

am speaking particularly of the section where I have resided for the last half century—are better off to-day than they were under the old reciprocity treaty. They have turned their attention to an industry by which they concentrate the products of the land into a small compass, and that concentrated product can be transported to distant lands where a good market is found; whereas if they had confined themselves to their old mode of farming, in the production of coarse grains; the freights would have eaten up the profits, so that they are better off under the present system than they ever were before. There is one thing I am glad to know, that that little island in the sea, to which the leader of the Opposition referred yesterday as having suffered from the National Policy, is turning its attention now to the production of that which will find a ready market in England, and which will supplant the cheese and butter now sent from Denmark, Norway, and other portions of Europe, to the British Islands. I predict that the people of that island, after they have pursued this industry which they are establishing all over the island, for a few years, will soon find they are not dependent on the markets of the United States, or of any other foreign country—other than that of England, if that may be termed a foreign market. Turning my attention again for a moment to the foreign market, I should like to place upon record and lay before the Senate what the result of the McKinley Bill has been, during the last five years, upon our trade with the United States and with England:—

	Great Britain.	United States.
1890.....	\$ 22,240,548	\$ 13,485,727
1891.....	26,245,171	11,608,225
1892.....	39,187,861	8,509,703
1893.....	42,495,261	8,083,955

Now, if any figures could possibly prove to this country that our natural market is England, they are the figures that I have quoted. They show the people of the country where their interests, financially and otherwise, lie; it certainly is not to the south of us, but in the motherland, for which we all have an admiration.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Because it is an open market.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—My hon. friend says it is because it is an open market. I admit it is an open market, but I should

like my hon. friend to tell me if the English people would eat any less because they had to pay two cents a pound on cheese and five cents a bushel on wheat? I rather think that the consuming powers of that people would be just as great under a 5 per cent tariff as it would be with free wheat. There are many other things that suggest themselves to me in connection with that remark of my hon. friend from Marquette, but I will not detain the House with them at the present moment. Let me look again at these returns, because, if I am not wearying the House, I desire to have this point impressed upon the minds of those who take any interest in it, that Great Britain is the ultimate market to which the products of our soil must be sent. If we take the period from 1890 to 1893 with reference to the exportation of animals and agricultural products to the United States, we find the following results:—

	1890.	1893.
Horses.....	\$1,887,895	\$1,123,339
Cattle.....	104,623	11,032
Sheep.....	761,565	1,088,814
Eggs.....	1,793,104	324,355
Barley.....	4,582,562	638,271
Hay.....	922,797	854,958
Potatoes.....	308,915	259,176
	<u>10,361,461</u>	<u>4,299,945</u>

Now, with regard to sheep, if the House will examine the facts, they will find that more than two-thirds of those that are termed sheep were lambs, and no matter what duty the United States Government may put on—at least that is the feeling of the trade—the Americans will have Canadian lambs. There has been a decline in the exports of barley. It may be argued that that is the result of not having a profitable market for this particular product. The Ontario statistics show that the agriculturists were alive to their own interests, that if they lost that American market it was quite proper to turn their attention to something else, and last year the area sown with barley was only a little over 468,000 acres, while the year before it was 875,286 acres. The acreage sown last year was only one-half of that which was sown the year before.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They may put in a good crop this year.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I do not know; I am not so sure of that. If the Bill which is now before the United States Senate indu-