

Oats exported to Great Britain.....	Bush.	1,738,666	\$	642,471
" the rest of the world.....	"	1,080,036		434,280
Total bushels.....		2,818,702		1,076,750
Indian corn, not the produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain....	Bush.	7,240,215	\$	3,480,119
" the produce of Canada.....	"	711		646
Green apples exported to Great Britain.....	Brs.	184,856	\$	569,156
" the United States.....	"	87,160		221,187
Clover seed exported to Great Britain.....	Lbs.	60,518	\$	447,000
" the United States.....	"	3,576		21,361

Until last year our best market for hay was found in the United States. The reason we exported more hay to Great Britain last year is that there was a good crop in the United States, and a scarce crop in Great Britain. However, last year was exceptional in that respect. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the figures given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the best market for the Canadian farmer, for his horses, sheep, barley, beans, potatoes, poultry, and vegetables, is the United States; and his best market for cattle, hay, butter, cheese, eggs, wheat, pease, oats, apples, and clover seed is to be found in Great Britain. Canada received, last year, from Great Britain, \$68,538,856 for the amount of exports sent to that country, and from the United States she received \$35,809,940 for the goods she sent there. Now, Sir, it is quite plain, from that, that we need both markets for Canada, and, in order that our farmers may get good prices, and in order that this country should prosper, we should have both markets. The Minister of Finance told us in his Budget speech that it is likely we would have more prosperity in this country. I agree with him in that, but I believe that when that prosperity does come we shall see more of the produce of this country sent to the United States market. The signs are encouraging already in our increased exports there. The duties levied under the McKinley tariff were almost prohibitive, but notwithstanding that, during the years that tariff was in force, we did a very large trade with the United States. We received \$750,000 for the hay shipped to that country during last year, and it must be borne in mind that there was \$4 duty charged on every ton of hay that went there. If the crops are as good, we may, therefore, expect better prices. There is also reason to expect that barley may increase in price. Last year we only received \$216,000 for Canadian barley sent to the United States and Great Britain, but in 1889, the year before the McKinley tariff came into effect, we received no less than \$6,400,000 for the barley we sent to the United States alone. This year the amount that we received for the sale of eggs in the United States and Great Britain is only a little over \$700,000: whereas, before

Mr. SEMPLE.

the McKinley Bill came into force, we received \$2,156,725 for eggs sold to the United States, being a larger sum than we received for the wheat and oats sold to the different countries in the world. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when these facts are considered, we see the intimate trade connection which this country has with the United States, and we find, also, that the depression existing in the United States has been very detrimental. I know that two years ago, the farmers received for lambs \$4 and \$4.25 each, whereas the highest price received last fall was \$2.50. If things in the United States improve, there will be more money there, and they will buy more goods from us, because the reason our trade has fallen off with them is on account of the depression. I wish now to refer to some statements made in a speech by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith). I know that hon. gentleman, and I am sure that he would not make extravagant statements such as have been made by members of his own party in this House. He is a practical farmer, and he has endeavoured not to go too great a length in exaggeration. He said:

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is, that any hon. gentleman of the Opposition who has spoken upon that question, can scarcely expect to make very many votes if, when the election comes, he pays a visit to South Ontario, because the people of that riding already feel the effects of the reduced duty. I make the statement, that I believe a number of these reductions were made to a great extent to satisfy the plea put forth by the farmers of Canada, but whilst the reduction pleased the farmers for a moment, they now find that to-day they are not buying a single article which they require, at a cheaper price than they could buy it for previous to the reduction. They are getting articles no cheaper, and the change of tariff has unsettled our manufacturers.

The change in the tariff made last year only amounted to a reduction of 2-72, compared with the tariff of 1893. The reduction was so very small that it could hardly be expected much difference would be felt by the farmers, or that they would derive much benefit from it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) in another part of his speech, said:

Now, it has been contended, time and again, not only in this House, but on many public