

increase home production and home consumption, and that contention has been borne out over and over again. Wherever manufacturing industries have been established, a greater number of men have been employed in those industries, and all these men are consumers of manufactured goods and of farm products. There is a vast quantity of vegetables and perishable articles which farmers are not able to ship out of the country, but for which they find a ready sale in the home market, wherever manufacturing business is carried on, because the people have the ready money to pay for those goods. I may say that the farming community for twenty miles about Hamilton find a ready market for their fruit and vegetables. If the farmers were obliged to export those goods, the goods would have to pass through the hands of one or two commission merchants, who would eat up the profits which the farmers now keep for themselves by selling direct to the consumers. I may say that the farmers surrounding Hamilton supply themselves with groceries and a great part of their clothing by the sale of their vegetables and other farm produce in the home market supplied them to-day by the protective policy. So, I claim that the farmers are greatly benefited in that way. All kinds of farm produce meets with ready sale in the city of Hamilton. I contend that the protective policy, instead of having benefited the manufacturers at the expense of the farmers, has benefited the latter class as well as the former. A careful estimate places the entire product of the Ontario farms at \$500,000,000, of which about one-tenth is exported, the balance being used for home consumption. This proves that the home market is, by all odds, the best for our farmers. The question to be asked is, Would it be well to jeopardize the home market, which consumes so large a portion of our agricultural products, for the possible good that might arise from the free entry of the one-tenth we have to spare into the markets of the United States? Time and time again the people have said, no. It is claimed that Canada has not prospered under the National Policy, but statistics prove the very reverse. Take the case of our farming population, for instance, and see how it compares with the farming population in the United States. According to the reports of the Ontario Bureau of Industries—and hon. gentlemen opposite will not question the truth of statements issued from that quarter—the value of farm lands, buildings, implements, and live stock in Ontario in 1882 was \$882,624,610, while in 1889 it was \$982,210,664, an increase of nearly one hundred millions of dollars in seven years in the wealth of the farmers of the province of Ontario alone. Take the condition of the Canadian and American farmers to-day, and what do we find?

The farms in the Dominion of Canada are mortgaged to the extent of about \$80,000,000, and it is a well-known fact that the greater part of this indebtedness has been incurred in order to improve old farms or acquire new ones. The New York "Times," one of the most reliable journals in the United States, recently made the following statement:—

The farms in our state (New York) are mortgaged for over \$700,000,000. * * * The farmers of the United States are staggering under a burden of mortgage indebtedness approximating nine thousand millions of dollars. The greater portion of the money represented by the faces of these mortgages has not been expended in improving the farms, because the larger proportion were supplied with buildings before the mortgages were laid. The money has been spent to enable the farmers to live.

It is contended that our farmers would be benefited greatly by obtaining free admission for their products into the United States markets. Why? The United States export agricultural products every year to the value of \$400,000,000, after supplying home consumption; so it is apparent that it would not be of very great advantage to our farmers to compete in a market already overstocked. Unrestricted reciprocity of trade with the United States would, moreover, seriously affect our trade with Great Britain, for the policy means, if it means anything, that we would have to meet the same duty there as the rest of the world, including the United States, has to meet. In 1878 our exports of animals and their products to Great Britain amounted to the value of \$9,060,279, while to the United States it was of the value of \$4,483,206; in 1890, the same class of exports to Great Britain amounted to the value of \$18,578,722, while to the United States the value was only \$5,906,474. So we see the home market was altogether more satisfactory to our farmers. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Rider) referred in the course of his speech to the expenditure on the experimental farm. I was under the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite were the great friends of the farmers; yet they claim that the Government should not have expended so large a sum in furnishing means to educate our farmers in the highest degree possible in regard to agriculture. I am sure the Government have taken all possible means to instruct our farmers, they have issued books of various kinds, and have engaged men of great experience as lecturers, and have adopted other methods to give our products high standing, not only in Canada, but throughout the world, and when the hon. gentleman found fault with the expenditure on the experimental farm, I thought he was certainly not very friendly to the farming community of this country. Diversity of industry is necessary to complete success. No nation that ever attained