth, as far as I can judge, are all sold at the Hamilton and Toronto markets for local consumption.

Q. Lambs are sent largely to the United States, are they not?—Well, I think lambs are consumed in a great part at home.

Q. Has Hamilton as a market for farm produce improved?—I do not know. Do you mean for vegetables?

Q. Yes.—Yes, we have a lively market there. It has been lively for years.

Q. Can the farmer raise profitably the corn required to fatten his stock?—Some may; others cannot and it would be an advantage to them to be allowed to buy American corn.

Q. Is the proportion of farmers who would buy American corn large as compared with those who would utilize their coarse grains?—I should think there was a fair proportion of them. Of course, many farmers who do not make a practice of breeding stock to any extent, raise all they require themselves. If they are feeding to any great extent, and have a limited area, they have to purchase.

Q. That is if they have not land enough to grow their own coarse grains?—Yes, some are feeders or raisers of stock.

Q. Has the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs and butter improved in consequence of the effect of the present Tariff in your neighbourhood?—I do not think so.

Q. There is no greater demand for those articles now?—There may be a greater demand at some times more than others, but I cannot think that the Tariff has had any effect upon the price of them.

Q. Are not the manufactories of Hamilton considerably increased?—They are thriving I believe.

Q. Have they not increased since the Tariff came in force?—I do not know that they did any more than previous to the Tariff. Hamilton for eight or ten years has been a manufacturing centre, and the manufacturers there have been reasonably prosperous.

Q. Does not the demand for these classes of farm produce increase in proportion to the increase of manufacturing industries?—A good many parties own a house and lot outside the city limits. This lot is converted into a garden, and the garden sass, as my hon. friend from North Norfolk would say, is grown in their own garden. I think the great bulk of all the vegetables that are sent to the Hamilton market are raised on some 500 or 600 acres of land East and West of the city by market gardeners who make it a business.

Q. Do you think the market for fruit has been improved by the Tariff?—Perhaps the market for early apples has. The Americans have heretofore shipped in early apples, a little earlier than ours, and has perhaps affected the market a little for a few days; but I do not think there has been any material advance in the price of apples on account of the Tariff.

Q. You have no knowledge of the amount of apples imported before the Tariff and since?—No, I have none of course, it depends altogether upon the crop. When we have them, we export them, and when we have not them we cannot do it. Now, last year I do not suppose there was one-fourth of the apples sent from the county of Wentworth that there was the year previous, and for the very good reason that they did not have them.

Q. Do you think that the Canadian farmers would be benefited by Reciprocity with the United States?—I do.

Q. Why?—I believe that if the restrictions of Customs' house duties were removed, and a freer system of intercourse established, that both parties would be benefited thereby.

Q. Is the American market for farm produce better than the Canadian?—It is at the present time.

Q. And it would be to the advantage of Canadians to use that market at times?—When we could get more there than here, we would use it.

Q. For what class of products have you known the American market to be mainly used?—It has always been much higher for barley. It is higher at the present time for oats, and it is generally higher for pease and wheat.

Q. Therefore on these articles the market in Europe does not regulate the price on articles of that kind—oats, pease and barley?—I do not think that it does. I think we send very little barley to England.

Q. Have you known any times when our market has been higher than the American market for oats?—Yes, I have.

Q. Do you think it fair that we should allow Americans to take advantage of our market when it is high, and refuse us the advantage of taking similar advantage of their market?—Well, I feel a little inclined to adopt a retaliatory Tariff right up to the sticking point, although I would much prefer Free Trade. I would prefer to go into their market when it suits our purpose, and to let them come into ours.

Q. Do you think we are in any better position to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States under the present Tariff than when American farm produce was admitted free?—No, the trade of Canada is a very small object to the people of the United States taken as a whole. There are Americans, I believe who do not know there is such a place as Canada. I recollect that I went to the fair at Philadelphia with two or three strong Conservatives, and after visiting New York, I said to one of those gentlemen who had been in the habit of telling me what a wonderful people we Canadians were: "Well, George, what do you think of those United States, anyway?" He shook his head and said: "I have learned a good deal by coming here. I fancy that we are not as great a people as I thought we were before we came." I said: "Do you suppose the trade of Canada would make any

material difference to the people of the United States. Would it make any difference if a Chinese Wall were built along the border?" "Well," said he in reply, "if they never saw it they would never know it was there." And that is really the fact. The trade of Canada in comparison with the trade of the United States, as shown by the Returns, must be admitted to be very trifling. I do not think it would make any difference in negotiating for trade relations.

Q. Have you any idea of the amount of trade; you have no figures?—No, I have heard them quoted.

Q. You do not know to what extent the Americans used our market for farm products previous to the imposition of this Tariff?—No, I could not say; but I think very little. We have always been an exporting people rather than an importing people. We have always had grain of every description to send away, instead of being required to buy it. During my experience of thirty-five years as a practical farmer, it has very seldom happened that the Americans have sent their grain into our neighbourhood. Oats is, perhaps, the solitary exception.

Q. And corn, I suppose?—And corn, of course.

Q. Was there never any flour brought in?—Not to any extent.

Q. Nor any wheat?—There may have been some wheat brought in. I could not say for that; but not to any great extent.

Q. But apples—they come in to a large extent?—Early apples do; but winter apples I do not think have ever interfered with our trade about the head of the Lake, because we have always had a great many more than we wanted.

Q. What has been the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool? Has it had any effect at all?—I do not think it.

Q. Nor on Southdown wool?—Well, we produce but very little fine wool in Canada.

Q. Is there any better demand for short wool to-day than there was?—No; not so good as there was fifteen or twenty years ago. I at one time had twenty-five or thirty head of merino sheep and could sell the wool at 55 cents a lb. I am only getting 25 cents now.

Q. Has there been any difference between the price a few years immediately before the Tariff and a few years after?—No, it has been going down. It was cheaper last year than it was for many years before.

Q. What has been the effect of the Tariff on the cultivation of flax?—We grow very little.

Q. What has been the effect of the Tariff on the price of agricultural implements?—I do not know that the price of implements has increased, but the implements made during the past few years have been of a much lighter description than formerly. They are less desirable. They are very effective in their operation; but I fancy that they will not stand more than half the number of years they did some eight, ten, twelve, or fifteen years ago.

Q. But they answer the purpose better?—For the time being they are easier to handle.

Q. Are woollens, cottons and hardware in your experience increased in price or otherwise under this Tariff?—I think they have increased.

Q. Will you give us some examples?—Well, one merchant tailor has made my clothes for the last twelve or fifteen years, and I think \$26 for a number of years was the price he charged me for a tweed suit such as I have on now. I have paid him \$28 the last two years and he tells me he is not making so much by clothing me now as he was some years ago.

Q. Perhaps you have grown?—Those who have known me for the past ten years I do not think will discover any great change in my proportions.

Q. Have you any experiences in cottons or hardware?—Well, cottons are things I never buy; I leave that for the female members of the family. They tell me the price has slightly increased.

Q. How about hardware?—About all the hardware I deal in is agricultural implements, and, as I told you before, I do not think there is any material difference in the price of them.

Q. Do you know anything about the price of nails?—Well, I paid a little more last year than I did two years ago.

Q. Has the home market for farm produce on the whole been increased and improved by the operation of the Tariff?—Well, it may have increased to some extent as the population has. I suppose every man had five or ten years ago to be fed. They all require to be fed now.

Q. But you do not think the Tariff has encouraged our industries so as to make people better able to buy more and become larger purchasers of farm products?—No; I had some conversation with a couple of men in Hamilton just a few days before I came away, and they told me they found it just as difficult to provide for their families as ever before, and that coal, coke, wood, cottons and woollens were dearer.

Q. Did they say farm produce had increased in price?—I do not suppose they buy much farm produce.

Q. Has the present Tariff given diversity of employment to our people?—Well, where new industries spring up which did not exist before that they give diversity of employment to the people. I see there are a great many people on strike now. It seems there is not sufficient employment for the people now, or if there is they cannot get remunerative wages so that they can live comfortably.

Q. Do you know whether wages are as high now or higher than they were before the Tariff came into operation?—I could not say. I know that numbers of people are to be seen at the street corners unable to get employment at remunerative wages.

Q. Have you noticed, yourself, men out of employment, and really unable to obtain work?—No, but I have seen a great many that I thought able to work, asking for work, and when you offered it to them you could not get them to commence.

Q. Do you think there are as many unemployed at the present time as before 1878?—I do not know that there are. There was a time of depression then, and the people were not then launching out into new businesses. Since that time a great many of our labouring men and citizens have left the country. So much so that it is almost impossible for a farmer to secure the labour he requires when he is harvesting his crops. We have to enter into competition with these manufacturers and pay from \$1.50 to \$2.50 a day besides board. Then they are not what you might call good farm hands. The manufacturer meets us in the labour market, and so much is done by machinery that a man with an idea of machinery, after the experience of a month or two, becomes a skilled operator as they call it. In the competition for labour between the farmer and the manufacturer I am bound to say in most cases the latter succeeds in taking him.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. And the result of the competition has been the increase in the price of labour?—For a short time at all events.

Q. Do you not think that the people who get employment at higher wages will not be greater consumers than they otherwise would have been?—Well, they cannot consume any more than sufficient to appease their hunger. They will stop eating when they have had enough. I do not suppose there has been any time, in our section of the country at all events, when a man who was industrious could not get wages that would supply him with all that nature demanded. That demand being satisfied, I do not suppose he would eat any more.

Q. You do not notice any difference, as far as those who come to beg are concerned, between now and previous to the Tariff?—No, the beggar of yesterday is, the same as the beggar of to-day.

*By Mr. Wallace:—*

Q. Are there as many of them now as formerly?—Yes, I think just as many in our section of the country.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Some of them follow it up as a profession?—There is no doubt about that, and one of them told me the other day that it was not a bad calling either. He said it paid pretty well.

Q. Do you think that the condition of farmers and the labouring classes has improved since 1878?—I do.

Q. Is there anything you would suggest in the way of legislation to make farming more profitable and desirable?—No further than to remove the restrictions that are imposed upon trade, and allow the farmer to sell where he can to the best advantage, and buy where he can to the best advantage.

Q. Is there anything in the present Tariff that prevents him from selling in a foreign market?—The Tariff of other nations would if ours did not.

Q. But that we could have no control over?—No, of course not, but the legislation I should desire would be to relieve trade of the trammels that restrict it now.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. And bring about something like Reciprocity?—Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Can Canada raise all the farm produce the people require?—I think so.

Q. And why should they buy it from other people?—Well, if they can sell what they raise to better advantage, and buy what they want cheaper, why should they not do it.

Q. Can they not raise more profitably than they buy?—No, not always.

Q. What is the business of the farmer?—To cultivate land.

Q. And raise produce and sell it?—Yes.

Q. Not to buy produce?—I do not see why he should not, if he can do so profitably.

Q. Do good farmers buy agricultural produce?—Yes.

Q. What class?—Men who wish to feed.

Q. Does it pay a farmer to buy feed to feed his stock?—I think it does.

Q. Then any man might feed stock profitably?—I do not say that, he might possibly.

Q. If it pays a farmer would it not pay everybody else?—Everybody else has not the facilities generally possessed upon a farm. If a farmer feeds twenty-five head of cattle, buys his feed to do it with, and profits by the operation, do you mean to say that he should be excluded from doing so simply because he was a farmer?

Q. No.—Then what do you mean?

Q. I mean to say Canada can raise all the agricultural produce the people require. I say that because we send away an annual surplus, why should we import it? Why should not these grazers buy from people at home?—So they do to a very great extent, but if they can buy American corn to advantage, why should they be prevented from doing it.

Q. Would not American corn come in competition with our oats?—Partially.

Q. What effect would it have on the price of oats?—It might reduce it slightly, but I question whether it would or not.

Q. Would that be a benefit?—Perhaps it would. What he would lose by the sale of oats he would gain by the purchase of corn.

Q. Which is the most profitable, grain raising or stock raising?—Well, it depends a good deal on the character of the farm you have. I prefer raising grain at my place.

Q. How have your crops been for the last three years, as compared with the previous three years?—They have been better during the last couple of years.

Q. How much better?—On the whole 25 per cent better. Wheat much better; barley a little better; oats no better. The crops have been good.

Q. Better than the crops were in 1876?—Well, I do not recollect the crops in 1876.

Q. Better than the crops of 1878?—I cannot say. The last two or three years we have had better crops than for the two or three years previous.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Do you attribute that to the National Policy?—No.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Were they 25 per cent better?—I think so, on wheat. Barley perhaps was not better and pease were not as good. Your National Policy did not keep away the pea bug.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. It did not?—No; and the last three years, since the introduction of the National Policy I lost my potato crop. It was impossible to subdue the potato bug, and I did not attribute that altogether to the National Policy. But misfortunes never come singly. The National Policy and the potato bug came together.

*By Mr. Wallace :—*

Q. Then the potato crop has not been as good?—Not with us.

Q. That is your offset against the wheat crop, I suppose?—Well, I am obliged to, if I offset it at all.

Q. Then on the whole, your crops would not be so much better?—They have been about 25 per cent. better on the whole. You can average them up as you have a mind to.

Q. Are you in favour of a Reciprocity of trade?—Yes.

Q. And failing that you advocate a Reciprocity of Tariff?—Yes; I think if you attempt to retaliate you may as well do it to the full.

Q. Do you know whether Canadians trade more with Americans or Americans with us?—No; I have not made that a study nor looked up the figures.

Q. You say the agricultural implements made to-day are inferior in quality?—No; I say they are lighter in make.

Q. Are they better in quality or inferior?—They are just as effective but they will not last as long.

Q. That would be inferior?—No; it would not. If they last five years or three years it would take more to keep them in repairs.

Q. You do not think they are inferior in quality?—I say they are as effective, but not as durable, from the fact that they are not made as strong. Digest that as you like. Those are the facts and you can draw your own conclusions.

Q. You say they are not inferior?—I say they are just as effectual, easier to handle and lighter, and being made lighter they are probably not as durable.

Q. And therefore not as good a quality?—You added that, I did not.

Q. But it is a self-evident proposition?—It may appear so to you, it does not strike me in the same light. I have worked the machine perhaps more than you have.

Q. Do the machines made at present answer their purpose better than those made in the past?—The machines of the present are more effective than those made twenty years ago. There is no question about that, year by year improvements are being made upon them.

Q. Are they better than they were five years ago?—Yes, I think they are. I think the sulky rake has been brought to greater perfection.

Q. What class of farmers does it pay to buy American corn?—Those who want it.

Q. Does it pay to do so?—Yes, for feeding purposes, when a profit is realized by the exchange. Fattening stock, however, has not been my forte, I have not indulged in it.

Q. Then you really do not know anything about it?—Yes, I do; I do not want to be made to acknowledge I do not know anything about it, still I have not fed to any very great extent, but I have fed some.

Q. Your experience is not sufficient to enable you to speak with authority?—Not if you refer to the wholesale trade, but in a limited way I can speak, because I have had experience.

Q. How far do you live from Hamilton?—About three miles.

Q. And you have been a farmer for thirty-five years?—Yes.

Q. And how much corn have you imported in that time?—I do not suppose I have bought more than 350 or 400 bushels.

Q. What year did you buy that?—The most I ever bought at one time was when I took away my barley.

Q. What year would that be?—Some eight or ten years ago.  
 Q. Have you bought any within the last ten years?—Just a few bushels at a time

Q. Do you know the price of corn now?—No; I told you before I did not.  
 Q. It is quoted now at 72 cents in Chicago?—That may be true for all I know.

Q. If the duty were off, do you think the Canadian farmer would import it now?—I do not know that they would.

Q. You raise pork I suppose?—I sell from 1,200 to 2,000 during the year.

Q. Have you sold any this last year?—I think we sold five pigs, that would perhaps weigh 250 or 275 pounds a-piece.

Q. What price do you get in Hamilton?—I am not sure, my son did the marketing. I think  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents.

Q. What did you get in 1878?—I could not say.

Q. Are you aware that we import a large amount of pork?—I believe that we do.

Q. Do you not think the importation of American pork affects the price of our home-grown product?—I do not know; but it may slightly.

Q. Do you think it affects it to the extent of the duty?—What is the amount of the duty?

Q. Two cents a lb. on hams, bacon and lard, and 1 cent a lb. on pork and 20 per cent. on swine.—I do not think it does to that extent.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. I notice that, in 1878, we imported \$116,192 worth of swine, and, in 1881, we only imported \$19,953 worth. Do you think that decreased importation would increase the price of live hogs in this country to the extent of the duty?—No; not to that extent. I would not say it did not affect it at all. I know our pork packers about Hamilton have left off business, and there does not seem to be such a demand for pork now as when they packed largely.

Q. But they pack a great deal in Hamilton now, do they not?—There is one firm which packs largely.

Q. Where is it sent?—I believe to Great Britain.

Q. Is not a great deal sent to the North-West?—I do not know but what there is; but that would be only during the last year or so.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. You think upon the whole it would be an advantage to the Canadian farmer to take off the duties and allow American farm produce to come in free?—I think so.

Q. You would take the duties off all American farm products?—I do not think, with the exception of corn and oats occasionally—and that has not been the case for a year or two—that their admission interferes with the price of ours.

Q. Would you take the duty off pork?—Yes. I would take the duty off the whole. Of course I would have no objection to having reasonable imposition on them. We have to raise a revenue by some means, and they should pay their fair share.

Q. Would you advocate an increase of duty on wheat and corn?—I would not advocate it at all. I am not an advocate for the imposition of these duties. If you are going to retaliate, I say do it in the full.

Q. Are there many farms for sale in your locality?—Yes; quite a number.

Q. Has real estate decreased in price since the imposition of the present Tariff in 1878?—Yes; taking the County of Wentworth, I think improved farms have decreased from 15 to 20 per cent.

Q. That is during the last—how many years?—Well, the last three or four years. I attribute that partially to the anxiety of some people to get away to the North-West.

Q. Are there many leaving your section of the country?—Yes; a good many.

Q. It would be difficult to get hands to work your farm?—It will be more difficult than previously, and I have found it difficult enough in years past.

*By Mr. Bain :—*

Q. You have lost several of your leading men, have you not?—Yes; we have lost some good men, I am sorry to say. Some of the most active, enterprising and energetic fellows who belong to the Liberal party have taken wings and flown away.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. I understand you to say wool is much cheaper than it has been hitherto?—Yes; I think I got a lower price last year than I got any time in ten years.

Q. Are you aware on what class of wool there is a duty now?—I believe it is on fine wool.

Q. No. If it had been on fine wool we would have had the advantage, because fine wools are imported to a very large extent. The demand for our farmers wool would have been greater if there had been a duty on fine wool.—Possibly that may be so. I think it is coarse wools, of which we have a surplus, and which we never import, that they place a duty on, but I do not know much about the wool trade. I never dealt largely in wool.

Q. In the event of our having a surplus of any article we produce, would the introduction of that article into the country from a foreign port affect the price of that article?—No; I do not think it could affect it by any possibility.

Q. If a million bushels of grain were imported from the United States, could it in the least affect the price of the article here?—No; I do not think it could.

Q. Would it be to our advantage, as Canadians, to encourage the importation of American corn through our midst in order to get the carrying trade?—I think the forwarders and shippers would receive a material advantage from the carrying of that trade.

Q. Are there any oatmeal mills established in your part of the country?—No; I do not think there is one in my riding.

Q. Were there any a few years ago?—No; I do not know that we have had one in the South Riding of Wentworth, unless there is one in Hamilton. I am not positive about that.

Q. Are you aware if any American oats come into your section of the country?—I have not heard of any for the last three or four years.

Q. Have you any experience in reference to the feeding properties of corn as compared with barley. Which do you prefer?—A bushel of corn is 56 lbs., and a bushel of barley is 48 lbs.; and I should say it would take 60 lbs. of barley to equal a bushel of corn. It would take a bushel and a quarter of barley to be equal to a bushel of corn for feeding purposes, and perhaps more—I do not know, but I should say so at least.

Q. Do you think the imposition of the duty on corn affects the farmer who feeds stock, to the extent of the Tariff?—Yes, I think so.

Q. You are frequently in Hamilton, and on the market among buyers?—Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear them speak in reference to the Liverpool quotations?—Yes.

Q. Do you think they are governed by that in their charges?—They say they are, at all events; and if you want to sell your barley they ask about the quotations at Oswego.

Q. Do you know the price of wheat in Hamilton?—No.

Q. You do not attribute the decreased price of land in your locality to the National Policy?—Not altogether. I think the National Policy has driven a lot of our people away, and that makes it more expensive to cultivate a farm than it did when labour was plenty. To that extent it has affected the price of land, but perhaps the major part of the decrease arises from the anxiety of people to sell their lands and invest in the North-West. A man having three or four sons can go up there and get an area of land sufficient to give them all farms.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. The price of farm produce has considerably increased during the past few years?—Yes.

Q. Can you call to mind any years when it was higher than it is at present?—Do you mean wheat?

Q. Yes?—I recollect in 1854 when it was \$2.40. That is the price I got for my wheat then.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Is not the price of farm produce on the whole as good or better this year than it has been for the last ten years, taking everything into account?—Yes, taking everything into account, it has ruled higher, I think. I could not say that particularly, because I have not looked into the matter.

Q. Does farm property rent lower or higher?—I do not think rents have increased at all.

Q. Have they decreased at all?—I do not know.

Q. Is there any difference?—I do not know that there is.

*By the Chairman?—*

Q. Is not the surplus usually taken out of the country in the fall of the year?—In our neighbourhood; I cannot say for any others. I think in the latter part of the month of May and the fore part of the month of June. I do not know that. I never sold but a very small part of my crop before the months of May or June.

Q. Are any farmers in your locality in the habit of holding back their grain in the hope that there will be a local demand for it, and that it will increase in price?—No, I do not think they do. We know too well that we have a surplus.

Q. Do you think we have enough wheat for home consumption to last till the harvest, or will we have to import?—I cannot say. I never saw any estimate of the amount on hand. I know in our section of the country, we have more than we want.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. It is the opinion of millers that we have not enough, and that we will have to import?—That may be, taking the whole together. I have no fears for my own part, if we did not bring a bushel in.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. I suppose you have never really examined the Toronto, Hamilton and Liverpool prices, backwards and forwards during different periods?—I have never made it a study. Of course, I get the market reports, and see what the Liverpool quotation are, and the comments of the *Mark Lane Express*.

Q. I suppose an examination of the market prices in those years, and a comparison of them with the prices at Liverpool, Toronto and Hamilton, would give a pretty fair idea as to whether prices do sometimes raise higher than—?—I think in all cases, in which we have a surplus, that Liverpool regulates the prices, but if we have not enough to supply our needs, the price then is regulated by the supply.

Q. That is the reason why I ask if our surplus does not pass out in a short period of the year?—In our section of the country, and you know it yourself, there are a good many farmers who are fairly well off, and are not in any hurry to realize upon their wheat crop. They do their thrashing during the winter in two or three instalments, because the straw comes out in better condition for feed then. They also have very little else to do then. That is the reason of our proportion of the crop remaining in the hands of farmers until the month of May.

Q. But they would derive the advantage that would result from any rise in the price?—Yes; but I think it is done principally with a view of keeping the feed in better shape.

LEWIS H. MASSUE, M.P., examined:

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Are you engaged in agriculture?—Yes, Sir.

Q. Do you occupy any public position in the Province of Quebec as an agriculturalist?—I am President of the Council of Agriculture of the Province.

Q. Do you think it would be in the interests of the agriculturalists of Canada to admit all, or any kinds of farm produce free of duty?—I think not, because the country can produce enough.

Q. What has been the effect of the imposition of a duty upon American corn, and other coarse grains? What has been the effect on the price of coarse grains?—I believe oats and pease have been a little higher since—from 5 to 10 cents.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. What are they now?—They are 50 cents in our part of the country; they were 40 cents before.

Q. That is owing to the scarcity?—I believe not, Sir.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. What has been the effect of the duties on the price of wheat and flour?—The price has increased, but I am not able to say whether it is on account of the Tariff, or by reason of the extra demand.

Q. Do you think flour has gone up in proportion to wheat?—No, Sir, I believe it has not.

Q. Do you grow both spring and fall wheat in your section of the country?—Only spring wheat.

Q. Is spring wheat higher comparatively since the Tariff has been imposed?—No; it is not generally, this year it is though.

Q. What has been the effect of the duties upon live hogs, dried hams, bacon and lard? Have the prices of those articles been affected?—I think the effect has been advantageous, because we are now selling more freely and more easily. The additional Tariff has given an impetus to the raising of these articles.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Has it increased the prices of those articles?—Yes.

Q. Has it encouraged the farmers to raise more hogs?—Yes, Sir.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Have the increased duties upon horses and live stock improved the market price?—Yes, about 25 per cent.; there are very few horses coming from the United States or any other country now.

Q. And the market is better?—It is better.

Q. Do you send any to Manitoba?—No; our market is in Montreal, and it is chiefly for the United States.

Q. Do you find it profitable in your section to breed horses?—Yes; but not so profitable as it is to breed horned cattle.

Q. Do you think the Canadian farmer can raise profitably all the grain required to raise his stock?—Yes, and more.

Q. Do you think it would pay the Canadian farmer to import American corn free of duty?—Well, in some instances it may, but generally speaking I do not see the advantage, because we have enough. Our pease are as good, if not better, to feed our cattle and pork with than the Indian corn; but in some instances, as this year when oats have been very high, it might have been better to sell the oats and buy some Indian corn; if the corn had kept its usual price, but the corn was higher too.

Q. So it would not have paid?—It would not have paid.

Q. Would not the importation of corn free of duty tend to lower the prices of pease and oats grown in your section of the country?—Yes; certainly it would.

Q. In the general interest of the masses of the farmers, do you think it would be well to admit corn free?—Not from my point of view. In the section of the country where I live we have enough of peas and everything of that kind.

Q. Has the market for vegetables, poultry, eggs, butter and fruit, improved?—Yes, it has.

Q. Do you think the Canadian farmer would be benefited by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?—No, not at present.

Q. If it were desirable to have a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, do you think the present Tariff places the Canadian Government in a better position to negotiate one?—By far.

Q. Have you noticed the effect of the Tariff on the price of wool?—No; I think it is less now than it was a few weeks ago.

Q. Do you think the woollen manufacturers of our country give an additional market to our Canadian farmer for wool?—Yes, they do; but it depends upon the kind of wool. In the section where I live, I do not think the manufacturers care much for our wool—it is the long wool.

Q. Do you know whether the price of long wool is not reduced all over the world—in the United States and England?—Yes, I think so.

Q. Has the cost of farm implements increased or decreased under the Tariff?—It has decreased. The price of mowing machines has decreased, and the price of rakes has decreased, and they are of a better quality; they have improved in quality.

Q. They do their work better?—Yes; they do their work better.

Q. Have the prices of woollens, cottons and hardware in common use among the farmers, increased or otherwise under the Tariff?—To my knowledge, no; I believe they have not.

Q. Has the home market for farm produce, upon the whole, increased by the operation of the Tariff?—Yes, I think it has. The Tariff has favoured the establishment of manufacturing industries, and as there are in consequence a great many people coming in from the United States and other places, it has increased the demand for agricultural products. The manufactories having multiplied in the country, they employ, as in Montreal, in some instances thousands of hands more than before. It has thus increased considerably the demand for agricultural produce.

Q. Do you think the present Tariff has given diversity of employment and other encouragement to our industrial classes, and has retarded emigration to the United States?—Yes, and more than that, I think it has brought many from the United States. Skilled hands have come back from the United States, and are now working for our manufacturers.

Q. Have many returned to your section of country to your knowledge?—Yes; some have returned—not to a great extent in my section of country; but I know many have returned to Montreal.

Q. Is there an increased tendency to invest capital in farm property under the present Tariff?—Considerably increased tendency.

Q. Farms have advanced in price?—In some instances more than 25 per cent.

Q. Do you think the general condition of farmers and of the labouring classes has improved since 1878?—Yes; on account of the constant demand for their products in our own market.

Q. Are there any changes in legislation you would suggest?—Of course, you mean from the point of view of the Tariff. If you did not refer to the Tariff, but of Provincial legislation, I might speak of the want of agricultural education; but there is no use speaking about that I suppose here?

Q. I think it is desirable to ascertain generally whether any further legislation can be carried out by the Dominion Parliament in the interests of the farmer?—Well, I think agricultural education might help a great deal. If we could find out some place where we could send our young men, as they do in the West—somewhere like Lake St. John—and gather them together there, it might be a way of improving agriculture.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Have you any agricultural colleges in Quebec?—Yes; we have three; two French and one English.

*By the Chairman:—*

Q. Do you think the present Tariff has removed the burden of taxation from the farmers to any extent?—Yes; I do. I think it has improved their position. They are selling easier than they did before, so that they do not feel the taxation.

Q. And if the manufacturers by giving employment to artizans, create another source of revenue, do you think the farmers are to that extent relieved of the burden of taxation?—Yes; certainly.

Q. Do you think the revenues derived from the duties on farm products imported from the United States are any assistance in relieving the taxation of the farmer?—A great deal.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. You are engaged in farming?—Yes, Sir.

Q. To what extent?—I own different farms.

Q. Do you work them yourself?—No, Sir.

Q. Do you work any farm yourself?—What I keep for myself is in hay.

Q. You merely collect rents then?—I keep a part of my farm in hay all the time; some 300 or 400 acres, subject to be flooded by water, I keep for myself.

Q. Do you raise much crops?—Yes.

Q. Do you raise any stock?—Yes, but not to a large extent.

Q. Do you feed stock in winter?—A little.

Q. To what extent?—Only a few.

Q. And did you, previous to the imposition of the Tariff, use corn for feeding purposes?—I used my own corn.

Q. You raised it?—Yes.

Q. Is it raised with success in your part of the country?—No, it does not pay very well; but we have to raise it.

*By Mr. Coughlin:—*

Q. Can you grow pease in your section of the country?—Yes.

Q. Good crops?—Yes.

Q. How much to the acre?—Not very high, about 15 to 18 bushels an acre.

Q. You are not troubled with the pea bug?—We were troubled with it two years ago; but we did not see any last year.

Q. How does the feed of pease compare with the feed of corn in fattening hogs or cattle?—About one-fifth in favour of the pease.

*By Mr. Trow:—*

Q. I understood you to say that the price of real estate has increased?—Yes.

Q. What is the price per acre of an ordinary farm, with tolerable buildings?—Two years ago you could get, for from \$35 to \$40 an acre, farms that you cannot get now for \$50 to \$55 an acre. Others that were worth \$65, are now worth \$85 to \$100 an acre.

Q. Are there many farms for sale?—No, very few; because there are a great many people ready to buy them as soon as there is one for sale.

Q. From what part of the United States did the parties of whom you speak, as having returned, come?—I could not say the exact locality they returned from; but they had been employed in the United States.

Q. At what?—At manufacturing.

Q. In Massachusetts?—I would not be able to tell. I know they are coming from the United States, but I do not know from what part.

Q. What were they, mechanics?—Yes.

Q. And they are employed in Canada?—Yes.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk):—*

Q. How far do you reside from Montreal?—About 15 miles from Montreal.

*By Mr. Béchard:—*

Q. You said the market for horses had been increased?—Yes.

Q. Do you attribute that to the operation of the Tariff?—No; I would not be able to say it was only due to the Tariff; but the Tariff has something to do with it, I believe.

Q. How do you explain it?—This way: Since the Tariff the prices of horses have increased a good deal. I would not be able to say whether that is due to the Tariff only; and I would not say that it is not from the demand as well as from the Tariff that the prices have been higher.

Q. Before the inauguration of the Tariff did we import horses for use in Canada in any quantity?—Very few.

Q. Do you think the quantity imported could affect the prices of horses; did it cause a competition to any extent in the sale of horses in the market?—I think so; a little.

Q. Can you state where our market for our horses is?—In Montreal, for the United States. Perhaps Manitoba, but I am not sure.

Q. Do you not think that the increased demand for horses from the United States has contributed largely to the increase of price?—Yes. I have already said so. I believe that both the Tariff and the demand may have increased the price.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. In reference to that, I would like to ask whether you do not think that the obtaining of a market in Manitoba for horses, which are taken chiefly from Ontario now, does not also assist them in the Province of Quebec in making a demand for horses?—I think it does; but I am not sure if our horses go to Manitoba or only to the States.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Has the American market been the market for our horses for many years—ten, fifteen or twenty years?—Yes it has been.

Q. What class of horses have you ever known to come from the United States to Canada?—No other horses but a few stallions, and pairs of horses for carriages.

Q. Would that interfere with our trade?—It might, a little.

*By the Chairman :—*

Q. Do you think the general prosperity of our manufacturing industries and the increased prosperity of the country under the Tariff creates a greater demand for horses in our own market, amongst our own people?—Yes it does.

*By Mr. Béchard :—*

Q. Do you remember that ten years ago, sometime before the last depression, horses were selling at very high prices in this country?—Yes; they were.

Q. As high as they are now?—I am not aware as to that; I think the prices are higher now than they were then, as far as I can remember.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Are you aware that 1,587 were imported in 1878?—No, Sir.

*By Mr. Béchard?—*

Q. Were they imported for consumption in Ontario or Manitoba?—I say I am not aware of their importation.

Q. You said the market for poultry and vegetables had been improved?—Yes.

Q. Do you attribute that to the Tariff?—Yes, Sir. We had some vegetables coming in from the United States to our market before, and, of course, the more we had of them, the less we got for our own vegetables.

Q. What kind of vegetables?—Almost every kind that came from the United States to our market competed against those we had to supply.

Q. What kind of vegetables came to the market at Montreal? potatoes?—Cabbage.

Q. Do you know that we export potatoes?—Yes.

Q. Do we import poultry, or do we export it to the United States?—We export poultry and we import also; but not on a large scale. We import poultry as we do horses.

Q. A few birds for the improvement of the breed I suppose. Would those effect the price in our market?—Not to a large extent.

Q. I should think that those imported for the improvement of the breed would be advantage to our farmers?—I beg your pardon. I thought you were not speaking about poultry; you spoke of vegetables.

Q. Now, Sir, did you say it was a great advantage to the farmers to feed with peas instead of corn?—Yes.

Q. Is it your opinion that it is preferable for the farmer to feed his peas instead of selling them and buying corn for feeding?—Generally speaking I think it is.

Q. Generally peas are higher than corn?—In my opinion it is not a proper way; though sometimes it may be advantageous and a good bargain as I said in the

beginning—when Indian corn would be very low and peas very high—for the farmer to sell his peas and buy corn.

*By Mr. Landry :—*

Q. In exceptional cases?—Exceptional cases.

*By Mr. Béchard?—*

Q. In cases where a farmer finds it to his interest to do so?—Yes; but I say generally speaking it is not advantageous to do so.

Q. Is it within your knowledge that we export pease—that we produce more than we use?—Yes, Sir.

Q. You stated, I think, that the general condition of the farmer had improved of late?—Yes.

Q. Since 1878?—Yes.

Q. To what cause do you attribute that?—I attribute that to the higher price he has for his crops.

Q. Do not you think that the better crops we have had for a couple of years past have contributed to the improvement of his condition?—To some extent, of course.

Q. What is the principal cause of the increase in the prices of farm produce?—I think our local market has been a great deal better than before, because we have less competition from the United States; and our local market being better, we had higher prices.

Q. Do you not think that the increased demand for farm produce on the European market, within the last two years, on account of the failure of crops there, has contributed largely to the increase in prices?—Of course, that is for exportation; but that does not destroy the fact that the local market was better, or the reasons I gave for its improvement.

Q. I suppose from your answers that you infer that the increase in prices is not entirely due to the Tariff, and that the increased demand for export has largely contributed to it?—That is what I say. I do not attribute it all to the National Policy.

Q. Do you think that Reciprocity of trade with the United States, on the basis of free intercourse, would be advantageous to Canada?—Not at present; not with the Tariff we have now.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Would not the increase of population and of the resources of Montreal, enhance the value of your property fifteen or twenty miles out?—No, Sir; I do not believe it would make any difference in farm lands; in city lots it would make a difference.

Q. But being in the proximity of a large city—supposing Montreal was to increase 50 per cent.—it would have a tendency to enhance the value of your property, because the increased market would place you in a better position to dispose of your perishable produce?—It is too far away. Just around the city of Montreal, and within a short distance, property is increasing rapidly in value, but not so far as fifteen miles.

Q. But the interests of country and city are identical?—They are; and if prices had not been better, if the local market had not been better, I do not think the prices of farms would have increased so much as I have stated.

Q. If the trade of transporting millions of bushels of surplus grain was diverted from the United States to Canada, and by the way of Montreal, would it not assist our railway companies, and benefit the cities through which it passes. In the meantime our Tariff debars the transportation of American produce. If we could divert that trade through our cities and towns to the ocean, on its way to Europe, would it not benefit this country?—I do not quite understand your question. Probable I do not get at your meaning.

Q. Supposing millions of bushels of wheat, which now find their way through the United States to New York and Boston on the way to Europe, were to be diverted from that channel, and carried through Canada, would it not be to our interest?—Yes.

*By the Chairman?—*

Q. Do you think the Tariff interferes with the carrying trade injuriously?—No, it does not.

Q. Has it been as large since the Tariff came into operation, as it was before the Tariff?—I think so.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Is there no obstruction?—Not that I am aware of.

*By Mr. Béchard :—*

Q. You said the home market for our farm produce has been much improved? Do you mean to say that that is in consequence of the greater demand for farm produce?—I think I answered that already. I stated that it was due to the Tariff, and the demand—the foreign demand.

Q. Not to the increase of the local demand?—Of the foreign demand.

*By the Chairman?—*

Q. You said of both; the increase of the home market also?—Yes; the increase of both.

*By Mr. Béchard?—*

Q. Do you suppose that the home consumption has been larger than formerly?—Yes, for the last three years I think it has.

*By Mr. Trow :—*

Q. Why, are there more people coming in?—Yes.

Q. Do not you think that the production of farm produce has been increased enough to counterbalance the home demand?—I am not able to answer that question at once. I have not the figures.

Q. You acknowledged that we had better crops during the last two years?—Yes.

Q. Do you not think that from the fact of those crops being better than they were before, the production has increased in such a quantity as to counterbalance the increase in the home consumption?—I am not able to answer that question.

*By Mr. Wallace (South Norfolk) :—*

Q. Have the crops been much better during the last three years than they were during the previous five?—If I were to take only one year, I should say yes; but putting the three against the five, I should say no. Last year the crop was a very good one; but this year it is a middling one. This year we had in our part of the country less hay than we had last.

*By Mr. Coughlin :—*

Q. Does the Liverpool market rule the price of wheat in Montreal?—Yes.

Q. Are you aware that the price of wheat in Montreal to-day is as high as it is in England?—I am not aware of that.

Q. It is slightly higher in Montreal?—I am not aware of that.

*By Mr. Béchard :—*

Q. You spoke of farm implements?—Yes.

Q. Do you not think there has been a constant increase in the price of farm implements?—I am not aware of it. Up to the last few years the prices of mowing machines, reaping machines and rakes have been the same for ten years.

Q. You did not observe any decrease in the price?—I did not then; but I do now.

Q. Is it to your knowledge that four or five years ago this country was said to be a slaughter-market for the American-made goods?—Yes.

Q. And during that period you did not notice any decrease in the price of farm implements?—I say that for the last ten years I did not remark, in the place where I am any decrease in the price of implements, because I bought some mowing machines ten years ago, and I bought some six years ago, and I paid the same price.

Q. Then you would not consider, that five or six years ago this country was a slaughter-market for American implements?—That is another question. They may sell a great deal cheaper and get more profit to-day. I am not able to go into that.

The Committee adjourned.

# INDEX.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE.....	4 to 13
TARIFF, Synopsis of the views of Farmers on.....	18
QUESTIONS TO AGRICULTURISTS, List of.....	19
“ “ Answers to.....	20 to 435

## ONTARIO.

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Abercrombie, Jno.....	Farmer.....	Pictou.....	Prince Edward.....	258
Adams, John J.....	do.....	Wales.....	Stormont.....	81
Afholder, Ignace.....	Township Clerk.....	St. Clements.....	Waterloo.....	296
Ainslie, M. F.....	do.....	Drumbo.....	Brant.....	65
Ailan, Jas.....	Councillor.....	Varny.....	Prescott.....	327
Allison, Wm.....	J. P. and Division Clerk.....	Barb.....	Hastings.....	74
Anderson, Chas.....	Secretary Ag. Society.....	Melrose.....	Prescott.....	359
Anderson, Henry.....	J. P. and Township Clerk.....	Wilton Grove.....	Middlesex.....	143
Anderson, Mat.....	Pres. Ag. Soc. and Reeve.....	Fergus.....	Wellington.....	235
Anderson, Wm.....	Township Clerk.....	Blairton.....	Peterboro'.....	51
Anderson, Wm.....	J. P. and Reeve.....	Mountain View.....	Prince Edward.....	281
Archer, W. B.....	Reeve.....	Campbellford.....	Northumberland.....	163
Armstrong, Sam.....	do.....	McKellar.....	Muskoka.....	295
Ashdown, Jas.....	do.....	Ashdown.....	Simcoe.....	83
Ashley, Harford.....	do.....	Belleville.....	Hastings.....	49
Ault, Sam.....	Farmer and J. P.....	Aultsville.....	Stormont.....	34
Bailey, John.....	Reeve.....	Head Lake.....	Victoria.....	257
Banting, R. J.....	County Clerk.....	Coopstown.....	Simcoe.....	355
Barber, John R.....	Warden.....	Georgetown.....	Halton.....	59
Barker, C. R.....	Reeve.....	Kincardine.....	Bruce.....	55
Barnum, Jas.....	Councillor.....	Grafton.....	Northumberland.....	171
Baumbach, Wm.....	Ex-Reeve.....	Rostock.....	Perth.....	115
Beatty, Johnston.....	President Ag. Society.....	Port Hope.....	Durham.....	20
Bedford, Gilbert.....	Reeve.....	Burnbrae.....	Northumberland.....	120
Benson, Jas.....	Township Clerk.....	Ameliasburgh.....	Prince Edward.....	35
Berriman, Sam.....	do.....	Stamford.....	Welland.....	187
Biggar, Wm.....	Reeve.....	Mohawk.....	Brant.....	124
Bill, Jas.....	Reeve and Farmer.....	Fulton.....	Lincola.....	46
Birdsall, F.....	Farmer.....	Westwood.....	Peterboro'.....	201
Blake, Rich.....	Reeve.....	Newboro'.....	Leeds.....	81
Blain, T. P.....	Merchant.....	Niagara.....	Lincoln.....	47
Blo t, Jas.....	Township Clerk.....	Dunnville.....	Haldimand.....	233
Blyth, John.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Orchard.....	Grey.....	239
Boucher, Wm.....	Farmer.....	South March.....	Carleton.....	306
Bourk, Wm.....	Reeve.....	Oso Station.....	Frontenac.....	168
Bouteiller, F. P.....	do.....	Belle River.....	Essex.....	159
Bowes, Jas. (jun.).....	Councillor.....	Strathnairn.....	Grey.....	141
Bowman, Ed.....	Reeve.....	Hagersville.....	Haldimand.....	138
Bradley, Wm.....	do.....	Paisley.....	Bruce.....	289
Brandon, Wesley.....	do.....	Cannington.....	Ontario.....	70
Broadfoot, J. H.....	do.....	Fergus.....	Wellington.....	144
Brown, Henry.....	J. P. and Ex-Reeve.....	Paisley.....	Bruce.....	381
Brown, Robt.....	Reeve.....	Cainrgorm.....	Middlesex.....	183
Brown, Wm. H.....	do.....	Baysville.....	Ontario.....	129
Brownlee, Hugh.....	Farmer.....	Kars.....	Carleton.....	305
Buchanan, Geo.....	Reeve.....	Zurich.....	Huron.....	327
Bunting, Wesley.....	Farmer.....	Strathroy.....	Middlesex.....	176
Burrows, Geo.....	Township Clerk.....	Stayner.....	Simcoe.....	78
Burt, J. W.....	Reeve.....	Coningsby.....	Wellington.....	238

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Cada, John B.	Deputy Reeve	Pike Creek	Essex	330
Cade, Robert	Farmer	Mount Brydges	Middlesex	185
Campbell, G. T.	Ex-Reeve and J. P.	Mayfair	do	52
Campbell, James R.	Farmer	Cornwall	Stormont	81
Canning, Mat.	Reeve	Islington	York	189
Cathcart, Carleton	Township Clerk	Stittsville	Carleton	69
Cassidy, Frs.	J. P.	Fergus	Wellington	339
Caven, Allen	Reeve	Picton	Prince Edward	111
Charlton, T. W.	Ex-Warden	Rosebank	Brant	200
Chisholm, John	Reeve	Owen Sound	Grey	53
Chisholm, Thos.	Farmer	Galt	Waterloo	155
Christie, Peter	Reeve	Manchester	Ontario	356
Clark, Geo.	Ex-Reeve	Waverley	Simcoe	72
Clarke, R.	Reeve	Colborne	Northumberland	35
Cline, And. N.	do	Springfield	Elgin	91
Clunas, John	Farmer and J. P.	do	do	31
Coburn, Robt.	do	Pembroke	Renfrew	211
Cochrane, B.	Deputy Reeve	Colborne	Northumberland	35
Cochrane, Jas.	Farmer	Kilsyth	Grey	204
Cohoe, J. F.	Farmer and J. P.	Ronson	Norfolk	288
Cole, W.	J. P.	Colces Corners	Lambton	135
Coleman, L.	do	Bloomsburg	Norfolk	269
Collins, Henry	Warden	Peterboro'	Peterboro'	31
Collins, W. B.	Reeve	Wycming	Lambton	152
Colville, Robt.	Reeve and Farmer	Orono	Durham	203
Cook, G. H.	President Ag. Society	Ingersoll	Oxford	181
Cooke, Chris	J. P. and Ex-Warden	Cookstown	Simcoe	355
Coughlin, David	Reeve	Harwich	Kent	293
Coxe, John	Ex-Reeve	H we Island	Frontenac	253
Crawford, Eli	Farmer	Brampton	Peel	94
Crerar, James	do	Shakespeare	Perth	145
Cross, James	J. P. and Pres. Ag. Soc.	Winfield	Wellington	111
Cruikshank, Ernest	Reeve	Fort Erie	Welland	66
Chrysler, E. M.	Farmer	Lynedoch	Norfolk	199
Chrysler, G. H.	Agriculturalist	Port Dover	do	169
Currelley, Thos.	Deputy Reeve	Fullarton	Perth	62
Currey, James R.	Farmer	Drumbo	Oxford	257
Currie, N.	Reeve	Glencoe	Middlesex	254
Dagg, John	Councillor	Lucan	Middlesex	295
Daniel, John	Reeve	Rosedale	Victoria	95
Darby, John	Farmer	Crown Hill	Simcoe	120
Davies, Lewis	Farmer and J. P.	Peterboro'	Peterboro'	21
Davis, Thos. L.	Postmaster	Yellvue	Victoria	311
Davis, A. A.	Reeve	York	Haldimand	40
Davis, Peter D.	Farmer and Ex-Reeve	Dorland	Lennox	76
Deacon, J.	Reeve	Lindsay	Victoria	43
Delamere, John H.	do	Minden	Haliburton	56
DeLong, Wm.	Justice of the Peace	Ameliasburg	Prince Edward	86
Densmore, D.	Reeve	Warton	Bruce	113
Desjardins, Israel	Deputy-Reeve	Stony Point	Essex	356
Diarmid, Hugh M.	Secretary Ag. Society	Lodie	Stormont	62
Dickhaut, Dav.	Reeve	Stromness	Haldimand	111
Dickinson, Charles	do	Clear Creek	Norfolk	138
Dickinson, N. K.	Manufacturer	Manotick	Carleton and Russell	217
Dickson, S. S.	Reeve	Cedar Hill	Lanark	20
Digman, Capt. B.	do	Sable	Middlesex	192
Dillman, D.	Councillor	Meagher's Grant	Halifax	311
Dillon, Thos.	Reeve	Bothwell	Bothwell	343
Dobbie, John	J. P. and Ex-Reeve	Garafraxa	Wellington	324
Dobbie, T. W.	Ex-Reeve	Tilsonburg	Elgin	93
Docker, Arthur	Councillor	Dunnville	Haldimand	233
Doller, W. N.	Reeve	Napanee	Lennox	224
Donaldson, Wm.	President Ag. Society	South Zorra	Oxford	199
Doone, John	Reeve	Osceola	Renfrew	212
Douglass, John	do	Tara	Bruce	132
Dowsley, Jos. L.	Merchant	Escott	Leeds	224
Drury, Charles	President Ag. Society	Crown Hill	Simcoe	196
Duncan, Alex.	do	Brantford	Brant	230
Duncan Henry	Reeve	Don	York	68

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Dunington, Jos.....	Reeve.....	Chatsworth.....	Grey.....	172
Eden, William.....	Farmer and J. P.....	Kingston.....	Frontenac.....	262
Dunn, David.....	Reeve.....	Elm Grove.....	Simcoe.....	131
Dunstan, E.....	do.....	Essex Centre.....	Essex.....	90
Eaton, Thos.....	Councillor.....	Dunnville.....	Haldimand.....	233
Eden, William.....	Farmer.....	Arthur.....	Wellington.....	314
Edge, Jas.....	Treasurer.....	Edge Hill.....	Grey.....	329
Ego, Angus.....	Township Clerk.....	Georgina.....	York.....	320
Elliott, Alex.....	J. P.....	Chantry.....	Leeds.....	167
Elliott, Thos.....	Farmer.....	Arnprior.....	Renfrew.....	354
Ellison, John.....	Reeve.....	Port Stanley.....	Elgin.....	254
Elson, Peter.....	Deputy Reeve.....	London.....	Middlesex.....	351
Emery, W. M.....	Merchant.....	Port Burwell.....	Elgin.....	58
Esplen, Wm.....	Director Ag. Society.....	Burgoyne.....	Bruce.....	384
Essels, A. W.....	Reeve.....	Wooler.....	Northumberland.....	171
Evans & Co., Robt.....	Seed merchant.....	Hamilton.....	Wentworth.....	64
Evans, J. D.....	J. P. and Deputy Reeve.....	Islington.....	York.....	139
Fairbairn, Thos.....	Reeve.....	Teeswater.....	Bruce.....	189
Fallows, J. S.....	do.....	London.....	Middlesex.....	369
Farry, Elias.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Dunnville.....	Haldimand.....	135
Fawcett, —.....	Councillor.....	Heathcote.....	Grey.....	104
Fearman, F. W.....	Merchant.....	Hamilton.....	Wentworth.....	132
Fell, John.....	Farmer.....	Bury's Green.....	Victoria.....	297
Fellows, W. R.....	Township Clerk.....	Harwich.....	Kent.....	293
Ferguson, S. T.....	Farmer.....	Cartright.....	Durham.....	285
Field, Wm. S.....	Reeve.....	Chalk River.....	Renfrew.....	345
Filson, Robert.....	do.....	Stella.....	Lennox.....	355
Findlay, James.....	President Ag. Society.....	Beachburg.....	Renfrew.....	213
Findlay, William.....	do.....	Salem.....	Wellington.....	45
Fisher, A. M.....	Township Clerk.....	Shakespeare.....	Oxford.....	25
Fisher, Joseph.....	Brewer and Reeve.....	Portsmouth.....	Frontenac.....	223
Fraser, Alex.....	Reeve.....	Tayside.....	Stormont.....	225
Fleck, Robt.....	do.....	Langierait.....	Lambton.....	134
Fleming, Robt. B.....	Farmer.....	Aberdour.....	Bruce.....	87
Fletcher, A. O.....	Township Clerk.....	Housey's Rapids.....	Muskoka.....	249
Follis, Geo.....	Reeve.....	Gowanstown.....	Perth.....	171
Foot, John.....	Secretary Ag. Society.....	Port Hope.....	Durham.....	227
Foot, David.....	Reeve.....	Elora.....	Wellington.....	156
Forrester, D. N.....	Mayor.....	Clinton.....	Huron.....	45
Forsyth, George.....	Reeve.....	Brussells.....	do.....	80
Fowlds, Jas. S.....	do and Grain Merchant.....	Hastings.....	Northumberland.....	26
Fox, Chas. G.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Kingsville.....	Essex.....	84
Framo, George.....	Deputy Reeve.....	Sebringville.....	Perth.....	190
Fraser, A.....	Reeve.....	Therold.....	Welland.....	35
Freeman, Clarkson.....	M. D.....	Milton.....	Holton.....	325
Gallagher, John.....	Reeve.....	Everett.....	Simcoe.....	37
Gareau, Philippe.....	Postmaster.....	Curran.....	Prescott.....	395
Garner, Anson.....	Farmer and cheese maker.....	Southend.....	Welland.....	53
Gash, M.....	President Br. Ag. Soc.....	Dunnville.....	Monck.....	112
Gibson, Fullarton.....	Farmer.....	Richmond Hill.....	York.....	176
Gibson, Wm.....	do.....	Fergus.....	Wellington.....	37
Gilchrist, H.....	do.....	Ailsa Craig.....	Middlesex.....	119
Gillespie, John.....	Reeve.....	Orangeville.....	Dufferin.....	173
Gillies, T. L.....	do.....	Port Dover.....	Norfolk.....	147
Girvin, Charles, senr.....	do.....	Nile.....	Huron.....	326
Golburne, Jas.....	Miller and farmer.....	Apsley.....	Haliburton.....	103
Gordon, R.....	Farmer.....	Kenilworth.....	Wellington.....	278
Gordon, R.....	Warden.....	Tweed.....	Hastings.....	363
Good, Thos. A.....	Farmer.....	Brantford.....	Brant.....	259
Goodfellow, R. B.....	Reeve.....	Smith's Falls.....	Leeds.....	363
Goodman, Kenneth.....	do.....	Parkhill.....	Middlesex.....	284
Govan, Walter.....	do.....	Campbellford.....	Northumberland.....	31
Graham, Wm.....	Reeve.....	Brucefield.....	Huron.....	162
Grandy, Sam.....	do.....	Yelverton.....	Durham.....	389
Grant, A. J.....	Farmer.....	Williamstown.....	Glengarry.....	73
Gray, W.....	do.....	Chatham.....	Kent.....	113

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Green, P. J.....	Township Clerk .....	Maynooth .....	Hastings .....	366
Greene, R. Y.....	Warden .....	March .....	Carleton .....	38
Grierson, Jas. F.....	Reeve .....	Fitzroy Harbour .....	do .....	179
Griffith, Jacob.....	do .....	Eganville .....	Renfrew .....	210
Grout, John H.....	do .....	Grimsby .....	Lincoln .....	351
Gunter, Peter M.....	do .....	St. Ola. ....	Hastings .....	63
Gunter, P. M.....	do .....	do .....	do .....	390
Hackney, James .....	Councillor.....	Farquhar.....	Huron.....	115
Haggan, John .....	Farmer.....	Grove's End.....	Elgin.....	184
Halter, Ed.....	J.P.....	New Germany .....	Waterloo .....	123
Hamilton, James .....	1st Deputy Reeve.....	Glen Huron.....	Simcoe .....	379
Hamilton, Thomas .....	Ex-Reeve.....	Hereward.....	Dufferin .....	199
Hamilton, William .....	Reeve .....	Dunnville.....	Haldimand .....	233
Hancock, Thomas H.....	Councillor.....	Tyrone.....	Durham .....	350
Hannwell, W. H.....	Treasurer, Ag. Soc.....	Beeton.....	Simcoe .....	170
Harkness, Adam.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Irene .....	Dundas .....	57
Hays, James.....	Reeve .....	Seaforth.....	Huron .....	276
Hawley, George D.....	M.P.P.....	Bath .....	Lennox .....	105
Hedgers, Charles.....	Reeve .....	Ranelagh.....	Norfolk.....	323
Heenan, Thomas.....	Farmer.....	Grafton.....	Northumberland .....	311
Henderson, David.....	Reeve .....	Kincardine .....	Bruce .....	322
Henderson, Magnus .....	Township Clerk.....	Glenallan .....	Wellington .....	147
Heslip, Nelson.....	Reeve .....	Victoria Road.....	Victoria .....	382
Higginson, John W.....	do .....	Hawkesbury .....	Prescott.....	96
Hill, S. W.....	P. M., D. G. A.....	Ridgeville .....	Monck.....	142
Hill, W. H.....	Farmer.....	Omemece.....	Victoria .....	193
Hinds, Ham.....	do .....	Hagersville.....	Haldimand .....	279
Hinman, Smith.....	J. P.....	Dundonald.....	Northumberland .....	223
Hiscott, James.....	Reeve .....	Virgil .....	Lincoln .....	90
Hoey, John.....	Farmer.....	Arlington.....	Simcoe .....	70
Hogan, Thomas.....	Reeve and Councillor .....	Wolfe Island .....	Frontenac.....	152
Hopkins, Ben.....	Reeve .....	Brownsville .....	Oxford.....	264
Hostetir, Harman .....	Farmer.....	Virgil .....	Lincoln .....	369
Howden, W. H.....	Warden .....	Sharon .....	York .....	222
Howey, Wm.....	Reeve .....	Massie .....	Grey .....	182
Humberstone Council .....		Humberstone.....	Wellington.....	209
Hutchison, A. C.....	Farmer.....	Port Rowan .....	Norfolk.....	141
Hutchison, David A.....	Councillor and Farmer.....	Harwich .....	Kent.....	293
Jackson, R. W.....	Deputy Reeve.....	London.....	Middlesex .....	351
Jardines, J. W.....	Reeve .....	Hamilton.....	Wentworth.....	229
Jelly, R. J.....	do .....	Whitehurst .....	Leeds .....	102
Johnston, James .....	Councillor.....	Auburn.....	Huron.....	290
Jones, Sam.....	Farmer.....	Hillier .....	Leeds .....	161
Kaine, John.....	Reeve and Farmer .....	Gorrie.....	Huron.....	160
Kavanagh, Dermot .....	Reeve .....	Unfraville .....	Hastings .....	388
Kells, Thos.....	Pres. Agricult. Society.....	Vandeleur.....	Grey .....	133
Kelly, P.....	Reeve.....	Blythe .....	Huron .....	174
Kennedy, R.....	do .....	Bath .....	Lennox .....	248
Kennie, John.....	do .....	Cherry Valley.....	Prince Edward.....	234
Kerr, Alex.....	Councillor .....	Seaforth.....	Huron .....	177
Kerr, George.....	Reeve .....	Lucknow .....	Bruce .....	48
Kettle, Stephen .....	Farmer .....	Ursa .....	Peterboro' .....	244
Kidd, A. R.....	Reeve .....	Warsaw .....	do .....	232
King, Ed.....	Councillor.....	Tanworth .....	Addington .....	183
Kirkland, A. S.....	M. D. and Reeve .....	Duntroon.....	Simcoe .....	224
Knox, James H.....	Reeve .....	Milford .....	Prince Edward.....	26
Knox, Thomas J.....	do .....	Dugal .....	Perth .....	61
Kroetsch, J. S.....	General Merchant .....	St. Clements .....	Waterloo .....	296
Labrosse, L. P.....	Mayor and Reeve.....	Alfred.....	Prescott.....	393
Labrosse, Simon.....	Reeve .....	St. Eugène.....	do .....	160
Lafferty, Louis.....	do .....	Sandwich .....	Essex .....	255
Laidlaw, James.....	M.P.P.....	Guelph .....	Wellington .....	299.
Lang, John.....	Reeve .....	Lang .....	Peterboro'.....	43
Lang, William.....	Farmer and J.P.....	St. Mary's.....	Perth .....	64
Lang, William.....	Reeve .....	Owen Sound.....	Grey .....	153

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or Distict.	Page.
Langford, G.K.	Reeve	Kent Bridge	Kent	146
Laue, James	do	Denbigh	Addington	250
Laurie, John	Warden	Port Dalhousie	Lincoln	142
Lee, Edward	Postmaster and Farmer	Marshville	Welland	272
Lehane, William	Farmer	Downeyville	Victoria	194
Lennox, John	do	Churchill	Simcoe	169
Leonard, Evor	do and Fruit Dealer.	Cobourg	Northumberland	25
Leversage, George	Reeve	Carlingford	Perth	261
Lindsay, James	do	Loch Winnock	Renfrew	107
Little, E. A. & Bro.		Allandale	Simcoe	58
Lloyd, B. C.	Reeve	Centreville	Addington	107
Lloyd, B. C.	do	Napanee Mills	do	214
Lloyd-Jones, Thomas	Farmer	Burford	Brant	277
Lottridge, James M.	Brewer and Farmer	Hamilton	Wentworth	54
Lowrey, D. J.	Farmer and Fruit Grower	St. David's	Lincoln	25
Lucas, Alex.	Reeve	Alvinston	Lambton	296
Lutton, Daniel	Ex-M.P.P.	New Sarum	Elgin	281
Luxton, William	Township Clerk	Luther	Wellington	236
Lyons, James	Councillor.	Dunnville	Haldimand	233
Maybe, F. S.		Birchville	Oxford	291
Magwood, Thos.	Councillor.	Poole	Perth	345
Malloy, U. A.	J.P.	Laskay	York	131
Manson, A. T.	J.P.	West Meath	Renfrew	210
Manson, Geo.	Farmer	Petworth	Addington	108
Mariett, Isaac	Reeve	Keswick	York	346
Marr, James	President Ag. Society	McGillivray	Middlesex	193
Marshall, Joseph H.	Warden and Reeve	London	do	351
Martin E. S.	President Ag. Society	Cayuga	Haldimand	329
Melville, M.	Township Clerk	Howe Island	Frontenac	253
Middleton, Henry	Farmer	Newcastle	Durham	288
Miller, Frs. H.	do	West Flamboro'	Wentworth	157
Miller, J. S.	Township Clerk	Centreville	Addington	107
Miller, James S.	Assessor	Parry Sound	Parry Sound	179
Miller, P. W.	Farmer and builder	Flinton	Addington	101
Miller, Wm	Deputy Reeve	Omemee	Victoria	350
Mills, Wm	Agriculturist	Peterboro'	Peterboro'	114
Minard, Gideon	Township Clerk	Clarence Creek	Russell	124
Misener, John	Deputy Reeve	Marshville	Welland	228
Moffat, John	Produce Merchant	Berlin	Waterloo	110
Morgan, John	Warden and J.P.	Kerwood	Middlesex	24
Mothersill, Richard	Reeve	Cedar Dale	Ontario	144
Mountford, John G.	Farmer and Reeve	Rondeau	Kent	63
Mumby, Jos	Ex-Reeve	Dunnville	Haldimand	198
Munroe, J. H.	President Ag. Society	Morrisburg	Dundas	151
Murray, Robt.	Reeve	Embro	Oxford	47
Murray, Thos. E. C.	do	Deux Rivières	Renfrew	242
Murdoch, Jas	do	Yeoville	Grey	175
Murdoch, Robt	do	Gordonville	Wellington	340
Murtrinhg, Pat.	Farmer	Cashtown	Simcoe	348
Myatt, Frank	Reeve	Catharine's	Lincoln	187
McArdle, Jos.	Postmaster and Farmer.	Hopeville	Grey	94
McArthur, Jos	Reeve	Fennelon Falls	Victoria	158
McCall, Dan. A.	do	St. Williams	Norfolk	122
McCalman, Neil	Reeve and J. P.	Thornbury	Grey	32
McCormick, Wm.	Reeve	Pelee	Essex	360
McDavitt, Chas.	do	Mayworth	Hastings	366
McDermid, Duncan	Ex-Reeve	Avonmore	Stormont	250
McDermott, John	Farmer	Palmerston	Perth	89
McDonald, John		St. Andrews	Stormont	83
McDonald, Jno. D.	Reeve	Port Lambton	Lambton	132
McDonell, Thos.	Secretary Ag. Society	Williamstown	Glengarry	321
McDougald, Hugh	Deputy Reeve	Gillies Hill	Bruce	388
McEachern, E. D.	Reeve	Kirkfield	Victoria	172
McFarlane, Jno.	do	Mandamin	Lambton	130
McFaul, H. A.	J. P. and Deputy-Reeve.	Allisonville	Prince Edward	260
McGregor, D.	Justice of the Peace	Caledonia	Haldimand	309
McGregor, Peter	Reeve	Dundalk	Grey	160
McGillicuddy, E.	Warden	Watford	Lambton	294

Name	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
McGirr, Andrew.....	Reeve.....	Feversham.....	Grey.....	247
McGowan, Adam.....	Deputy-Reeve.....	Tweed.....	Hastings.....	289
McGowan, John.....	Farmer.....	Alma.....	Wellington.....	331
McGugan, M.....	Reeve.....	Hendrick.....	Middlesex.....	295
McIntyre, A. R.....	do.....	Middleville.....	Lanark.....	190
McKay, G. P.....	do.....	Lefroy.....	Simcoe.....	259
McKechnie, R.....	do.....	Dundas.....	Wentworth.....	40
McKellar, Alex.....	do.....	Hendrick.....	Middlesex.....	373
McKellar, Wm.....	Farmer.....	Komoka.....	Middlesex.....	164
McKenyon, Isaac.....	Reeve.....	Perth.....	Lanark.....	82
McKenzie, Wm.....	do.....	Morrisburg.....	Dundas.....	21
McKercher, John.....	do.....	Cass Bridge.....	Dundas.....	33
McKnight, Jas.....	do.....	La Salette.....	Norfolk.....	385
McLaren, Alex.....	do.....	Cromarty.....	Perth.....	229
McLean, Andrew.....	Farmer.....	Cheviot.....	Bruce.....	306
McLean, Jas.....	Municipal Clerk.....	Aberfoyle.....	Wellington.....	71
McLean, Neil.....	Farmer.....	Turtle Lake.....	Muskoka.....	252
McLeod, Farguhar.....	Reeve.....	Glennevis.....	Glenarry.....	32
McLieve, Jas.....	Journalist.....	Garrison Road.....	Welland.....	158
McManus, Thos.....	Farmer.....	Parker.....	Wellington.....	334
McMullan, John.....	Reeve.....	Cons'ance.....	Huron.....	118
McMullin, Jas.....	First Deputy-Reeve.....	Harwich.....	Kent.....	293
McNaught, Robert.....	Reeve.....	East Linton.....	Grey.....	188
McNeill, Neil.....	Farmer.....	Jarvis.....	Norfolk.....	183
McPhail, Wm. J.....	Reeve.....	St. Andrews.....	Stormont.....	359
McPherson, Jas.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Rama.....	Ontario.....	225
McQuade, T. H.....	Farmer and Councillor.....	Omemece.....	Victoria.....	.....
McRae, Phillip.....	Reeve.....	Brechin.....	Ontario.....	273
Neelon, Sylvester.....	Merchant.....	St Catharines.....	Lincoln.....	371
Newcomb, A. J.....	.....	South East Passage.....	Halifax.....	359
Nicoll, Wm.....	Reeve.....	Morristown.....	Wellington.....	299
Norris, Geo. A.....	M. D. and Reeve.....	Omemece.....	Victoria.....	89
Northcott, Thos.....	Farmer.....	Mount Brydges.....	Middlesex.....	128
Offholder, Ignace.....	Township Clerk.....	St. Clements.....	Waterloo.....	266
Oliver, Adam.....	Reeve.....	Canning.....	Brant.....	65
Oliver, Allen.....	Farmer.....	Napanee.....	Lennox.....	195
Osterheat, John D.....	Miller and Farmer.....	Rosehall.....	Prince Edward.....	108
Ostrand, John.....	Reeve.....	Courtland.....	Norfolk.....	90
Ovens, Jas.....	J. P.....	Alloa.....	Peel.....	153
Owen, J. G.....	Reeve.....	Streetsville.....	do.....	291
Paffard, Henry.....	President Ag. Society.....	Niagara.....	Lincoln.....	369
Parker, Ben.....	Reeve.....	Glasgow.....	Ontario.....	281
Parker, Wm.....	Farmer.....	Stamford.....	Welland.....	237
do.....	do.....	Garnet.....	Haldimand.....	308
Parr, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Cartwright.....	Durham.....	61
Patterson, Jas.....	do.....	Glen Tay.....	Lanark.....	168
Patterson, R. S.....	do.....	Kingston.....	Frontenac.....	72
Patterson, Wm.....	Township Clerk.....	Arden.....	do.....	132
Patton, Jas.....	Farmer.....	Goderich.....	Huron.....	60
Pennock, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Restock.....	Perth.....	44
Petrie, W. S.....	Miller.....	Holstein.....	Grey.....	304
Pettit, Jas. G.....	Clerk and Treasurer.....	Burgessville.....	Oxford.....	222
Philip, J. W.....	Councillor.....	Colborne.....	Northumberland.....	35
Phin, John.....	Farmer.....	Hespeler.....	Waterloo.....	117
Pickworth, Wm.....	Councillor.....	Colborne.....	Northumberland.....	35
Pierson, John.....	Reeve.....	Burgoyne.....	Bruce.....	390
Pipe, David.....	Councillor.....	Enfield.....	Durham.....	350
Pitcher, Seneca.....	Reeve.....	Warwick.....	Oxford.....	76
Platt, Percival.....	Farmer.....	Adolphustown.....	Lennox.....	161
Pole, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Appin.....	Middlesex.....	146
Potts, Henry T.....	Reeve.....	Daublane.....	Bruce.....	140
Potter, Jas.....	.....	Berlin.....	Waterloo.....	189
Praun, John.....	Reeve.....	Harriston.....	Wellington.....	174
Prefontaine, F.....	Farmer and J. P.....	South Durham.....	Drummond.....	40
Preston, Isaac, jun.....	Vice-Pres. Ag. Society.....	Bethany.....	Durham.....	387
Preston, R. A.....	Farmer.....	Newboro'.....	Leeds.....	206

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Pringle, Allen.....	Farmer.....	Selby.....	Lennox.....	231
Prout, C.....	Clerk.....	Hay.....	Huron.....	232
Quance, Rich.....		Elfrida.....	Wentworth.....	149
Quinn, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Urilla.....	Simcoe.....	50
Rae, David.....	Farmer.....	Cass Bridge.....	Dundas.....	137
Rae, Robert.....	Reeve.....	Theodford.....	Lambton.....	148
Rannie, Wm.....	Farmer.....	New Hamburg.....	Perth.....	274
Rawlings, Hiram.....	J. P. and Pres. Ag. Soc.	Ravenswood.....	Lambton.....	261
Raymond, W. C.....		Dickinson's Landing.....	Stormont.....	226
Reid, Donald.....	Towuship Clerk.....	Skipness.....	Bruce.....	297
Reid, Jas.....	Councillor.....	Centreville.....	Addington.....	107
Reid, J. R.....	1st Deputy Reeve.....	Lynedock.....	Norfolk.....	191
Reid, Hugh.....	Master.....	Hawthorne Grange.....	Grey.....	303
Renwick, John G.....	Farmer.....	Orono.....	Durham.....	293
Reycroft, John.....	Reeve.....	Highgate.....	Bothwell.....	200
Richards, J.....	do.....	Richard's Landing.....	Algoma.....	330
Richardson, Wm.....	do.....	Walkerton.....	Bruce.....	89
Richie, Sam.....	do.....	Wilberforce.....	Haliburton.....	389
Riddle, Walter.....	do.....	Cobourg.....	Northumberland.....	347
Rikely, Wm. H.....	Councillor.....	Parma.....	Lennox.....	75
Roberts, Hugh.....	Ex. Reeve and Farmer.....	Elora.....	Wellington.....	145
Robertson, Chas.....	Reeve.....	Rosseau.....	Simcoe.....	213
Robertson, John.....	Farmer.....	Lindsay.....	Victoria.....	369
Robin, Jacob H.....	Reeve.....	Adolphustown.....	Lennox.....	282
Robinson, Ed.....	Deputy Reeve.....	London.....	Middlesex.....	351
Robinson, John.....	Ex-Reeve.....	Ailsa Craig.....	do.....	263
Robinson, John.....	Farmer.....	Sandfield.....	Algoma.....	380
Robson, And.....	Pres. Ag. Soc.....	West McGillivray.....	Middlesex.....	169
Robson, John J.....	Reeve.....	Newcastle.....	Durham.....	103
Roche, Thos.....	Township Clerk.....	Brudenell.....	Renfrew.....	328
Rocheleau, Denis.....	do.....	Canard River.....	Essex.....	255
Rogers, D. T.....	Reeve.....	Cayuga.....	Haldimand.....	22
Rogers, P. L.....	Township Clerk.....	Bath.....	Addington.....	248
Rolaps, O. M.....	do.....	Flinton.....	Lennox.....	102
Rork, Thos.....	Reeve.....	Norwood.....	Peterboro.....	117
Rose, Baltis.....	Ex-Warden.....	Frankford.....	Hastings.....	173
Ross, John.....	Pres. S. S. and E. B. A. S	Cookstown.....	Simcoe.....	37
Roth, Benedict.....	Farmer.....	Shakespeare.....	Perth.....	93
Rundle, Jas.....	do.....	Bowmanville.....	Durham.....	202
Russell, Jas.....	Farmer.....	Russeldale.....	Perth.....	92
Russell, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Binbrook.....	Wentworth.....	146
Ruttleidge, John.....	do.....	Loughborough.....	Frontenac.....	139
Ryan, W. H.....	Ex-Reeve and Farmer.....	Elginfield.....	Middlesex.....	273
Sanderson, W. F.....	Warden.....	St. Mary's.....	Perth.....	235
Sangford, Thos. W.....	Deputy Reeve.....	London.....	Middlesex.....	331
Saylor, Adam H.....	Manufacturer.....	Consecon.....	Prince Edward.....	23
Schuler, Thos.....	Township Clerk.....	Mildmay.....	Bruce.....	382
Schultz, John E.....	Farmer.....	Petersburg.....	Waterloo.....	186
Scully, Dennis.....	Councillor.....	Downeyville.....	Victoria.....	193
Secord, S. O.....	Reeve.....	Homer.....	Lincoln.....	39
Shaver, Wm.....		Ancaster.....	Wentworth.....	144
Shaver, Reuben.....	Reeve.....	South Mountain.....	Dundas.....	236
Shaw, John.....	Miller.....	Normandale.....	Norfolk.....	290
Shields, Jas.....	Township Clerk.....	Tamworth.....	Addington.....	183
Shipley, Thos.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Falkirk.....	Middlesex.....	280
Shoemaker, Anthony.....	Township Councillor.....	Formosa.....	Bruce.....	221
Sills, G. B.....	Farmer.....	Napanee.....	Lennox.....	77
Sills, E. K.....	Township Clerk.....	Sillsville.....	Lennox.....	249
Simpson, Isaac.....	Banker (Private).....	Kingston.....	Frontenac.....	345
Sing, C. R.....	Warden.....	Meaford.....	Grey.....	128
Skely, John.....	Farmer.....	Melrose.....	Hastings.....	347
Sloan, Richard A.....	Reeve.....	Conway.....	Lennox.....	151
Smart, J. H.....	do.....	Kingsville.....	Essex.....	75
Smith, Albert A.....	do.....	Alport.....	Simcoe.....	98
Smith, C. S.....	do.....	Acton.....	Halton.....	27
Smith, D. M.....	Township Clerk.....	Sutherland's Corners.....	Lambton.....	56
Smith, Geo.....	Reeve.....	Sandford.....	Ontario.....	318

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District	Page.
Smith, Oliver.....	Ex-Councillor.....	Avonton.....	Perth.....	180
Smith, M. S.....	Warden.....	Tilsonburg.....	Oxford.....	52
Smithson, Joshua.....	.....	Graystock.....	Peterboro'.....	292
Smithson, Thos.....	President Ag. Society.....	Glenarm.....	Victoria.....	341
Smithson, Wm. J.....	Farmer.....	Weston.....	York.....	166-
Snell, Humphrey.....	do.....	Clinton.....	Huron.....	275
Sommer, John.....	do.....	Tavistock.....	Oxford.....	385-
Splatt, Frs.....	Councillor.....	Dunnville.....	Haldimand.....	233
Spoor, M.....	.....	Wolfe Island.....	Frontenac.....	116
Spring, Albert.....	Reeve.....	.....	Muskoka.....	176
Staebler, J. M.....	do.....	Berlin.....	Waterloo.....	24
Stafford, Wm.....	Ex-Warden.....	Lyn.....	Leeds.....	106
Stagg, John.....	Farmer.....	Brockville.....	Leeds.....	377
Stanley, Wm.....	Reeve.....	Lucan.....	Middlesex.....	66
Stanley, W. D.....	do.....	Granton.....	Middlesex.....	91
Steele, J.....	.....	Fonthill.....	Monck.....	191
Stephens, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Dresden.....	Kent.....	49-
Stevens, J. C.....	President Ag. Sy.....	Almonte.....	Lanark.....	110
Stevenson, J. R.....	Reeve.....	Georgina.....	York.....	320
Stewart, F. C.....	Merchant.....	Orangeville.....	Wellington.....	276
Stewart, Peter.....	Reeve.....	Parkhill.....	Middlesex.....	39
Stewart, Peter.....	Councillor.....	Shakespeare.....	Perth.....	349
Stewart, John.....	Cattle Dealer.....	Springbank.....	Middlesex.....	231
Stickney, John.....	Reeve.....	Lynn Valley.....	Norfolk.....	221
Strachan, Thos.....	do.....	Brussels.....	Huron.....	154
Strickland, P. C.....	Reeve and Farmer.....	Lakefield.....	Peterboro.....	- 30
Strong, Jacob H.....	Reeve.....	Rosedene.....	Lincoln.....	234
Stone, Fred. Wm.....	Stock-Breeder.....	Guelph.....	Wellington.....	240
Storr, Elijah.....	J. P. and ex-Warden.....	Lincester.....	Lennox.....	297
Stubb, Sam.....	Justice Peace.....	Caledon.....	Peel.....	182
Stymast, John.....	Secretary Ag. Society.....	Stymast Settlement.....	Northumberland.....	251
Sutherland, Jas.....	Farmer.....	Owen Sound.....	Grey.....	236
Suttaby, R. E.....	Farmer and Tp. Clerk.....	Gravenhurst.....	Simcoe.....	354
Swanson, C. D.....	Ex deputy Reeve.....	St. Mary's.....	Perth.....	208
Sweetman, Mat.....	Reeve.....	Guelph.....	Wellington.....	114
Swinarton, Thos.....	do.....	Coventry.....	Peel.....	121
Switzer, Fletcher.....	2nd Deputy Reeve.....	Centreville.....	Addington.....	107
Switzer, Wm.....	Deputy Reeve.....	New Lowell.....	Simcoe.....	129
Sylvester, John H.....	Councillor.....	Ratho.....	Oxford.....	367
Tapping, Thos.....	Reeve.....	Hardinge.....	Frontenac.....	214
Taylor, Jas.....	Farmer.....	Lansdowne.....	Leeds.....	28
Taylor, Jas.....	Farmer and Reeve.....	Kirkfield.....	Victoria.....	323
Taylor, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Dalton.....	do.....	327
Tett, Ben.....	Reeve.....	Bedford Mills.....	Frontenac.....	207
Thompson, Geo.....	do.....	Paisley.....	Bruce.....	292
Thorne, G. C.....	Farmer.....	Hilton.....	Northumberland.....	38
Tindale, Wm.....	do.....	Fergus.....	Wellington.....	208
Tolton, John.....	Reeve.....	Walkerton.....	Bruce.....	362
Tooke, Jas.....	Farmer.....	Bracebridge.....	Muskoka.....	136
Torance, Jas.....	do.....	Porter's Hill.....	Huron.....	163
Tracy, Geo. C.....	J. P. and Farmer.....	Gallingertown.....	Dundas.....	190
Trussler, John.....	Farmer.....	Wellesley.....	Waterloo.....	343
Turnbull, Walter.....	J. P. and License Com.....	Delhi.....	Norfolk.....	233
Turnbull, Wm.....	Farmer.....	Brantford.....	Brant.....	337
Tuttle, Jas.....	Reeve and Merchant.....	Biidgewater.....	Hastings.....	36
Tytler, John.....	Warden and Reeve.....	Clarence Creek.....	Russell.....	30
Vahey, W.....	Reeve.....	Arkona.....	Lambton.....	278
Vance, Robt.....	Farmer.....	Ida.....	Durham.....	138
Van Bridger, Jas.....	Reeve.....	Plantagenet.....	Prescott.....	44
Vancamp, L.....	1st Deputy Reeve.....	Bowmanville.....	Durham.....	305
Vanderwater, Daniel.....	Farmer.....	Foxboro'.....	Hastings.....	354
Vanderwort, Willmot.....	President Ag. Society.....	Wellman's Corners.....	Hastings.....	272
Van Horne, John.....	Farmer.....	Chatham.....	Kent.....	162
Van Keuren, Geo.....	Reeve.....	Dunnville.....	Monck.....	207
Vester, John.....	2nd Deputy Reeve.....	Harwich.....	Kent.....	293
Wager, Leonard.....	Councillor.....	Tamworth.....	Addington.....	183
Walker, David.....	Reeve.....	Brucefield.....	Huron.....	119

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Walker, D. Jas. ....	J. P. and Reeve.....	Inverary .....	Frontenac.....	271
Wall, Jacob .....	Farmer.....	Petersburg .....	Waterloo .....	186
Wallace, Jas. ....	Grain Dealer.....	Almonte .....	Lanark .....	29
Walter, Ferd. ....	Reeve and Farmer .....	Bamberg.....	Waterloo.....	240
Water, Thos. ....	do .....	Rockwood .....	Wellington .....	289
Watson, E. P. ....	do .....	Sarnia .....	Lambton .....	83
Watson, Henry .....	Clerk .....	Clearville .....	Bothwell .....	200
Watson, John S. J. ....	Reeve .....	Rockingham .....	Renfrew .....	68
Watzer, J. B. ....	Farmer .....	Ventnor .....	Grenville.....	178
Webster, Robt. ....	do .....	Lucknow .....	Huron.....	249
Webster, Wm. A. ....	Reeve .....	Lansdowne .....	Leeds .....	28
Wees, Stephen .....	Councillor .....	Centreville .....	Addington .....	107
Weir, David .....	do .....	Wroxeter .....	Huron .....	237
Weisbrod, J. C. ....	Reeve .....	Aylmer .....	Elgin .....	52
Wessel, Nelson .....	Township Clerk .....	Carnarvon .....	Haliburton .....	243
White, A. T. ....	President Ag. Society...	Pembroke .....	Renfrew .....	248
White, Thos. B. ....	Reeve .....	Gordon .....	Essex .....	41
Whitelaw, Wm. ....	Farmer .....	Guelph Lake .....	Wellington .....	302
Wianero, A. ....	Farmer and Reeve .....	Sparrow Lake .....	Muskoka .....	79
Williams, Jas. ....	Reeve .....	Arden .....	Frontenac .....	129
Williamson, J. C. ....	Postmaster .....	Ballyduff .....	Durham .....	151
Willmot, Ben. ....	Farmer.....	Richmond Hill.....	York .....	178
Willmot, H. ....	do .....	Kingston .....	Frontenac .....	95
Wilson, And. ....	1st Vice-Pres. Ag. Soc'y.	Appleton .....	Lanark .....	74
Wilson, D. D. ....	Reeve .....	Seaforth .....	Huron .....	256
Wilson, Hiram .....	do .....	Florence .....	Lambton .....	343
Wilson, John .....	do .....	Robinson .....	Welland .....	48
Wood, Jas. ....	Lieut.-Col. and J. P. ....	Loughborough .....	Frontenac .....	161
Wright, John. ....	Reeve .....	Chatham .....	Kent .....	197
Wright, Peter .....	do and Farmer .....	Oxley .....	Essex .....	193
Wyatt, Frank .....	do .....	Catharine's.....	Lincoln .....	187
Yates, Abel .....	Postmaster .....	Spring Valley .....	Leeds .....	82
Yool, Jas. ....	Farmer .....	Brooksdale .....	Oxford .....	367
Young, Wm .....	do .....	Colbourne .....	Huron .....	321

## QUEBEC.

Aikman, David.....	Contractor .....	Montmagny .....	Montmagny .....	121
Allard, Prospère, jun .....	Farmer .....	St. Cuthbert.....	Berthier .....	431
Archambeault, J. N. A. ....	President .....	Verchères .....	Verchères .....	408
Archambeault, Ubalde ...	Farmer.....	St. Timothé .....	Beauharnois .....	395
Armstrong, Wm. B. ....	do .....	Shawville .....	Pontiac .....	100
Audet, Ephrem .....	do .....	St. Lazare.....	Bellechasse .....	401
Barnard, Ed. A. ....	Director Ag. Society.....	Cap St. Michel.....	Quebec .....	411
Barwis, Thos. ....	Prothonotary .....	Arthabaskaville .....	Arthabaska .....	87
Beaubien, Louis .....	do .....	Montreal .....	do .....	392
Beauchamp, B. ....	Sec.-Treas. Ag. Society..	St. Hermas .....	Two Mountains .....	432
Beauchamps, T. ....	Notary .....	Ste. Julienne .....	Montcalm .....	397
Beaudry, Jean .....	Merchant .....	St. Charles .....	Bellechasse .....	398
Bellefleur, Liguori.....	Farmer and Mayor.....	St. Constant .....	Laprairie .....	415
Bertrand, S. ....	Notary .....	St. Mathias .....	Rouville .....	412
Bernier, Cyrille .....	do .....	Cap St. Ignace.....	Montmagny.....	414
Blain, M. G. ....	do .....	St. Edouard .....	Napierville .....	404
Blinn, H. C. ....	President Ag. Society....	Stanbridge East .....	Missisquoi .....	379
Bourke, Calixte.....	Farmer .....	St. Pie de Guise .....	Yamaska .....	423
Boutel, Charles.....	Director Ag. Society.....	Victoriaville.....	Arthabaska .....	413
Brunet, Jules .....	Farmer .....	St. Timothé .....	Beauharnois .....	434
Burns, Wm .....	Farmer and Merchant ...	Rawdon .....	Montcalm .....	121
Campbell, E. H. ....	Agent .....	St. Hilaire.....	Rouville .....	398
Cardinal, Jos. Doré. ....	Farmer.....	St. Timothé .....	Beauharnois .....	435
Carle, Louis, sen. ....	do .....	St. Ursule .....	Mashkinongé.....	396
Caron, George.....	Merchant and Farmer ...	St. Léon .....	do .....	405
Cartier, L. J. ....	do .....	St. Antoine.....	Verchères .....	416
Casavant, Antoine .....	Farmer and M.P.P .....	St. Dominique .....	Bagot .....	425

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Casgrain, J. E.....	M.P.....	L'Islet.....	L'Islet.....	413
Cassidy, Pat.....	Farmer.....	Cranbourne.....	Dorchester.....	245
Chalfour, Arsène.....	do.....	Grondines.....	Portneuf.....	416
Chartier, J. B.....	Priest.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	428
Chouinard, Noel.....	Farmer.....	St. Modeste.....	Temiscouata.....	421
Cloutier, Gabriel.....	do.....	St. Pierre.....	Montmagny.....	402
Crevier, Alex.....	.....	Ste. Anne de Bellevue.....	Jacques Cartier.....	409
Coté, F. Adeline.....	Farmer and Mayor.....	St. Barthelemi.....	Berthier.....	429
Daly, Alex.....	J.P.....	Rawdon.....	Montcalm.....	363
Desaulniers, Léon.....	Farmer.....	Pointe Claire.....	Jacques Cartier.....	407
Deslaurier, Léon.....	do.....	St. Anne de Bellevue.....	do.....	410
Doré, Geo.....	do.....	St. Ubalde.....	Portneuf.....	416
Ducharme, Marc E.....	J.P. and Mayor.....	St. Marc.....	Verchères.....	400
Dumontier, Noé.....	Farmer.....	St. Barthélemi.....	Berthier.....	429
Fêrér, Emery.....	Farmer.....	St. Eustache.....	Two Mountains.....	394
Filion, F.....	.....	Chatnam.....	Argenteuil.....	419
Fitzgerald, Thos.....	Farmer.....	Frampton, West.....	Dorchester.....	358
Gagnon, Maximin.....	Farmer.....	Rivière du Sud.....	Montmagny.....	409
Garneau, Antoine.....	do.....	Pointe du Lac.....	St. Maurice.....	435
Gavage, F. X.....	Mayor and Farmer.....	St. Augustin.....	Two Mountains.....	404
Girouard, Evariste.....	Mayor.....	St. Benoit.....	do.....	403
Gosselin, Eugene.....	.....	St. Charles.....	Bellechasse.....	400
Grenier, P. O.....	N.P. and Farmer.....	St. Rose.....	Laval.....	401
Hayes, James.....	Farmer.....	Shefford.....	Shefford.....	110
Hebert, Odilon.....	Merchant.....	St. Charles, River Richelieu.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	426
Hemming, E. J.....	Farmer.....	Drummondville.....	Drummond.....	293
Hooper, Wm.....	Councillor.....	Bishop's Crossing.....	Wolfe.....	267
Hughes, Michael.....	Postmaster and Farmer.....	Collfield.....	Pontiac.....	127
Inglis, Wm.....	J.P. and Pres. Ag. Soc.....	Grand Fresnière.....	Two Mountains.....	97
Johnston, J. D.....	Mayor.....	Marinda.....	Missisquoi.....	195
Joncas, P. S.....	Postmaster.....	Berthier.....	Montmagny.....	404
Kay, And.....	Mayor.....	Grandby.....	Shefford.....	99
Kilgour, Geo.....	Mayor and Farmer.....	Shawville.....	Pontiac.....	125
Kitrick, Alex. M.....	Farmer.....	Marbleton.....	Wolfe.....	346
Lacerte, Pierre.....	Sec.-Treasurer.....	St. Maurice.....	Champlain.....	405
Lachance, Olivier.....	Farmer Warder.....	Chicoutimi.....	Chicoutimi.....	220
Lacour, J. B.....	.....	St. Laurent.....	Jacques Cartier.....	433
Lacoursier, N.E.....	Notary.....	St. Casimir.....	Portneuf.....	397
Lafontaine, J. L.....	N. P. and Farmer.....	Roxton Falls.....	Shefford.....	405
Lafrenière, J. O. B.....	Miller.....	St. Cuthbert.....	Berthier.....	430
Lambert, Thos.....	J. P. and Farmer.....	St. Joseph.....	Beauce.....	399
Laport, R. A.....	N.P.....	St. Alexis.....	Montcalm.....	401
Lassiseraye, A. H. S.....	Parish Priest.....	St. François du Lac.....	Yamaska.....	378
Lavoie, Félix.....	.....	St. Martin.....	Laval.....	407
Leclerc, Victor.....	Farmer.....	St. Bazile.....	Portneuf.....	398
Lefebvre, Pierre.....	J. P.....	St. Philippe.....	Laprairie.....	418
Lemire, J. Louis.....	Mayor.....	La Baie des Fêbvres.....	Yamaska.....	394
Letourneau, Flav.....	Farmer.....	.....	Rouville.....	412
Longton, Moïse.....	Ex-Mayor.....	St. Constant.....	Laprairie.....	424
Martin, Nye C.....	Mayor.....	Upper Bedford.....	Missisquoi.....	83
Meigsh, D.....	do.....	Stanbridge.....	do.....	328
Middleton, John.....	Sec.-Treasurer.....	Point Fortune.....	Vaudreuil.....	97
Mignault, H.....	M. D.....	St. Dennis, Rv. Richelieu.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	422
Milot, J.....	Notary.....	Yamachiche.....	St. Maurice.....	408
Morin, Laurent.....	Mayor.....	L'Islet.....	L'Islet.....	413
Mousseau, Ls.....	Retired Merchant.....	La Baie des Fêbvres.....	Yamaska.....	399
Mosher, Jas. H.....	Mayor.....	West Farnham.....	Missisquoi.....	356
Mullan, P. J.....	School Teacher.....	Vinton.....	Pontiac.....	126
Myre, J. Bte.....	Farmer and Mayor.....	St. Louis de Gonzagues.....	Beauharnois.....	414

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page
McArty, John.....	Farmer and Lumberer...	St. Julienne.....	Montcalm.....	94
McCabe, John.....	Mayor.....	Mount Oscar.....	Vaudreuil.....	353
McCallum, John.....	.....	Avoca.....	Argenteuil.....	241
McConnell, A.....	J. P.....	Cushing.....	do.....	358
McPherson, Wm.....	Mayor and J. P.....	Port Daniel.....	Bonaventure.....	218
Nadeau, Antoine.....	Pres. Ag. Society.....	St. Isidore.....	Dorchester.....	427
Paquet, J. C.....	Miller.....	Pont Rouge.....	Portneuf.....	407
Paquette, Jos.....	Merchant.....	St. Magdeleine.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	420
Paré, Jos.....	Farmer and Mayor.....	St. Hubert.....	Chamby.....	426
Paterson, E. T.....	do.....	Kirkdale.....	Drummond.....	242
Pelletier, Jos.....	do.....	St. Pamphile.....	L'Islet.....	418
Pelletier, Thos P.....	Merchant.....	Trois Pistoles.....	Temiscouata.....	403
Phelan, M.....	Farmer.....	St. Columbin.....	Two Mountains.....	287
Pilau, Isidore.....	.....	St. Timothé.....	Beaulacnois.....	415
Ricard, N. E.....	Priest.....	St. Zéphirin de Courval.....	Yamaska.....	433
Rousseau, Louis.....	Farmer.....	St. Germain.....	Drummond.....	403
Roy, E. A.....	do.....	.....	Bellechasse.....	423
Roy, Henry.....	do.....	St. Sebastien.....	Iberville.....	406
St. Amant, L.....	N. P.....	St. Alban.....	Portneuf.....	416
Sesmans, Henry H.....	Farmer.....	Otter Lake.....	Pontiac.....	265
Seguin, Antoine.....	Warden.....	St. Eustache.....	Two Mountains.....	404
Senecal, Aimé.....	Mayor.....	Varenes.....	Verchères.....	397
Senecal, M.....	.....	St Charles, River Riche- lieu.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	420
Schmoult, J. D.....	Professor Agriculture.....	Ste. Anne de la Poca- tiere.....	Kamouraska.....	417
Somerville, Wm.....	Mayor.....	Shawville.....	Pontiac.....	206
Sylvestre, N.....	.....	St. Barnabé.....	St. Hyacinthe.....	422
Thérien, François.....	Secretary-Treasurer.....	St. Calixte de Kilkenny.....	Montcalm.....	410
Thivierge, P. N.....	Curé.....	St. Bonaventure.....	Bonaventure.....	401
Tourgeon, Chas.....	Schoolmaster.....	St. Isidore.....	Dorchester.....	419
Varin, J.....	Mayor.....	St. Théodore de Chert- sey.....	Montcalm.....	427
Wiggett, J. W.....	Mayor.....	Sherbrooke.....	Sherbrooke.....	279
Wyman, Jos.....	Ex-Mayor and J. P.....	Onslow.....	Pontiac.....	215

## NEW BRUNSWICK.

Bowes, James H.....	Farmer.....	Golden Grove Mills.....	St. John.....	338
Campbell, James A.....	.....	Kingsclear.....	York.....	246
Close, Benjamin.....	Warden.....	Gibson.....	do.....	85
Cohan, Thomas.....	Councillor.....	Upper Keswick Ridge.....	do.....	289
Connolly, Dennis.....	Farmer and Lumberer.....	Golden Grove.....	St. John.....	336
Currie, James.....	do.....	Barnesville.....	do.....	377
Dalley, Samuel, sen.....	Farmer.....	St. Martin's.....	St. John.....	375
Davidson, John.....	do.....	Gervan Bank.....	do.....	352
Doherty, W. W.....	Councillor.....	Campbellton.....	Restigouche.....	383
Dunn, John.....	.....	Musquash.....	St. John.....	331
Fairweather, J. E.....	Farmer.....	Hampton.....	King's.....	301
Fowler, W.....	.....	Hammond Vale.....	do.....	333
Goodspeed, B. N.....	J. P.....	Peniac.....	York.....	392
Howard, Alex. G.....	.....	Fairfield.....	St. John.....	360
Kerr, Donald.....	Farmer.....	River Charlo.....	Restigouche.....	386

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
Montgomery, William	President Ag. Society	Dalhousie	Restigouche	387
Murch, J. H.	Councillor	Bear Island	York	366
McGuire, James	Farmer	Golden Grove	St. John	372
McKeel, William	Coroner	Greenwich Hill	King's	287
McKell, William	do	do	do	287
McLean, William	J. P.	Nashwaak	York	303
Peck, G.M.	Mast'r Albert Sire Grange	Hopewell Hill	Albert	309
Stapleden, Bartholomev.	J. P. and Pres. Ag. Soc.	Chatham	Northumberland	361
Thompson, Richard	Merchant	St. John	St. John	357
Weldon, R. C.		Penobsquis	King's	271
White, George H.		River Charlo	Restigouche	376

## NOVA SCOTIA.

Black, Hiram	Farmer	Amherst	Cumberland	269
Brown, Jas. H.	Councillor	Lunenburg	Lunenburg	246
Chapman, Martin		Amherst	Cumberland	219
Dauphinee, Jas. E.	Councillor		Lunenburg	207
Ehler, John	Councillor		Guysborough	149
Fenisty, Chas.	Dairy Farmer	Sackville	Halifax	284
Finter, Colin R.	Councillor	South Pictou	Pictou	268
Fitzgerald, Thos.	Farmer	Big Tracadie	Guysborough	286
Fraser, Colin R.	Councillor	South Pictou	Pictou	268
Fraser, Donald	Farmer	Pictou	Pictou	165
Gaetz, Isaac		Musquodoboit Harbour	Halifax	301
Guild, Wm.	Councillor	Head of Jeddore	do	300
Haliburton, A. F.	President Ag. Society	Baddeck	Victoria	166
Innes, Robert O.	Farmer	Porter's Lake	Halifax	367
Kennedy, Geo.	Warden	Granville Ferry	Annapolis	265
Locke, Jacob	Merchant	Lockeport	Shelburne	267
Lorway, John	Port Warden	Sydney	Cape Breton	364
Maxwell, Robt.	Councillor	Lime Rock	Pictou	205
May, Thos.	County Councillor	Port Mulgrave	Guysboro'	85
Moffatt, C. W.	Farmer	Little Bras d'Or	Cape Breton	391
Moore, Sam.	Councillor	Goose River	Cumberland	282
Moore, W. H.	Merchant	North Sydney	Cape Breton	266
Munroe, Colin	Farmer	Boulardarie	Victoria	330
Munroe, John	do	do	do	330
Mackay, Geo.	Farmer	Marion Bridge	Cape Breton	386
McAdam, Allan	do	Eskasoni	do	266
McDonald, Jno. R.	Councillor	New Larig.	Pictou	284
McDonald, R.	Postmaster	Lingan	Cape Breton	247
McDougall, H. F.	Mem. Prov. B. Ag.	Christmas Island	do	378
McInnis, John	Trader	Wallace Bridge	Cumberland	205
McIsaac, Dan. J.	Farmer and Trader	McAdam's Lake	Cape Breton	253
McKeen, Wm.	do	Gray's River	Halifax	372
McLennan, Rod'k.	J. P. and Pres. Ag. Soc'y	Sydney	Cape Breton	364
McLeod, D.	Councillor	Westville	Pictou	329
McLeod, Geo.	Farmer	Middle Musquodoboit	Halifax	358
McNeil, Neil	Merchant	East Bay	Cape Breton	125

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	P. O. Address.	County or District.	Page.
McNeil, Stephen .....	Trader and Farmer .....	Beaver Cove .....	Cape Breton .....	267
McOdrum, Murd .....	Farmer .....	Marion Bridge .....	do .....	391
Neill, Thos. O. ....	Councillor .....	Salmon River Lake .....	Guysboro' .....	288
Neville, Pat .....	.....	Bridgeport .....	Cape Breton .....	330
Robertson, Gabriel .....	Receiver of Wreck .....	Barrington Passage .....	Shelbourne .....	269
Ross, John .....	Farmer .....	New Glasgow .....	Pictou .....	310
Sangster, S. S. ....	Shipbuilder .....	New Harbour .....	Guysboro' .....	283
Smith, Chas .....	County Councillor .....	Port Grenville .....	Cumberland .....	149
Smith, Robt. A. ....	Warden .....	Chester .....	Lunenburg .....	96
Smith, Wm. ....	J. P. ....	Barrington .....	Shelbourne .....	270
Snow, Wm. A. ....	Master Mariner .....	Upper Port La Tour .....	do .....	251
Spratt, Chas. R. ....	Farmer .....	Middle Musquodoboit .....	Halifax .....	268
Thorne, Jas. H. ....	Mail Courier .....	Lower Granville .....	Annapolis .....	220
Tory, Jas. A. ....	Collector of Customs .....	Guysboro' .....	Guysboro' .....	166
Tupper, Chas., jun. ....	Warden .....	Upper Stewiacke .....	Colchester .....	346
Videte, Alfred .....	President Ag. Society .....	Bridgetown .....	Annapolis .....	332
Watson, Alex. ....	Farmer .....	Barrington .....	Shelbourne .....	316
Watson, T. W. ....	J. P. ....	do .....	do .....	312
Young, Wm. H. ....	Councillor .....	Belle Isle .....	Annapolis .....	264

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Campbell, Hugh .....	Farmer .....	Rollo Bay Cross Roads .....	King's .....	313
Compton, Geo. ....	do .....	St. Eleanors .....	Prince .....	333
Costain, Richard .....	Postmaster .....	Miminegash .....	do .....	318
Dawson, Henry .....	Farmer .....	Tryon .....	Prince .....	334
Dewar, Robt. ....	do .....	New Perth .....	King's .....	374
Duffy, Peter .....	do and Miller .....	County Line Station .....	Prince .....	271
Gill, A. ....	Farmer .....	Little York .....	Queen's .....	365
Haslem, Wm. ....	Farmer .....	Springfield .....	Queen's .....	216
Howatt, Josiah .....	do .....	Cape Traverse .....	Prince .....	337
Howatt, Nelson .....	do .....	North St. Eleanor's .....	do .....	319
Jamieson, Jno. ....	Farmer .....	Sturgeon .....	King's .....	335
Leslie, John .....	Farmer .....	Souris, West .....	King's .....	315
Mills, John .....	.....	Bay Fortune .....	King's .....	363
Mullin, John S. ....	Farmer .....	Kensington .....	Prince .....	372
McDonald, Clement .....	Farmer .....	Clear Springs .....	King's .....	317
McDonald, Duncan .....	Merchant .....	Montague .....	do .....	314
McDonald, Sam .....	Postmaster .....	Dundas .....	do .....	220
McLeod, D. A. ....	.....	Belfast .....	Queen's .....	319
McNeil, Roderick .....	M.D. and Farmer .....	New London .....	do .....	243
McNeill, Thos. ....	J.P. ....	Alberton .....	Prince .....	318
Owen, Geo. F. ....	J.P. and Farmer .....	Cardigan Bridge .....	King's .....	204
Shaw, Arch. ....	Farmer .....	New Perth .....	King's .....	365
Simpson, W. M. N. ....	J.P. ....	Hamilton .....	Prince .....	319

## BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Name.	Profession or Occupation.	Post Office Address.	County or District.	Page.
Fry, Henry .....	J. P. and Farmer .....	Maple Bay.....	Cowichan .....	384
Ingwell, Thos .....	Farmer .....	Sooke .....	Sooke.....	382
Martley, J.....	Capt. II M. 9th Reg .....	Clinton .....	Cariboo .....	383

QUESTIONS TO MANUFACTURERS, List of.....	436
“ “ Answers to .....	436 to 443
Abell, John, Woodbridge, Ontario.....	440
Adams, Peter .....	442
Adams, W. E., of Adams, Hockland & Co., Paris, Ontario .....	436
Barber Brothers, Bowmanville.....	437
Clay, W. W., of Paris Manufacturing Co., Paris, Ontario.....	439
Denton & Co., D. H., Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.....	441
Dight Thomas, Lucan, Middlesex, Ontario.....	410
Frost, Francis T., of Frost & Wood, Smith's Falls, Ontario.....	437
Gill, Allan & Co. ....	436
Haggart, John, Brampton, Ontario.....	439
Hepburn, Robert, Manager Ontario Worsted Co.'s Carpet Mill, Elora..	440
McIntosh & Taylor, Woodbridge.....	440
Mitchell, Alexander, Mitchell, Ontario.....	439
Noxon, James, of Noxon Bros., Manufacturing Co., Ingersoll, Ontario.	442
Patton, W. Henry, Iroquois Stave Mills, Iroquois, Ontario.....	438
Raymond, Charles, Guelph, Ontario .....	436
Smith, George, Lambton Mills, Ontario .....	438
Weston, John, of Ayr Agricultural Works, Ayr, Ontario.....	442
Wilby & Co., O., Woollen Manufacturers, Weston.....	442
Liverpool prices, 1877-78, from Records of the Montreal Corn Exchange ..	446
“ “ 1880-81 “ “ “ “ ..	448
“ “ 1877-78 from Records of the Toronto Corn Exchange....	450
“ “ 1880-81 “ “ “ “ .....	451
Chicago prices, 1877-78 .....	452
“ “ 1880-81.....	454
New York prices, 1877-78.....	456
“ “ 1879-80.....	458
“ “ 1880 and part 1881.....	460
Montreal prices, 1877-78.....	462
“ “ 1880-81.....	464
Toronto prices, 1877-78.....	466
“ “ 1880-81.....	468
Agricultural Products, Fluctuations in price.....	470 to 473
Fluctuations in prices between Chicago and Toronto 1877-78.....	470
“ “ “ “ 1880-81.....	471

Results of Quotations—Chicago and Toronto.....	472
“ “ “ and New York.....	472
“ “ Toronto and Montreal.....	472
<b>FREIGHT RATES ON GRAIN at stated periods in 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881 :—</b>	
Chicago to Kingston by schooners and steamers.....	477
Chicago to Liverpool by rail and steamer (1880 and 1881 only).....	476
Chicago to Liverpool <i>via</i> Montreal and Portland (also 1879 and 1882 but not 1877).....	477
Chicago to Liverpool (only 1877 and 1880) per G. T. R.....	477
Chicago to Montreal by water.....	476
Chicago to Montreal (also 1882) per G. T. R.....	477
Chicago to New York by rail.....	474
Chicago to New York <i>via</i> Buffalo and Oswego (lake and canal).....	475
Chicago to Toronto (also 1882) per G. T. R.....	477
Kingston to Montreal by barges.....	477
New York to Liverpool by steam and rail.....	475
New York to Liverpool (also 1879).....	476
<b>EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>478 to 752</b>
Abell, John, Woodbridge.....	624
Beadle, W. A., St. Catharines, Ontario.....	540
Burpee, Charles, M.P., Sunbury, N.B.....	647
Charlton, John, M.P.....	594
Craig, John R., Brampton.....	566
Currie, Nathaniel, Genesee.....	616 & 631
Dawson, William, Vittoria, Norfolk, Ontario.....	527
Dight, Thomas, Lucan, Middlesex, Ontario.....	501
Hay, Robert, M.P., Toronto.....	572, 579 & 593
Howard, R. E., Bath.....	495
Hudson, W. P., Roslin, Hastings, Ontario.....	524
King, G. G., M.P., Queen's, N.B.....	705
Larue, Dr., St. Augustin, Portneuf, P. Q.....	676
Longley, Avar, M.P., Annapolis, N. S.....	717
MacInnes, Donald, Senator.....	513
Massue, Lewis H., M.P.....	746
Moir, Ed., Cornwall Woollen Mills.....	548
Murdoch, —.....	578
Murray, Alexander, M.P.P., Manitoba.....	642
Parks, J. H., St. John, N.B.....	727
Paquin, Samuel.....	690
Preston, D. H., County Lennox.....	478
Rymal, Joseph, M.P., Wentworth, Ontario.....	735
Schmouth, J. D., Prof. Ag. College of St. Annes, Kamouraska.....	656
Speight, James, Markham.....	559
Tweed, Thomas, Stomont Cotton Co.....	555
Wheler, George, M.P.....	581