

for the year 1892. According to that report, the value of the following field crops, wheat, oats, rye, peas, corn, buckwheat, beans, barley, potatoes, mangel-wurtzel, carrots, turnips, hay, in 1891, was \$130,866,000, and in 1892, \$110,563,000, showing a decrease of \$20,303,000, in 1892, as compared with 1891. On 250,000 farms, that would represent an average loss to each farmer of \$812. Yet we have men in this House who will probably, before this debate is through, get up and say that the farmers are as well off now as they were years ago. Although the products of each farm yielded \$812 less in 1892 than in 1891, yet we have men in this House, sufficiently intelligent to be selected as representatives of constituencies, who will, in the face of these figures, taken from official sources, tell us that the farmers of this country are as well off this year as they ever were. My comprehension may be limited, but that certainly is one thing I cannot understand. Now, the Government may ask, how could we help all this? Supposing the farmers do not sell as much as they did, supposing their lands are cheaper in value, can we increase the prices? What can we do for the farmers? I will tell you, Sir, what the Government can do. They can leave the farmers alone; they can let them hew out their own destiny, which they would do much more effectively and satisfactorily than they are doing at present. You do not find the farmers coming to Parliament as lobbyists. You do not find them so crowding our passages here that you can hardly get through from one place to the other. You do not find them coming to ask favours and special legislation to increase their profits. All they ask, and they ask it emphatically, is to be let alone to do the best they can with their products. They ask to be allowed to sell where they can realize the most, and to buy where they will pay the least, so that if they lose in one way they will save in the other. This Parliament, however, has not acted justly by the farmers, but has placed burdens upon them, and that in the very face of the depreciation of their property and reduced prices for their products. In the Speech from the Throne, the Government have announced that these burdens shall be continued. Their raw material is taxed. On their farm implements, there are duties levied to the extent of 18 to 20 per cent, and in some cases even 60 per cent over the average duty of 30 per cent imposed on other articles. Our agriculturists say to Parliament: Gentlemen, we want you to take off the burdens you have put on; reduce the taxation on agricultural implements and on iron; reduce the duty on coal oil, barbed wire, and manufactured goods generally—woollens, the cheaper kinds of clothing, cottons, boots, and shoes. Give us a fair field, they cry, and we want no favour. We can stand on our own energy and industry.

and hew out, unaided, happy and prosperous homes for ourselves. There is another thing which the Government can do. Our farmers are, to a very large extent, shut out of their natural market, and the Government have been promising for the last few years to take steps to pull down the fence now raised so high between the two nations who ought, in trade matters, to mingle and intermingle freely with each other. The Americans produce many articles which we require, cheaper than we can produce them, and there are many things which we can produce cheaper than the Americans can, so that there is every opportunity for reciprocal trade if no barriers were raised to prevent it. We all know what honourable distinction Canada gained at the World's Fair. I was never so proud of being a Canadian as last October when I visited the Chicago exhibition and saw the high position our country took. In grain, our Canadian farmers won no less than 197 awards for their exhibits. In flour, oatmeal, &c., they took 24 awards. In honey, they carried off 17 awards. In swine, they gained 50 awards. Their cattle bore off 184 awards. Out of 352 sheep which they exhibited, 250 took awards, whereas, out of 478 sheep exhibited by the United States, only 193 took awards, so that while 71 per cent of our sheep gained prizes, only 40 per cent of the American sheep earned this distinction. Does not that prove that if we had an open market for our butter, cattle, sheep, honey, swine, &c., we could profitably dispose of them in the large centres of the United States? Our best cattle would go to the cities of Detroit and Chicago, and other western cities, where they would come into competition with the inferior beef from Texas and Mexico and the Indian Territory; and the rich customers in those western cities, who do not look so much to the price as to the quality, would certainly purchase our cattle in preference to inferior stock. The same remark applies to our sheep. Let me give you, briefly, the results which Canada achieved at that exhibition. Our cattle, horses, sheep, swine and poultry obtained 963 awards, out of an exhibit of 1,847 animals, or 51 of our animals out of every hundred took prizes. Compare this with the United States exhibit. The United States exhibited 4,005 of these animals, and obtained only 1,494 awards, so that only 37 of their animals out of every hundred came to the front. This proves that if we had an open market for these products in that country we should have a large and lucrative trade. Sir, I take up now the subject of cheese. You all know that in her cheese exhibits Canada swept the board, that neither the United States nor any other country had any place. Canada took no less than 392 awards for cheese, and in some cases the excellence of this cheese was recorded at 99½ points, 100 being perfection. Suppose we had the Am-