

put a reasonable profit on their products, and did no slaughtering at home. People never dumped stuff in their own yards so long as their neighbors permitted their yards to be used as dumping grounds. Under commercial union Canada would be in the same position as the United States with reference to the surplus of manufactured products; there would be no dumping ground in either country. He was not aware that American farmers wanted commercial union, for they might think that there would be greater competition of agricultural products in their own markets. Canadian manufacturers seemed to be afraid of ours, but there was no occasion for this alarm, for there was a large number of small factories flourishing in the United States. Canada had a superior soil for all kinds of agricultural productions, but the United States had the prestige and the progressive spirit, which caused many ambitious Canadians to move across the border. Speaking from the standpoint of a Canadian farmer, he could not see what Canadian farmers could lose by commercial union. They would pocket the duty, if the American markets were open to them. National wealth consisted in the purchasing power of the dollar—the difference between the income and the outlay. He could see no reason why objection should be taken against direct taxation.

W. WELD—I should like to know if Mr. Wiman, the New York railway speculator, has any authority to speak for the farmers of the United States, or any other body of American citizens. Has he ever been known to befriend the American farmers?

MR. WASHINGTON—Not that I am aware of. He is a Canadian by birth, and so far as I know his motives are patriotic.

PRESIDENT LEITCH—I should like to hear what Mr. Weld has to say on the subject. He has travelled all over the countries in question, and is editor and proprietor of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE; his remarks should carry great weight amongst the farmers of Canada.

MR. WELD—I would much rather not express myself on this occasion, and I do not desire to influence the action of this intelligent body of farmers. It is true that I entertain strong feelings on the subject, but I have other ways for expressing them. For twenty-one years, I have striven to conduct an agricultural publication independent of partyism, but the steps now being brought forward make it almost impossible to be silent and do my duty on this important subject. I have encouraged every legitimate and proper plan to try to unite the farmers. As a member of a Farmer's Institute, from which this commercial union has received so much attention, I am highly pleased to support and encourage any institution that will enlighten the farmer and tend to unite him with his fellows, and I am gratified to think that this question receives their attention. I am also pleased that this, which may be the first efficient step toward the restoration of harmony between the United States and Great Britain, has emanated from the United States, as Mr. Erastus Wiman, a wealthy American, has gained the influence and assistance of the President of the Permanent Central Farmers' Institute, and if their object is to aid in re-uniting Britain and the United States (mother and child), it would be the grandest achievement of the Jubilee, or of this century. Could such be accomplished by Mr. Wiman, Mr.

Fuller and the Farmers' Institutes, it might be of great advantage to us and to all the world, if proper arrangements could be made, and we have hopes that they may, as we have always found the Americans most friendly and hospitable to us every time we have crossed the border. In fact, from such high eulogiums that I have heard of our Queen, I am led to believe that there are as really loyal subjects to the Queen in the United States as there are in Canada. Although approving of any measures tending to the interest of farmers, I cannot quite agree with Mr. Fuller when he states that Canadian farmers are not as prosperous as the farmers in the United States. My observations cause me to think Mr. Fuller is in error, for we know of no part of the world where the farmers are succeeding better at the present time than in Ontario. When I first came to Canada we purchased a cow for \$10, and a good yoke of oxen for \$40, or \$20 an ox; we have also sold flour at \$1.25 per cwt. These prices may be ruling again in Canada and in the United States. I have also seen wheat so cheap in England as to be fed to hogs and horses. We might for a time procure some of our implements at a cheaper rate, but I do not consider that we should receive such great advantages as have been depicted from the sale of farm products. When in Ashford market in Sussex, England, last year, I saw two good grade 3-year-old Canadian heifers sold at £20 sterling each; that is equal to about \$100. No such cattle landed from the U. S. have brought within 20 per cent. of that price. This is because Canadian stock are free from diseases, and are allowed to be taken into any market, whereas the U. S. cattle must be killed on landing. This fact enhances the value of our stock to an enormous extent. Our dairy, pork and orchard products already command a better position in the British market. The advantages of dealing direct with a nation that must purchase farm products is an undoubted advantage; but we could not expect much from a nation that is a competitor in the same market. Whether the market of those that must purchase, or those that must sell, will be most beneficial, is a matter worthy of consideration. From my observations when travelling in the United States and from the information I have received and from personal observations in Ontario, I believe that both American and Canadian means have been used to suppress truth and disseminate falsehood, and to hoodwink Canadian farmers.

A member called upon the President to express his views.

PRESIDENT LEITCH—As President of your Council, it is not proper for me to express myself except through your courtesy or at your request. I have travelled a great deal through the United States, and I am pretty well acquainted with the condition of the farmers in that country. In order to prove to my satisfaction that commercial union would be advantageous to the farmers of Canada, you must show to me that the farmers across the line, say in Michigan, are more prosperous than we are. Barring exceptional cases, I have failed to find that they are more prosperous. There are a few fancy farmers, or rather speculators, there, who engage in fancy stock raising, or other fancy specialties, and they will pay fancy prices for our stock. Our farmers, especially those who live near the border, get good prices for their lambs

which are shipped to Buffalo and thence distributed amongst the large cities; but for all this, sheep-raising has not been profitable, and this is the practical side of the question. The Americans also take our barley to satisfy the demands of their German beer-drinkers, but who can assure us that intemperance is to be a lasting institution amongst our neighbors? Breeding stock is exported free of duty, but there would be an advantage in free access with other animals. The Americans have injured their farmers by attempting to shut out foreign manufactures, and our debt is already so burdensome that we must adopt the same policy, or resort to direct taxation, which, although correct in principle, we are not yet prepared for. I should like to see all possible restrictions removed, but I don't think that we are at present prepared to adopt such a radical policy. I am a warm friend of the American people—I admire their hospitality and intelligence—and for this reason I would welcome commercial union if the state of our finances admitted the adoption of the scheme. I see also that our weightiest concerns are bound up with the mother country. When the Americans consume more of our produce than the British, and establish the price of our agricultural productions, then commercial union becomes a practical question. We should not attempt to press our products into a congested market. I know Canadian farmers in Genesee County, Mich.—one of the most fertile districts in the United States—and they possess no special advantages there over what they possessed in Canada, or what we now possess. I recently paid a visit to this county, and I could see these facts with my own eyes, and they were forced to acknowledge them. This is the practical view of the question, and so long as this state of affairs continues, I can see no advantages in commercial union, by means of which our farmers and those of the United States are supposed to be placed on the same commercial level. I see no objection to a fair measure of reciprocity of the natural productions of both countries.

The usual hour for the adjournment of the Council having arrived, it was moved by Henry Anderson, and seconded by Jas. K. Little, that the discussion be postponed until the next meeting of the Council.—Carried. It was expected that Mr. Waters' paper would be duly received and that it should be discussed at the next meeting. The Council adjourned (as is customary during the busy summer months) until the third Thursday in October.

Mr. Waters' Paper on Commercial Union.

Mr. Waters' paper arrived the day after the meeting of the Council, the delay not having arisen through any fault or negligence on his part. We are asked by the committee of the Dominion Farmers' Council to publish the paper in order that the members of the Council may have an opportunity of studying it and preparing for the postponed discussion. We are also asked to invite the farmers' clubs which are amalgamated with the Council to discuss the paper at their earliest opportunity, and send in the resolutions which they pass to the Secretary of the Council.

Mr. Waters incloses the following letter with his paper:

W. A. Macdonald, Esq., Secretary Dominion Farmers' Council:

SIR.—Enclosed you will find a few thoughts upon the proposed trade relations. They may not meet the views of the Council, but I may say