

THE CONCLUSION ARRIVED AT:

"From all we could learn we found that farmers in Jefferson and St. Lawrence Counties, where we visited, pay as much or more for what they have to purchase and get no more for the produce they have to sell than do farmers in the County of Leeds. We also found that they are not any more prosperous, and from all we could gather are more heavily mortgaged than farmers in the County of Leeds. We also found that well improved farms of the very best of soil, free from broken lands, and lying within from two to ten miles of the city of Ogdensburg, as well as in other localities where we made enquiries, can be purchased much cheaper than lands of the same quality with same improvements similarly situated in the County of Leeds; that lands have depreciated in value more in the last ten years in St. Lawrence and Jefferson Counties than similarly situated lands in the County of Leeds."

During the last session of Parliament the position of the Canadian farmer as compared with his brother farmer in the United States attracted a good deal of attention, especially with respect to the articles of binder twine and coal oil—the duty on both of which articles was materially reduced by the Government. The general contention of the Opposition was, in effect, that the operation of the National Policy was to increase to the farmer the cost of those articles he was obliged to purchase, and to lessen the prices which he could obtain for the farm and other articles he produced. It was further argued by Sir Richard Cartwright and other Opposition orators that the value of the farm lands had greatly declined on account of the adoption of a Protective policy in 1879; that mortgages had increased; that the general condition of the farmer in Canada was worse than it was in the United States, and that the only remedy for such a state of things was closer trade relations with the United States, whereby the Canadian farmer would have access to their "market of