

South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) who said that Britain was the market where the Canadian farmer gets the best returns for his produce. Does he know, as a practical farmer, that barley is the crop to-day that pays the farmer in the Province of Ontario better than any other crop we have raised for a large number of years? In 1891, 4,056,848 bushels of barley went into the United States, upon which we paid 10 cents a bushel. Then there was 922,752 bushels that paid 30 cents duty, so that \$682,536 was paid to get our barley into the United States. Now, they may tell us that the United States export a large quantity of barley. True, they do export a certain quantity, something like 900,000 bushels during 1891. But if they did export that amount, that is an advantage to us if the purchasers for the United States market will come into Canada and give us a better price to-day than we can get from the British market, although it displaces a certain amount of their own grains? That is our profit and it is theirs also, otherwise they would not come and buy it from us. Now, about horses. We have been told time and time again that England is our best market for horses. I state without fear of successful contradiction that the English market require very few of our horses. I find that in 1888 there were imported into England 11,505 horses; in 1889, 13,832; in 1890, 19,286, or 44,643 during those three years. Now how many horses did they export during those same years? In 1888 they exported 11,281; in 1889, 13,668; in 1890, 18,981, or altogether 43,930, so that the exports and the imports were very nearly equal, with a difference of only 1,024 in favour of the imports during those three years. These figures are taken from the last British agricultural returns, showing conclusively that Britain is not a market where we can expect to sell our horses with profit. We find that the continental countries of Europe can supply the British market much more readily and with far less risk of loss than we can. For instance, Denmark supplied the British market in 1890 with 2,489 horses, Germany with 12,600, Holland with 1,575, Norway with 294, Spain with 156, the United States with 364 and Canada with 225, that was the total import of horses from continental countries and from the United States and Canada into England during the year. Now, we find that in 1890 the United States imported 37,675 horses: that was the year before the McKinley Bill came into effect. In 1891 they imported 7,631 horses at \$30 per head, 7,965 at 20 per cent and 368 at 30 per cent. In all, the United States imported during that year the McKinley Bill came into force, 15,964 horses, showing that there was a falling off in that year of 21,711 horses on account of the change in the duty. The United States exported only 3,110 horses in 1891, which left a market for 12,854 horses in the United States against a market of 1,026 in Great Britain, showing conclusively that the United States is a better market for us than Great Britain can be for our surplus horses. I state from practical experience that we cannot establish with Great Britain a trade so successful and profitable as we can with the United States. The long sea voyage causes great loss, and then we have to pay heavy insurance in transporting our products and animals across the water. Let me say that the United States, instead of increasing their imports of horses during the last year, decreased the number by 157,000, showing

again that that is the market upon which we must rely to a greater extent than any other, for horses. We have been told that Great Britain is our best market for all sorts of grain. I gave a statement to the House this year in reference to this and I challenge its contradiction. In the *Empire* of the 23rd of April I find the following prices quoted for fall wheat, spring wheat, and barley, in the cities of Buffalo and Toronto. Fall wheat, Buffalo, 94 cents; Toronto, 84 or 85 cents; or a difference of 9 cents in favour of Buffalo. Spring wheat, Buffalo, 92 cents; spring wheat, Toronto, 82 to 86, or a difference in favour of Buffalo of 7 cents. This was a special despatch to the *Empire*, in which it was said that 7,000 bushels of barley were sold in Buffalo at 86 cents as compared with 50 cents in Canada, or a difference of 36 cents in favour of Buffalo.

Mr. TAYLOR. What has that to do with binder twine?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It has got to do with an answer to the gentleman who spoke on that side of the House. Why do you allow license to one when you attempt to circumscribe another; that is the policy of the Conservative party. I hold that the markets of the United States are the most profitable markets we can have, provided we had unrestricted reciprocity, and I believe the day is not distant when the people of this country, Conservative and Reformer alike, will arise in their might and demand unrestricted reciprocity. There is no country so cursed with party politics as Canada is. Many a Conservative has stated to me within the last three months that he was in favour of unrestricted reciprocity with the States, and that he would ten times rather have it than allow the Grits to come into power. They are afraid on the other side of the House that if Reformers come into power we will get unrestricted reciprocity, and some hon. gentlemen opposite have a feeling that the Government have not behaved honestly with the people of this country in their late trip to Washington with respect to the question. This binding twine is a grievous matter for the farmers, and it is one that has to be repeated every year. During last year I bought 175 lbs. of binding twine and it took 2½ lbs. to each acre, or in other words it cost me 9 cents per acre of a duty within a mere fraction, so that I paid \$5.42 duty on that 175 pounds of twine. Every farmer in Canada who has got improved machinery, and who carries on his farm in a proper manner, has to pay this tax, and it is a burden that comes around every year, and when the twine is used once it cannot be used again. Will the Government take this into consideration, and see that justice is done to the farmer of Canada. Why should the fishermen of the Lower Provinces get free cordage and free salt, and why should the farmers of Ontario be assessed to contribute to a bounty of \$150,000 annually, when they are denied the same privilege as the fishermen have of getting their twine free? I hold that this is a gross injustice. I believe myself, that if the Government do not give us some relief in this matter, that next year we will be worse pinched on binding twine than in the past, on account of this large cordage company having the whole supply of the States and Canada under their control. I trust that the Government will see their way to remove the duty on twine, so that we