

erican market for our cheese; suppose we had Chicago and Detroit and Buffalo and New York and Boston and other large cities to send our magnificent quality of cheese into, should we not be assured of a splendid market? Are not all the best products of every kind assured of a ready market in these cities, where there are rich people anxious to procure them, and willing to pay the price? One more department of industry: Canada stood 30 per cent higher in fruit than any other state or country. And what a magnificent market would be opened for our apples, our plums, our pears, and our peaches if freedom of trade were established, and we were able to ship our high class goods to purchasers in the United States. I must bring my remarks to a conclusion. I have given you, Mr. Speaker, twelve or thirteen reasons against the protective system; I have demonstrated that the present policy is a detriment to 90 per cent of our people, and that burdens are placed upon these in order to secure the prosperity and advancement of the few. Take the case of the Massey-Harris Company. Mr. Massey has accumulated great fortunes, which he is now giving away. I would like to ask in what business is it possible for a man in 20 years, without extraordinary profits, to amass wealth so great that he can give away fortunes right and left? It is the farmers' money that is being spent, and this money has been taken unfairly from the pockets of the farmers of the country. I am sorry the Government has not seen fit to promise us a great reduction of the tariff. I am sorry they have not promised us the wiping out of the protective principle to the extent of establishing the tariff upon a revenue basis with protection as an incident, rather than, as they are doing to-day, putting protection first with the object of revenue as merely incidental.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, before this debate closes I would like to say a few words. I can cordially endorse the sentiments of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution with reference to the Governor General. I am glad also to congratulate him upon the manner in which he presented his case to the House, for there is no doubt he had a very hard task. In some respects he seems to have been misinformed. For instance, he stated that our trade with the West Indies had been extended through the efforts of the Government in sending delegates to that country. I cannot believe the hon. gentleman has examined into the subject, otherwise he would surely never have made such a statement. Years ago when the late Hon. John Macdonald, the great merchant of Toronto, went down to the West Indies, we received from him a glowing account of the trade that could be established with that country. So when Mr. Adam Brown, of Hamilton, was sent down to those islands, we were told there was a large field there for the

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

extension of Canadian trade. Again, when the Finance Minister came back from that country after having visited it at the expense of the people, we were assured that there were splendid opportunities there for the extension of our trade. How does that matter stand to-day? Why, Sir, in 1875 we had trade with the West Indies to the amount of \$3,948,000, while in 1893 it amounted to only \$3,145,000, a reduction of \$800,000, and this notwithstanding that a large amount of money had been spent in the effort to increase the trade. We have had the Minister of Trade and Commerce lately visiting the Australian colonies. When he returned he spoke before the Board of Trade of Toronto, and gave a glowing account of what could be done in extending the trade of Canada with Australia. Let me ask what benefit it is going to be to those whose condition most needs to be improved at the present time, the farmers and workingmen of Canada, to extend our trade with the Australian colonies? Why, Sir, the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself stated that of \$8,000,000 of stuff exported from the United States to Australia agricultural products made up only \$63,000 of the amount, and the rest were the products of manufactories. Let me ask what benefit it will be to the farmers of this country to subsidize a line of steamers with a large sum of money in order to take agricultural implements from Canada to the Australian colonies? The only effect will be that, while the farmers will still have to pay the 35 per cent duty on their implements, their burdens will be increased in order that the manufacturers may be better able to place their goods upon the market in the Australian colonies. Why, Sir, I can remember when, some two or three years ago, the Finance Minister rose in his place in this House and stated that a large trade was being established in agricultural implements in the Australian colonies. He stated at that time that Mr. Massey alone had declared that he had established a trade of something like \$300,000 a year with those colonies, and when the statement was challenged he still declared it to be accurate. Is that statement shown to be accurate in the light of events? Why, Sir, the whole value of our exports to the Australian colonies is only \$208,000, and the agricultural implements sent from Canada to these colonies amounts to only something like \$86,000. Now, Sir, let me, just for a moment, examine into the wealth of Canada, or more particularly, into the wealth of the province of Ontario, as we have not the means of ascertaining the agricultural wealth of the other provinces in the same manner as we have that of Ontario through the Bureau of Industries. I find, according to the census that was taken in 1891, that there were then 175,000 farmers in Ontario, who farmed 22,646,000 acres of land. The total value of their property, farm land, agricultural implements and farm stock, was \$980,000,000. The average farm in