

dead meat forms during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1889, is as follows:

	GREAT BRITAIN.	UNITED STATES.
Horses.....	\$ 26,975	\$2,113,782
Cattle.....	4,992,161	488,266
Sheep.....	303,009	918,331
Wool.....	470	216,918
Cheese.....	8,871,205	31,473
Eggs.....		2,156,725
Bacon and Hams.....	378,736	87
Hides, other than fur..	7,070	454,105
Butter.....	174,027	7,879

From these figures it is apparent that our principal market for horses, sheep, wool, eggs and hides up to the present has been the United States and that our principal market for cattle, cheese, bacon and butter is that of Great Britain. The passage of the McKinley Act has greatly injured our market to the United States in horses, wool, and hides and it has practically annihilated the same in cattle and eggs. That it has destroyed our trade in store cattle is no matter of regret, for if our farmers can be taught the folly of selling store animals at the cost of the loss of a market to the extent of half a million of money, the gain will soon more than counter-balance the loss. The markets for all these products and many more in Great Britain remain as gloriously free as the winds that waft her ships o'er all the seas of earth, and so they will continue till we and our sons are dead, an object lesson to all the world of the value of unfettered trade.

That the future of our live stock industry will be greatly affected by coming legislation in the United States is beyond the shadow of a doubt, and the element of uncertainty that hangs over this legislation perplexes us somewhat as to how we should shape our course. The safe rule for us to follow at present is to moderate our production in those lines which are adversely affected by the McKinley tariff, to increase it in those which are not so affected, to still further increase our production in lines in which we have already captured the British market, and to strengthen our position there in every possible direction wherein we may be weak at present.

From this it follows that we should moderate our production of horses. The United States is our only market for these. The cheaper classes of horses are now shut out of that market. Our only hope, therefore, in

this respect in the meantime lies in the production of horses of a better quality. The rapid extension of new modes of travel and of communication say to us quite as loudly as the McKinley legislation that we should moderate our production of horses.

There is great reason, however, for the extension of the sheep industry. At present the whole number of sheep in this Province is only 1,344,180 head, that is but one sheep for every 16½ acres of the assessed lands of the Province. By raising sheep of the right class we would get a ready market for one million more lambs than we now raise. These would be sold in the markets of the United States and Britain and would bring in the former country in autumn an average of \$5 per head, and in the latter country when one year old from \$8 to \$10 per head. In the item of sheep alone we would more than make up for the loss from an injured trade in horses and poultry, and we could do this without interfering with any of the other lines of live stock production if we pasture judiciously in summer and feed properly in winter. We could fatten one million lambs in the autumn on 100,000 acres of rape which is only the one hundred and fourteenth part of the arable lands in Ontario. The style of sheep wanted for this purpose is the progeny of such ewes as we have, and from dark faced rams, particularly those of the large types, as the Shropshire, Oxford and Hampshire Downs. If we now can get from Great Britain about \$5000,000 annually for our beef, why may we not grow beef enough to secure \$10,000,000 annually from the same source? If we now can procure about \$8,000,000 a year for our cheese from the same country, why may we not produce enough to bring us a return of \$16,000,000 a year? The market for both these products is unlimited, and the extent to which we occupy it, may only be hedged in by our desire and ability to produce beef and cheese.

The market in Britain for our pork is as wide as our ambition may care to make it. It is true that in that market we come in competition with American pork. But with our beef and our cheese we have a similar competition, and when Canada comes in competition with the United States in the line of live stock and live stock products the results are always the same, the beaver has been found more than a match for the eagle. Our cheese industry substantiates this statement. The same is true of our beef industry, and it finds further