

great captains of industry in this country could teach him nothing. The wholesale merchants, the bankers, the railroad men, the manufacturers, the miners, the farmers, the lumbermen, and the steamboat men, came to the hon. gentleman to impress their views upon him and to show that the existing condition of things was ruining the artizan class, and was driving them out of the country to build up foreign cities, but they could teach the hon. gentleman nothing. He was described very well by one gentleman as sitting there like a fretful porcupine with his quills set against every man who approached him. In those days, as good luck would have it, there sat on the other side of the House men who did not know everything, men who could learn, men who knew that the industrial condition of this country had changed, men who discovered some things which these hon. gentlemen did not see. They took up this policy—not a protective policy, but a national policy. They knew that there never could be a strong nation built up in this Dominion unless it had diversified industries. They knew that if most of the industrial power of this country was absorbed by the republic to the south of us, there never could be any strength or permanence in this Canada of ours. This is the reason that many of us who were trained to free trade in our colleges, who were taught by free trade professors, who had read free trade books, learned, when we came to open our eyes and see the signs of the times, that while free trade might be a good policy for European countries where different conditions prevailed, it was not the policy for Canada. Those free trade books were written by men accustomed to different industrial institutions, and under the inspiration of old world ideals which have not been realized, for even the nations of Europe have not become free trade states. Our Conservative statesmen, with the common-sense ideas acquired by being daily in touch with all classes of the people, gave the people what they wanted, I will not go over the other arguments which in those days were put forward, such as that about Canada being made the slaughter market of the United States. We were 4,000,000, and they were ten times as many, and they needed only to add 10 per cent. to their output in many lines of production in order to supply our wants. Thus they could glut our market and destroy our productive industries; and when these were once destroyed, they could amply recoup themselves by raising the prices of their goods. Herein is the justification for eight-tenths of a cent per pound which the hon. Minister of Finance has laid on refined sugars. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford said there were no intelligent protectionists. There are no intelligent free traders in Canada. Free trade is a fetish, and the days have gone by when men will worship it. Protection with many men is a fetish. Every community, however, must deal with its own problems from its own point of view. That is what our people have done, and that precisely accounts for the fact that the Conservative party have carried the elections of 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891. I never was a protectionist in my life, but I have favoured a policy which has guarded our home market from absorption by our neighbours in the American Republic. The hon. member for South Oxford, in attacking the Budget speech, laid great stress on the decline of farming and farm

values. He said that the value of farms in the Province of Ontario during the operation of the National Policy had gone down from 25 to 33 per cent. in forty-nine cases out of fifty. Here was another of those unfortunate, naked assertions for which that hon. gentleman is becoming famous, and on account of which he is coming to be not very carefully listened to in the House of Commons. I desire to put against his naked and unsupported words the record of statistics which are the latest in point of time that I could find in the library. They are from the Report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1888, published by Mr. Blue, an authority which I do not think the hon. gentleman will repudiate. It tells us that the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario, instead of having depreciated, have in the seven years from 1882 to 1888, appreciated in value \$8,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh.

Mr. WELDON. I will read you the figures. In 1882, the value of farm lands in Ontario was \$632,000,000; seven years later their value had increased to \$640,000,000. In the same period the value of farm buildings increased from \$182,000,000 to \$188,000,000, the value of farm implements from \$37,000,000 to \$49,000,000, and the value of live stock from \$80,000,000 to \$102,000,000. In that period the value of farm lands, buildings, implements and stock in Ontario has increased from \$882,000,000 to \$982,000,000, an increase of \$100,000,000 in seven years, which, I think, is a pretty good showing. I wonder if the hon. gentleman, when he next goes into Ontario, will have the effrontery to tell the people that farm property has gone down in value?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think I would.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not even understand the figures you are quoting.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for South Oxford, by way of making an attack on the National Policy, has called our attention, as he has been accustomed to do for many years, to the movement of our population away from the country. This is a subject of great interest all the world over; but I know of no cheaper trick on the part of the demagogue than to take some fact which is not traceable to tariff policies or fiscal policies, because it is as patent in free trade countries as in protectionist countries—which is visible all the world over—which operates in almost equal strength in the United States and in Canada, in free trade Scotland, in free trade England, in protective Germany, in Switzerland—which is as universal as the atmosphere—and attributes the same phenomenon in his own country to the defects of the Government. I say it is one of the most cheap and despicable arts of the demagogue. Now, what is the fact as to the movement of population in this country? I will not follow the bad example of that hon. gentleman—I will not pit my naked assertion against his; but I will read from the record, although not at such length as to weary the House. The statement I read is from the *Toronto Globe* of three days ago, an authority the value of which I hope the hon. gentleman will recognize: