

(December 29)

The Grain Growers and the Manufacturers.

BY MR. T. A. RUSSELL.*

ADDRESSING the Canadian Club on the subject, "The Grain Growers and the Manufacturers," Mr. T. A. Russell said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—Forty-three years ago, far-sighted statesmen in this country concluded a union of the scattered British provinces of North America and laid the basis of our national existence. For a generation succeeding there were many who thought this a mistake; who thought this scattered fringe of land at the northern end of the continent could hope for no separate political existence; that we must naturally ally ourselves in all matters of trade if not of politics with the powerful nation to the south; that our commercial enterprise must be confined to the cutting of timber, the catching of fish, and the growing of grain and cattle to be exported to the United States.

But the far-sightedness of our own statesmen, aided by the domineering attitude of our southern friends, changed our history and made Canada a nation.

But important above all, there was developed a national spirit which refused to wait suppliant at the door of the United States or any other country, and a policy adopted which aimed at the all round development of Canada as an agricultural and an industrial people.

This policy was not adopted without a struggle. Many a loyal Canadian thought the proposition a hopeless one. During this period there were arguments for free trade, for low tariff, for commercial union, yea, even for political union and annexation. Slowly and not without effort, however, a national fabric was reared. Our great transcontinental railway was a success,

*Mr. T. A. Russell is Chairman of the Tariff Committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and General Manager of the Canada Cycle & Motor Co., Ltd. His earlier experience as a lecturer in Economics in Toronto University, and as Secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, particularly qualify him to deal with such a subject from a manufacturer's standpoint. His address to the Canadian Club and his relation to the tariff through the Canadian Manufacturers' Association gave him a leading part in the tariff controversy during the succeeding weeks.

our population grew, industries were founded, cities sprang up, our canals teemed with commerce.

Gradually argument as to the policy that should guide our destiny grew less and less. The great Liberal party which in the early days had feared the result of any measure of protection, came to power in 1896 pledged to tariff revision. They came, however, pledged to give the best they had to the service of their country, and during their term of office, appointed two Commissions to take evidence and examine into our national requirements.

What was the result? No upheaval of policy, but the studied application of a moderately protective and revenue tariff amended from time to time as conditions changed. Discussion as to free trade or protection gradually ceased and our country has gone ahead and prospered under a stable fiscal policy.

But a new element has come to the front. A great deputation of farmers (or rather grain-growers) has come down from the west demanding a complete reversal of public policy; demanding a large measure of free trade; and what is particularly of interest in view of our earlier national experience, demanding reciprocity with the United States.

And they are in earnest. They have made their demands with western vigor, and I think you will agree, painted their wrongs with western exaggeration. We have heard again how the farmer is paying tribute to the manufacturer, how the heel of the manufacturer is on the neck of the farmer, of how the hard earned dollars are unfairly taken from him to the profit of a privileged manufacturing class. They have been outspoken. I would be wanting in courtesy if I were not outspoken in reply. I hope I shall not be lacking in courtesy.

The organization of this delegation was under the Grain Growers' Associations of the three prairie provinces, connected and identified, as Mr. Partridge, one of the leaders told you, with the Grain Growers' Grain Company. It is a company with assets of \$820,000, has investments in bank stock and other securities of \$199,000, purchased real estate for an office in Winnipeg at a price said to be \$155,000, paid a cash dividend of 15 per cent. on its paid-up stock and carried forward \$56,000. Not bad for a "poor farmer."

These great organizations are, through their organizing meetings, their press and their public speakers, spreading sentiment tending to inflame the farmer against the manufacturer. Think what this means. A great many of these men are comparatively new Canadians, some from Great Britain, some from the United States, others from the overcrowded countries of

Central Europe. Think what it means to have a body of men, a great many of whom have not been in the country 20 years, and are unacquainted with our national history or development, and all of whom are engaged in a single industry, demanding with all the confidence, all the assurance of prosperous youth, that the whole policy of the country developed through generations and affecting every class and industry in the country shall at one fell swoop be changed at their bidding. Is it reasonable? Is it sensible?

Now, what of these men individually? Are they the farmers we know or think of? Our mind turns to our fathers or grandfathers who cleared the land of the virgin forest, who toiled with their hands to win a farm as the reward of a lifetime's toil; who carried on the back of their horse, or, perhaps on their own back, the sack of grain for their bread through the forest where they followed the path by the blaze on the trees. But for these men a different day has dawned,—their land is ready for the plow, a beneficent government spreads the payment for it over years enough for the crops that grow on it to meet. A nation has toiled to build railroads to their doors, agricultural implements with spring seats have been devised for every form of work and the maker spreads the payment over one, two or three years. What says John Hawkes, of Regina:

The farmer as a down-trodden, over-burdened, oppressed man is beginning to be the best joke of the century. In the west he has two or three new trunk railroads, with more heaving in sight. The Hudson Bay and innumerable branch railroads are to be his. The Georgian Bay Canal is to be made for his wheat. The old canals are to be deepened. Untold millions are to be found by the people of Canada for this purpose, and by whom? In the long run by the consumers of the farmers' products—by the farmers' customers.

Like all other classes, there are all kinds of western farmers. But they are no down-trodden class. The heel of the manufacturer has not been on their neck; it has been at the foot of the ladder steadying it so that they might mount. Many of them are landlords, who measure their possessions in the denominations by which countries and continents are measured, that is, square miles. Many live in towns and farm by proxy, simply letting contracts for sowing and reaping. I met more than one man in the west threshing 100,000 bushels of grain. Many I say are landlords, not farmers. Others of course are not.

We as manufacturers grudge them not this—rather we are glad. We rejoice in their prosperity, but surely we have a right to ask that they drop the fervid oratory talk about paying tribute to anyone; when it is the common knowledge in Canada to-day that there is no class in Canada making so great a return on his cash investment as the farmer in northwestern Canada. Can this delegation speak for the farmers of Canada? John Hawkes, Regina, says again:

I venture to say, as a matter of cold fact, that the Western farmer of to-day—the type of farmer who is represented by the Grain Growers' Association—instead of being overtaxed, does not pay his full share to the taxes of the Dominion in proportion to the prosperity he enjoys.

There is an old saying "Let well enough alone." I believe that the present tariff in Canada is as fair, reasonable and businesslike as it is possible to frame one. Farmers and manufacturers would do well to frankly recognize the fact and be contented with such modifications as circumstances may call for as time goes on. Both of them are in clover to-day if they only knew it. The young Canadian farmers know nothing about reciprocity—have never considered it. The Americans, British, Germans, Hungarians, Poles, are necessarily uninformed. Before anyone ventures to say what the Western farmer's views on reciprocity are, let that same farmer have time to figure out the difference between a customer and a competitor.

David Jackson, Grimsby, says in the *Hamilton Spectator* of November 8, 1910:

In view of the fact that Parliament meets soon, it might be well to let the Government know that Mr. Drury, "Grand Master of the Grange" (who has boasted in a recent letter to the *Globe and Farmers' Advocate* that he will appear before them asking for a reduction in the tariff) does not represent the views of the farmers in Ontario. In speaking about the farmers of the West asking Laurier for free trade, he says "the farmers of the East are at one" with them, that the agricultural press and "farmers' associations" are all in favor of free trade or tariff for revenue only. Would like to ask by what authority he puts himself up as the mouthpiece of the "farmers of the East?" Who are the Grangers, anyway, and how many are there in Niagara Peninsula? The answer, methinks, is that they are practically a defunct organization.

The writer recently asked ten staunch Liberals like himself and who are also engaged in mixed farming their views on reciprocity. Nine out of the ten were against, seven were for higher duties, saying it would cause the Yankees to build here. The one exception is a ward of the United States receiving a pension.

The province of Quebec is satisfied with the present tariff, and does not ask for any revision. It is becoming more and more a manufacturing centre, and is attracting to its large centres a population which makes a constant demand for agricultural products.

The Ontario Fruit Growers' Association passed this resolution:

Resolved—That in view of the possible negotiations with the United States in regard to reciprocity of tariffs, the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association wish to place on record their unqualified disapproval of any reduction of the duties in fruit coming into Canada without consulting a committee to be appointed by the association. The duty is now much lower than the duties on manufactured goods and lower than they ought to be in view of the fact that there can be no monopoly or combine in fruit; the price being fixed absolutely by the law of supply and demand.

The Winnipeg Vegetable Growers sent this petition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and to the members of the House of Commons at Ottawa:

We, the members of the Kildonan and St. Paul's Agricultural Society, in annual meeting assembled, humbly desire to impress upon your honorable body the importance of the duty now being imposed upon green vegetables coming into Winnipeg from the United States. We therefore petition that this duty be left as at present, and sincerely hope that your government will not remove the same, as asked for by the wholesalers of the City of Winnipeg in the session of 1909, as it would be the means of depriving our gardeners of a very large proportion of their earnings, and in fact, many of them would have to go out of business.

Fruit growers of British Columbia are alarmed and are preparing to make themselves heard.

These are only a few indications, got not by any agitation or advertising, but they serve to show that the farmers of Canada are not only not a unit, but that great and important sec-

tions feel the importance of the home market and are prepared to fight for its development and maintenance. In fact I am sure that only the slightest opportunity to organize would be seized by thousands of farmers to say "no" to the demands of the grain growers.

Mr. Drury, Master of the Dominion Grange, spoke for Ontario farmers. For how many of them is he authorized through the Grange to speak? Mr. James, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, says there are 175,000 farmers in Ontario. Does Mr. Drury represent half, or 10 per cent.? No, I venture to say it is nearer 1 per cent. But whether rich or poor, representative of all farmers or not, they had a right to a fair hearing and fair consideration for their requests. Our thought as manufacturers was that there was room for exchange of ideas between farmer and manufacturer; we sent a cordial invitation to them to visit some of our great industries, accept our hospitality and together talk over the problem of our common country. So that our position might not be misunderstood, we sent our Assistant Secretary to Winnipeg to personally convey the invitation. Then representative members of our Council also waited at Ottawa. But the invitation was declined.

One of the members of the Montreal Harbor Commission went to Ottawa to invite the delegation to view the great national work being done at the port of Montreal with a view to cheapening the transportation of grain and other commodities. The invitation was declined.

That was not the right spirit. If the cause were right, it would be advanced by meeting and discussing with all classes. No one section either east or west has all the wisdom or statesmanship, and we have much to gain in this vast land by trying to forget that there is any east or any west but by coming together and in the light of common knowledge seeking to get a common ground from which to work. More will be gained than by inflaming the farmer against the merchant or manufacturer.

The trouble is the west seems to have lost all sense of perspective. Living in an air of continual self-advertisement, it is in danger of absorbing the idea that all that is of value is west of the great lakes. The West is grand, but it can still be reminded of some facts about the older East:—

(1) The dairy produce of Ontario approaches the value of the Western wheat crop.

(2) The hay crop of Ontario alone last year was equal in value to the whole wheat crop of the three prairie Provinces.

(3) The value of live stock slaughtered in Ontario last year was greater in value than the wheat crop of the West.

I mention these points not to lessen the importance of the West, but to show how great is our country, how complicated its questions, and therefore how carefully, how broadly and generously we should approach the solution of our national problems. Frankly, I was disappointed to find reference to the development of Hudson's Bay route as our national salvation in transportation. The Hudson's Bay project may be all right. We in the East feel we know little about it. We are, I think, skeptical about its practical advantages, but generally I believe we are prepared to accept the judgment of the Westerner, who should know more about it than we do, and contribute our share to it if it is believed to be a national asset.

But would it not have been fair of this great deputation to refer to our past efforts to provide transportation to the West; to have expressed some appreciation of the Government's great work in building the National Transcontinental Railway; to have approved of the grain shipping facilities being provided at the nation's cost in Montreal and other points; to have encouraged the building up of our waterways system by deepening our canals or even by building the Georgian Bay Canal? Would it not have been more Canadian than building all our hopes on a Hudson's Bay Railway or shipment of grain via Panama and Tehautepec?

Let us look at the tariff requests of the farmers' delegation at Ottawa:

1. That we strongly favor reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States in all horticultural, agricultural and animal products, spraying materials, fertilizers, illuminating, fuel and lubricating oils, cement, fish and lumber.

2. Reciprocal free trade between the two countries in all agricultural implements, machinery, vehicles and parts of each of these; and in the event of a favorable arrangement being reached, it be carried into effect through the independent action of the respective governments, rather than by the hard and fast requirements of a treaty.

3. We also favor the principle of the British preferential tariff, and urge an immediate lowering of the duties on all British goods to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff schedule, whatever that may be; and that any trade advantages given to the United States in reciprocal trade relations be extended to Great Britain.

4. For such further gradual reduction of the remaining preferential tariff as will ensure the establishment of com-

plete free trade between Canada and the Motherland within ten years.

5. That the farmers of this country are willing to face direct taxation in such form as may be advisable to make up the revenue required under new tariff conditions.

The first call is for reciprocity in natural products. Would this be profitable for Canada? This is hard to answer, too hard for me. But I will offer a few suggestions: Doubtless larger markets always benefit the producer, if not accompanied by some other disadvantage. But is it for us to talk of tariff reduction to the United States? For the past ten years our purchases from the United States were \$1,600,000,000—their purchases from us \$800,000,000. They are twelve times greater in population. In other words our purchases from the United States were \$30 per head—theirs from us \$1.10 per head. The United States average tariff on all goods dutiable and free is 24 per cent., ours 16 per cent. Theirs on dutiable goods 42 per cent., ours 27 per cent. That is, their tariff barrier was over 50 per cent. higher than ours. If reciprocity negotiation will remove this inequality we will all rejoice.

Sir George Ross points out that Canada has much to lose if the identity of her wheat and her flour is lost through mixture with inferior United States grades. During the last three years the export of flour from the United States to Britain has fallen off, while from Canada it increased 100 per cent. He points out that Canadian cheese has now driven United States cheese out of the English market. Are we to sacrifice that position so dearly bought?

At a time when greater attention than ever before is being paid to the conservation of great natural resources are we to throw down the barriers to our great forests and have their products exported in a crude state to build up United States industry? Are we to sacrifice our sea-ports to those of New York, Boston and Portland, for this is what the United States advocates of reciprocity claim will result.

We hope the present negotiations will produce some results of value, but what we in Canada should say to our Government is this:—"We have the greatest confidence in the statesmanship that has guided our nation since Confederation; we want to meet our United States neighbors on a friendly basis, but we want you to feel that you are under no mandate to carry out any treaty or agreement unless you can see well and clearly to the end and feel sure that these changes will redound to the welfare of Canada.

"We are doing well; our country is growing. Time is with us, and if to-day you cannot secure for us terms that are not only good but the best that can be had, we are content to wait, to go on as we are expanding our factories, building railways, filling up the west as we have been doing for the past decade.

"We know that the time is near at hand when the United States needs many of our products and is prepared to lower her tariff to get them whether she gets reductions in return or not."

The second request for reciprocal free trade on all the manufactured goods the farmer buys means, of course, practically on everything, for commerce is so interrelated, and these industries call on so many others for raw material which in turn would have to be free that it means practically free trade all along the line. Think what this means. If such a policy were adopted we would see such a period of stagnation in Canada as we have never known. What industrial establishment would expand? What new ones be founded? We have now in Canada 180 branches of United States concerns, with a capital of \$225,000,000, employing 30,000 people. Would these people be here if it were not for our tariff? There is less reason for a branch here than for a concern to duplicate the plant in New York State. In the United States census of 1900 it was shown that there were 1,500,000 Canadians in the United States, or one-quarter of our whole population of Canada. Do we want that experience to be repeated? It will be if industrial development in Canada is stunted, for not all men will live on the farm. You ask why would this follow if we have access to their great market? Because of necessity any treaty, any concurrent legislation, any arrangement is for a term of years or is subject to change at will.

It is impracticable for any manufacturer in Canada to build and equip factories in a home market of 7,000,000 to cater for one of 100,000,000 when the 100,000,000 market may be closed in a year or a day. He could only invade the United States market safely with a United States factory. But how different with the United States manufacturer. He can stay at home, for even if this market were cut off in a day, his loss of trade which is only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of his whole can easily be made up in a good year's growth at home.

There is only one way in which a wide measure of reciprocity between the two countries can be adopted with profit to Canada, that is on a permanent basis, or in other words, on a basis of political union. If you believe that to be for the benefit of this country, and I take it that one and all we do not, then

wide and free reciprocity is possible; but on no other terms can the smaller nation place itself in free intercourse with the larger.

The third and fourth requests, for the maintenance of the British preference and its extension year by year to free trade, becomes, of course, practically a nullity if the reciprocal free trade with the United States as proposed before is adopted.

I wonder if the farmers have stopped to reason out the significance of their last request for direct taxation. The farmer grows more of what he uses and therefore buys less proportionately than any other citizen. Hence a tax on imports like a tariff, bears less on him than on any other citizen. What will direct taxation, largely or wholly on land values, do to him with his great holdings of land?

These proposals are radical, revolutionary. They might with propriety be advanced at a time when trade was dull, farmers getting low prices for their produce, our population shrinking, our factories idle and our country's credit low. But what are the facts? Our western country is being filled up as fast as we can assimilate the additions; railways are being constructed, our factories are busy, our country's credit never stood so high. And what of the farmer? In the west he has grown rich in a decade. In the Niagara peninsula his land values have increased ten fold. Throughout Canada he gets 50 per cent. more for his grain and fodder than he did a decade ago. 48 per cent. more for his meat; 33 per cent. more for his dairy produce—and this at the time when the cost of manufactured goods has as a whole remained stationary or decreased. Investigation shows that a fixed amount of farm produce will buy 50 per cent. more of general manufactured goods than twenty years ago.

Is this then a time for revolution, for experiment? No, rather let us continue our policy of fiscal stability which has been at the basis of our prosperity, and if it needs amendment, amend it with care after investigation as to the conditions.

Why then does the farmer make these demands? He is in earnest, but he is misinformed. Here are some of the statements given him and he has no means of judging their truth or falsity. Their speakers say without any shadow of proof in a written statement to the Premier that the tariff enhances the price of goods by just the amount of the tariff, whether the goods be made at home or imported. Mr. Drury illustrated this in a recent article by stating that Canadian-made farm implements were sold in Australia cheaper than in Canada. Now this is a good illustration, for binders enter Australia free. In Canada the duty is $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If the argument which was laid

before Sir Wilfrid in seriousness were true, binders would be 17½ per cent. dearer in Canada than in Australia. What are the facts? Implements are not only not cheaper in Australia, but they cannot name a single one that is not 20 per cent. dearer in Australia despite the fact that freight is lower to Melbourne than it is to Edmonton. A farmer hearing such statements might be expected to be heard from, but is it fair?

Another speaker says: "Boots and shoes manufactured in Canada amount to \$20,000,000; we imported \$1,178,000. It is conceded that the manufacturer adds the duty to his selling price, therefore on boots and shoes we paid the Government \$353,000 and the manufacturer \$6,000,000." Can you imagine a man so misstating a case? Why would our factories sell \$20,000,000 in competition with the great United States factories selling only \$1,000,000 if prices were equal?

Again, Mr. Drury says the home market is a myth. Mr. Scallion, President of the Manitoba Grain Growing Association, says the home market is a joke. What are the facts? Last year we exported \$53,900,000 of animals and their produce; \$90,400,000 of agricultural produce, or \$144,300,000 altogether; \$30,000,000 of this was manufactured farm and food products, leaving \$114,300,000 purely agricultural.

So as not to make their statements appear too absurd I will first compare only the produce of one province, that of Ontario. Why, the market value of the *grain crop of Ontario alone* last year was \$168,000,000, or \$54,000,000 more than the *farm exports of the whole of Canada*, and this takes no account of the animals and their produce, dairy products, or fruit. As a matter of fact Ontario farmers last year produced 2½ times in value as much as Canada as a whole exported in agricultural products. At the time of the last census the total value of farm produce in Canada was \$365,000,000. Our exports of farm produce, including manufactured farm products, were \$80,000,000. In other words, we consumed in this mythical home market 80 per cent. of all we produced. But this is not all. During the same year we imported of farm products, animals and their produce, \$30,000,000, or in other words the total consumption in Canada was 86 per cent. of the total product.

What does Commissioner Ruddick of the Department of Agriculture say:

The main reason for the decrease in exports of butter and cheese is the increased home consumption. I see no reason to deplore our decreased exports. On the contrary we have every reason to congratulate ourselves that

we have found another outlet in the enlarged home market. The lesson for us is that we should give more attention to our home trade, which has already been of more importance than we have generally recognized. I have only to state that we consume in Canada over two-thirds of our total dairy productions.

Does this sound as if the home market were a joke? Is it surprising that our farmers are aroused when they are taught such wrong statistics? I can see no excuse for Mr. Drury's position; for the western man's I can. Although we consume half the wheat grown in Canada we have a great surplus to export. And just so long as the grain growers go on *mining*, not *farming*, their land, just so long will they be careless about a home market. To-day the western farmer is growing wheat, wheat, wheat, year after year, keeping little or no stock, burning his straw, taking from the soil of its richness and giving nothing back.

Gentlemen, this very problem is of vastly greater importance to the future of the country than the tariff or our railway rates or any other one problem. It is the problem of the conservation of our resources, the question whether we will hand on to our children and our children's children a land fertile and improved or a land impoverished and depleted. You may think me out of my element on this subject. Listen to what practical farmers say.

Duncan Anderson, speaking at the National Live Stock Association, says:

The province of Manitoba is ready for a change in its system of agriculture. I asked one farmer how he put in his time during the winter. His answer to me was that he went to town during the winter four times a week, and his sons went down every night to play hockey.

They will not feed cattle. Yet nature has given them any amount of rough feed and straw that is burned could be used to good purpose. I venture to say that in this coming spring there will be enough food set fire to and burned to feed three-quarters of a million cattle. Can farming continue on this basis? The west is rich in the fertility of the soil, but that will not last forever.

Grain growing is all right in Manitoba, and in a large part of Saskatchewan, but when men are depending entirely upon a single crop system, they are going to be left—whether growing wheat in the West or potatoes in the East.

What does our great Canadian agricultural authority, Dr. Rutherford, say?

I must say I have listened with interest, and was almost entranced with Mr. Anderson's speech—it is a wonderful and complete account of agriculture and live stock conditions from sea to sea. That speech ought to be printed and a copy sent into the house of every farmer in the prairie country.

I see a number of Manitoba friends here who know that for years I preached on the same text that Mr. Anderson preached on to-night. In fact, in a year of a good crop of wheat, I used to say it was one of the worst things that could happen. Three times we got our farmers started into mixed farming; we had cheese factories started and we got them interested in cattle and hogs. In fact, we got things going nicely in the way of mixed farming and crop rotation. Then a good crop would come along and everybody would go crazy; they shut up the cheese factories and let the cattle freeze to death—all were filled with the dream of a dollar a bushel. That shows that these big crops have their drawbacks. I am convinced that moderate progress along agricultural lines will be of more benefit than those big crops. In certain older settled parts the land used to produce 30 bushels to the acre; the average this good year, was 18 bushels to the acre, and the average of the previous year was only 14 bushels to the acre. Considering that we call our prairie Provinces the granary of the world, is it not worthy of note that in England and Wales they grow 32 and 40 bushels to the acre? It shows that here we are following in the footsteps of the Genesee Valley, Indiana, Ohio, Minnesota and Dakota, only with the greater disadvantage that with the exception of the last of these States they were able to go into the cultivation of corn.

Gentlemen, this problem of getting the West into mixed farming, growing other produce than grain to be shipped away, feeding their straw and rough grain to stock, killing the stock in our own country instead of shrinking it ten per cent. by shipment alive as is the present position, and no keeping our land increasingly fertile is the great problem in Western Canada to-day. And of all the means to attain that great end, I submit that the most effective is the development of diversified home industries providing an expanding home market.

Now, as to Ontario and the East: The tariff is to-day one of the least of our agricultural problems. Here are the main ones stated by our own great authority, Mr. C. C. James:

In the province of Ontario we have 175,000 farms whose annual productions total about \$250,000,000. If by some magic or process of regeneration we could turn all the indifferent farmers into wide-a-wake, progressive, up-to-date farmers, the total production would be easily doubled, and it is not beyond the reach of possibility to treble our output.

You know the foundation courses upon which this great wealth may be built. These courses are plain and simple. 1. Drain the soil; 2. Sow only the best seed; 3. carefully protect and store the products of the fields and orchards; 4. Feed field products only to profitable stock; 5. Put the finished product on the market in the best form.

If we could bring, in some way, the indifferent farmer to the knowledge of those five plain, convincing lines of work, we would have solved the problem; all else involved in agricultural improvement would come easily as a natural sequence.

We have this year about \$780,000 to spend in agricultural work in Ontario. To carry this work into every county and district of the province, to man all the branches of the Department and meet the requirements of the Agricultural College to keep pace with demands, we need approximately \$250,000 more annually. At first this looks like a big sum, but in comparison with an annual output of \$250,000,000 from 175,000 farms it is not so large. We are now spending on agricultural improvement just thirty cents apiece yearly for every person in the province. What we need is just ten cents apiece more.

I want to add one other problem to Mr. James' list, because I think it all important to our Ontario farmers—the problem of good roads. Here is what practical farmers think of it:

C. F. Foy, Ex-Warden, County of Lanark:

Land contiguous to a good road increases in value. I venture to say every person here who has had to do with good roads and who has had experience in building good roads will bear me out in that. The land in Lanark has increased from \$1,000 per hundred acres to as high as \$2,500. Some that were before in a ruinous condition have been turned into arable, tillable land, and to-day are well worth the money which I say.

Mr. W. G. Trethewey says:

In Ontario there are 175,000 farmers. On my farm my transportation costs me about twelve dollars a day to the city, under the present system; but, if the roads were good, I could do the work for five dollars a day. Now, we will say that you have a yearly saving for each farm, which is putting it conservatively, of fifty dollars; that would give you a saving per annum of \$8,750,000.

What, then, is my conclusion? It is this. We must take the farmer by the arm though he has threatened to take us by the leg. We must in some way seek to dispel the erroneous impressions he is receiving as to the paying of tribute to any class. We must show him that goods made in Canada are not enhanced to the extent of the duty, or to half of it; and it can be shown. We must be ready, if there is found on careful investigation by those qualified to know, any undue, unfair enhancement, to apply the remedy. But we must get him to see that any slight enhancement is an investment which is bringing in industries, affording employment to our people, and providing a valuable home market. And it can be shown, for it is so. We must also show how year by year as our industries grow and competition increases, we get all the benefits of home production without enhancement of price at all. This is a work of national importance which we should assume.

But more than this, we must take an interest in the farm and the farmers. I believe the man in the city should contribute to the upkeep of roads in the country. We, in the city, should uphold the Deputy Minister of Agriculture in this Province in his request for additional 10 cents per capita for agricultural purposes. We should stand ready to second the efforts of our Federal Government in all that pertains to improvement in the growing of produce, its marketing and shipping.

Above all, let us gain the confidence of the farmer so that we can come together and know each other's problems instead of flying at each other's throat. Half of the men in the cities were raised on the farm and have the warmest attachment to it. Our country, great as it now is, will be infinitely greater, not by tearing down any one class, but by working together to build up all. Businesses, countries, nations are made great, not by tearing down, but by building up, not by division, but by co-operation.

And so to-day, let us say to our representatives who go to Washington: Hasten not into anything where you cannot see the end; our country is prosperous; if we cannot get advantages from the United States without sacrificing our own interests, come back to Canada and wait for the time when you can. It will not be long.