

farmer was given the advantage of supplying at least the people in Canada. In 1879, we put upon the statute-books the tariff known as the national policy, and hon. gentlemen and the House know that it contains the agricultural protection clauses to which I have already referred. The statement I desire to make now is absolutely borne out by the facts, namely, that every time an effort was made in this House by the Conservative party to preserve the home markets for the Canadian farmers, that effort has been opposed by the Liberal party, and by the members of the Liberal government who have charge of public affairs at the present time. Not only did they fail to keep our markets for us here, but they have never got for us any markets in foreign countries. I want to state here to-night that the reciprocity negotiations with the United States are, to every intelligent thinker, practically a matter of the past. The Prime Minister says that the negotiations are still alive, that the High Commission will meet once more; but we had a member of the High Commission last night decrying the whole question of reciprocity, and saying that the United States are mean and illiberal. It means that these hon. gentlemen have found out the impossibility of making any arrangement with the people of the United States, and I want to add that not only have they lessened their chances by giving free corn to the farmers of the United States without getting anything in return for it, but, I want to assert, and it is an assertion, which, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite will appreciate in a moment, that the contention as to the condition of Canada, the helplessness and the hopelessness of the Canadian farmer and of Canada generally, made by hon. gentlemen from 1878 to 1896, put the American people into a frame of mind to imagine that they could get much greater advantages out of Canada and a much better bargain than any party in Canada could ever, with the approval of the people, concede. When they went to Washington their speeches rose up against them and destroyed them in their efforts to secure reciprocity for this country. Sir, these hon. gentlemen said to the farmers of Canada: 'Put us in power, and if we do not get you reciprocity and a market for your products in the United States within a very short time, turn us out.' The people, Sir, will take them at their word on many another count beside that. The right hon. Prime Minister, speaking at Brampton, I think, in 1894, made this statement: What do you farmers want? You want markets; I say you want markets, and it is the mission of the Liberal party to give you markets. The mission of the Liberal party, if that were the mission of the Liberal party, has been very badly fulfilled indeed. We have gone from 1896 to 1899, and what have the government to announce in the way of mar-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

kets for the farmers of Canada? Only this, that negotiations are pretty well advanced for free trade between this country and the Island of Trinidad, a very unimportant island, which is absolutely unknown, I venture to say, in a great many of the agricultural sections of the Dominion of Canada. But, the hon. Minister of Customs, when he was speaking, said to the farmers of Canada: We have got you markets by reason of our preferential tariff. These are his words:

We have to-day, by virtue of our preferential tariff—there is no doubt about it in my mind—a decided preference in the British market. If it is not a legal preference, it is a preference through the good-will of the British consuming public themselves, who by this preferential tariff had their hearts drawn towards Canada as they never had before.

What does it mean to the great agricultural class?

Wealth to the great agricultural class of this country, which means wealth and prosperity to every man who dwells in it. Who will deny it? I have given you figures most gratifying had their hearts drawn out towards Canada as they never had before.

But if it had not been for our preferential tariff we could not have done it. He says that Canadian products exported to Great Britain in 1895-6, amounted in value to \$62,718,941, and in 1898-9 to \$85,114,555, an increase, roughly estimating it, of 33½ per cent. He gave another table in regard to the exportation of animals and their products. In 1895-6 the exports from Canada to Great Britain of animals and their products amounted to \$42,074,384 and in 1898-9 to \$62,000,000. The hon. gentleman, in making his subtraction was in error, or the reporter, in taking down his figures, may have made an error. The difference appears in *Hansard* as \$17,000,000, but there is \$21,000,000 of an increase, or about 40 per cent from 1895-6 to 1898-9, and I desire to give the hon. gentleman's argument full force. I looked up the figures to ascertain the increase from 1892 to 1896 when there was no preferential tariff in existence, when we were going along in the same way that we had gone along for years, and I found, that, in 1892, we exported, of animals and their products, \$24,068,008, and that in 1896 we sent \$32,523,071, or an increase of 33½ per cent, showing that the hon. gentleman is quite wrong in his contention that the increase in the exportation of these products to Great Britain has been brought about by the preferential tariff. It has come in the ordinary course of events. England has been importing more, and we have been prepared to ship more. I have shown how this came about in my figures in relation to meats and also by the facts I have given in regard to the dairy industry and cold storage. And in addition to that we see that the same increase took place where no preferential