

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And yet they do leave by tens and hundreds of thousands for the United States.

Mr. COLBY. Yes, some do go to the United States. I did not intend to touch upon that point, but now I will—a little later on. The hon. gentleman was speaking of the sad case of the farmer in Ontario. Now, Sir, I am going to speak to you for a few moments of the condition of farmers in the United States, and I do not do so with any degree of satisfaction, but with a very great deal of regret. I am sorry that their condition is such, but it is an incontrovertible fact that all the older States—the northern and eastern of the United States—are in a condition as much worse than the hon. member pictures Ontario to be, and he pictures it worse than it really is, as one can fairly imagine. I would take, for instance, that good old State of Vermont. Some people may say : Oh, well, Vermont is not a good agricultural State ; but I say, with a full knowledge of the State of Vermont—for I know it from one end to the other—that it compares favorably with the farming districts of the Dominion throughout, and I think I might almost say with some favored districts of Ontario. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) need not shake his head. I know it, almost every inch of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) You do not know every inch of Ontario.

Mr. COLBY. I do not know every inch of Ontario, but the person who tells you that the beautiful valley of the Champlain is not one of the finest valleys in all the north—my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Wright) knows it, because I think he is familiar with that locality—tells you what is not correct. When a person tells you, Sir, that the valley of the Connecticut River, which is one of the most beautiful on the continent, comparing almost with that of the Shenandoah, one of the richest alluvial valleys, is not a fine agricultural section, he tells you what he knows nothing about. If he tells you of those beautiful pastures, those hill-side pastures in Vermont, which are unsurpassed in any part of this continent for dairy purposes, for pure water, for sweet and luxuriant feed, if he says we have better pastures in Canada than those for dairy purposes, I tell him he does not know Vermont as well as I do. Yet what is the condition of agriculture in that State ? I will give the hon. gentleman an object lesson. No later than the 1st of January, 1890, the commissioner of agricultural and manufacturing interests in the State of Vermont, under instructions from the State, published this circular, and this map, and this invitation :

“ Showing the location of towns in which are unoccupied farms and lands occupied, which can be bought at about the same price as those occupied. Good farms with fair buildings and maple sugar orchards, can be purchased at from \$3 to \$5 per acre, others with better buildings and near railway or village, can be bought for from \$5 to \$10 per acre. None of these lands are far from a ready market, and all are adapted to dairy purposes. Payments made easy. Farm labor is in great demand at good wages. In many sections those desiring can procure work through the winter on wood and lumber jobs.”

Now, where are those lands ? In what part of the State ? I ask hon. members opposite to look at the proportion of that map which is marked red, and there you see the proportion, in the Connecticut Valley, in some of the best counties and towns in

Vermont, of lands that are to be sold from \$3 and \$5 an acre, and many of them unoccupied. That is the record put out by the Commissioner of that State, and it includes sixty townships in ten out of the fifteen counties which constitute the State.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the advantage of protection to agriculturists.

Mr. COLBY. Very well, the advantage of that system you wish to unite with. My hon. friend wishes to pool the farmers of Ontario with the farmers of the United States. I tell him that the farmers of Ontario are better off to-day. They do not want to go into partnership with the farmers of Vermont ; they do not want to come under any of those conditions which have brought Vermont to the situation in which she finds herself to-day. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to sneer, to sit there and show a great glee, as if he had superior knowledge to that of every other person, to look pompously down upon the opinions of other people, but I tell the hon. gentleman that if the farmers in Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada are in a better condition than the farmers in Vermont and in New York—and statistics show that they are—it is because we have protected our farmers ; I declare that boldly, it is because we have given protection to our farmers in our markets, so that the products of the farmer may be sold at fair prices in the local market. Hon. gentlemen opposite have the most singular faculty of misapprehending facts. It is only after an election, when they have been shown the true feeling of the country that they have any realisation of them, and that awakening only lasts for six or twelve months ; but the old fatuity comes back, the old self-conceit comes back again, they know more than anybody else, and they go again to their destruction, as they are going now. Sir, pork in my county, pork in the County of Missisquoi, in the County of Brome, and throughout the Eastern Townships, has been reduced in price more than a cent a pound, by pork coming in from St. Albans, and other places in the State of Vermont, paying one cent a pound duty and reducing the value of pork in our market. That being the case, if we are not inundated and overwhelmed by the products of the United States coming into competition with the products of our farmers, we owe it largely to the protective tariff, and to it is due, in a very large degree, the superior condition of the farmers in Canada to that of the farmers of the United States. Even now, does the hon. gentleman suppose that we for one moment could compete on even terms in the markets that are common to Canada and the United States, if we were one country ? Can we produce corn as cheaply as they can ? Can we produce the equivalent of corn as cheaply as they can ? I say we cannot. Our barley is the nearest equivalent to their corn for feeding purposes. The unrestricted admission of their corn would lower the price of our barley. That would be the effect also upon all the coarse grains which the farmers do produce, and will produce, notwithstanding the high scientific farming that is coming by-and-by. The average price of corn in Chicago for seven or eight years past, has been 40 cents per bushel, while that of Canadian barley for the same period has been about 57 cents per bushel. The effect of an intimate relation with the United States, of being upon even terms with them, would be to bring down the prices of our