

they held office the aggregate during that period was \$217,565,510. When they left office the aggregate was \$153,455,682, a falling off to the extent of \$64,109,828; so that you may take the whole trade of the country and you will find that the statements I have made will bear out all and more than we have claimed, and more than the party to which I belong have claimed for it. Look at the trade so far as it affects the farming industry—represented by a large class of people who have been lately taken under the special care and guardianship of certain hon. gentlemen—and what does it show? The exportation of farm products to Great Britain in 1891 was \$24,264,272 and last year it amounted to no less than \$36,091,589, an increase of \$11,827,367. It is true that the hon. the leader of the Opposition yesterday stated, when he referred to the increase of trade last year, that it was the result of the large output of the North-west and the farming community. If the farming community in this country has so progressed in the production of cereals, animals and other products of the farm that they had nearly twelve millions more to export in 1892 than the year before, it certainly is not an evidence of their deterioration either in skill nor industry, or that they are becoming poorer under the fiscal policy of this Government. It is an evidence of this, however, that they are growing in wealth. In the aggregate they are better off than they were before. There may be isolated cases, there may be certain sections of the country, and we all know it, in which the farming community like others are not as well off as they should be, but it has led intelligent farmers in the country to the conclusion that they must change their agricultural methods to meet altered conditions. I remember when the treaty of 1854 was abrogated, in my own section of the country whenever you saw a Yankee drover, as we called them, coming into the district to buy the settlers' cattle, the farmers were glad to take \$10, \$15, or \$20 per head for their stock, and if they got \$25 for a cow they thought they were rich. At that time the farmers were devoting their whole time and energies to the growing of coarse grains which found a market in the United States. When that market ceased, they turned their attention to other branches of farming. I see an hon. gentleman opposite to me who was one of the first to visit the United States

and study their dairying industries and the mode and manner in which they were carried on, and he came back to his county and established the first cheese factory in the eastern section of our country. The result is to-day that the farmers have turned their attention to dairying and stock raising, instead of to growing coarse grains. I refer particularly to the hon. Senator from Quinté (Mr. Read) and to the county of Hastings. We have now over forty cheese factories in that district, and they are beginning to establish creameries under instructions from the Experimental Farm—over which my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Angers) presides. I look forward to the time, at no very distant day, when our butter will occupy as prominent and profitable a position in the English market, as the cheese does to-day. We exported last year cheese to the amount of \$11,000,000. It may not be gratifying to the gentlemen who desire commercial union, continental union, or unrestricted reciprocity—which that able but erratic writer, Mr. Goldwin Smith, says, mean one and the same thing—to know that the McKinley Bill, instead of destroying the trade of this country, has only diverted it from the United States to England. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that while our trade with the United States is falling off through the operation of their policy, it is increasing with England. Our neighbours are cutting off their own noses to spite us. The export of the products of the farm to the United States in 1891 was \$10,188,760, being \$14,075,462 less than to Great Britain; while last year it had fallen through the operation of their own tariff, and from the fact that there is a better market in England than there is in the United States, to \$7,235,012; and I am convinced, from a careful study of this question and from practical experience of the tariff during the period I have held a position in the Government of Canada, that the whole trade of this country is gradually going to England and to Europe, where we find the consumer, rather than passing through the United States, where our products are purchased by the middleman, who exacts his profit and then sends the goods on to England. It is nonsense to suppose that a country that exports as does the United States is our best market. Take the articles of ham and pork as an illustration. I have the President's message in my hands stating the figures.