

at length, because, I think, the other day the Finance Minister very ably and conclusively showed, that so far as that contention was concerned, there was really no truth in the allegation. But the Government side of the House refutes that idea, and contends that it is as essential to agriculture that this interest should be protected as it is that protection should be extended to our manufacturing industries. It was shown by the Finance Minister, also, that the market of the Canadian farmers had been increased to an enormous extent, that in consequence of the adoption of the National Policy the home market had been greatly extended last year, there being no less than seven million bushels of additional Canadian grain sold in our own market, which large amount was formerly taken by the farmers of the United States. A large market in this country formerly lay open to the farmers of the United States, who had by competition taken from them a large portion of their own market. It is very strange when hon. gentlemen in Opposition state that it is an evil to our farmers to have a large market at their hearths, and that notwithstanding this market, they derived no good from it. Is there a single business man in the House who would say it would be an injury to him to have a large additional number of customers? But what will hold good as regards those engaged in other industries will hold good as respects our farmers. I think we shall be able to show conclusively by the committee that not only have they obtained a large market for their produce, but large additional prices. With regard to the classes of grain grown in this country, and other produce and cattle, I shall not go into that subject particularly to-night. The Government has already referred, by the Finance Minister, to that subject on the Tariff discussion; but I may call attention to a few important points as regards which our farmers have experienced most striking benefits. In the North-West market our Ontario farmers now enjoy a valuable trade in horses and cattle and the higher classes of stock. The result has been highly beneficial to the agricultural interests of this country. Horses which were formerly a drag in the markets of the older Provinces are now rapidly bought up for the North-West at large prices; the same applies to other kinds of stock. As our Ontario farmers have become large cattle graziers and are going extensively into the higher kinds of stock, it must be plain to every man who looks candidly at the question, that they will enjoy hereafter a large and profitable market in the North-West—and one not open to foreign countries. I might refer to other articles of farm produce, such as wool, but shall defer any reflections on that subject for the present. There is another point I wish to refer to, and that is the fact of the National Policy, in making money cheap, has resulted in great benefit to agriculture in this country. In consequence of the introduction of the National Policy to Canada, money has been kept in this country which used to be sent to foreign countries. The money which our farmers obtained for their grain which they sold in foreign markets was left there to buy the manufactures of those foreign markets, and the result was a stringency in the money market of Canada; but in consequence of the benefit which has accrued through the operation of this policy, we find money plentiful and cheap in Canada. Confidence is established in the British money markets, in Canadian securities, from the effect of the National Policy and the judicious management of the present Government in bringing about a system of surpluses, instead of the former system of deficits. The result has been to give confidence to British capitalists, and money is cheap in the Canadian market. Even the other day we saw in the Bank of England the rate of money was much increased; it went up one day, I think, to 7 per cent. Is it not strange that this did not effect the money market in Canada? The simple explanation is this: that British capitalists feel more confidence in

Canadian securities, than they do in British securities, because of the troubles that exist in the British Empire. The result of the cheap money in Canada has been to give greater stimulus to the production of agricultural products; and this year we find a very much larger amount has been supplied to our own people, and also a larger amount to Great Britain. Our exports have largely increased, in consequence of which many of our farmers have made improvements in their farms, and consequently have been enabled to raise more; in other words they have been enabled to produce two blades of grass where only one grew before. I need not refer to the benefit which has been derived by the large market for the perishable products of the farmer; but I will just refer to one point which I think conclusively shows that the price of grain has risen in Canada. Never before was spring wheat higher than fall wheat. Fall wheat does not continue to be affected so much by the National Policy as spring wheat. Why? Simply because spring wheat is used by our own millers, and our own people to make strong bakers flour; and the result is that spring wheat has risen in price and is now higher than fall wheat, through the inauguration of the National Policy. I think this conclusively proves that the effect of the National Policy, on that kind of wheat at any rate, has been highly beneficial to the Canadian farmer. Now, Sir, it is strange that hon. gentlemen opposite will continue to maintain that it is better for us to buy our manufactured goods in Great Britain and in the United States than in Canada. I would like to know why it is that Great Britain and other manufacturing nations in Europe have so high a market for agricultural products? Is it not because they have a large accumulation of artisans and laborers employed in manufacturing goods? Why, then, should we not endeavor, if possible, to transfer the artisans of Europe and Great Britain to this country in order to manufacture for our own people and thus provide for the increased population that will come into this country through the development of our great North-West. We have regions yet to be developed whose importance we can hardly realize. We see that the iron industry of the United States has increased to an enormous extent within the last twenty years. In 1860 the iron industries of the United States produced \$24,000,000 worth. In 1880 those industries in that country had increased their products to the value of \$450,000,000. Now, Sir, with our resources of iron and coal and our other facilities for entering into the manufacture of various classes of ironware, it is evident to all who will look to their country's interest, that there is a great future before us in the development of that industry, and that the development of that industry will be beneficial to the farmers, none can deny. If such high prices for farm products in Great Britain is caused by the large manufacturing centres there, the development of those manufacturing centres in this country will have a similar result. There is no reason why we should not have a higher and continually increasing market for the farm produce in our own country. The object of the committee will be to gather all the information they can and place it in as clear a light as possible before this House and before the farmers of this country, so as to enable them to express their views in a manner similar to that in which they did so before the former committee. Hon. gentlemen may, perhaps, then be able to put into some sort of comprehensible shape the policy which they have been seeking to lay before the country. I think it will be thought a great benefit to hon. gentlemen opposite, and also satisfactory to those on this side, when the report of that committee is brought before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to replace the name of Mr. Allison by that of Mr. Plumb.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is important that such a committee should be appointed, if it is within the province