

ces the Canadian farmer to return to his old habit of raising barley, and 20 cents is not found a pretty high protective duty on an article which is to-day selling at 60 cents per bushel, I do not know what is. And then, if my hon. friend has paid any attention to the farming operations of the United States as far west as Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin, will know that the western farmers are producing barley to-day and sending it into the state of New York, competing with the Bay of Quinté barley, which was the best in the markets of the continent.

An hon. MEMBER—It is not equal to our barley.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I did not say it was. It is nearly equal to it, and if they go on progressing, as they have done, and paying attention to the seed and the production of the crop, it certainly is an article which will, in the future, as in the past two years, come into competition with and displace that which formerly was held in such high esteem in that country. The world moves, although it might appear that my Liberal friends, who are supposed to be the progressive party in that country, do not know it; but it does move and move rapidly, and people adapt themselves to all circumstances which may come up, and there is no class of people who have more active intelligence in that respect than the farming people of this country. No tariff of the United States, I care not if it be three times as high as the McKinley tariff, can crush the industries of Canada, while they have a market which is more profitable and better for them than the one to which they formerly sent their products. The same thing is precisely the case with hay and potatoes. Taking the whole of these articles we find that while the Americans bought from Canada in 1890, \$10,371,461, last year they bought only \$4,299,095. If these people are determined to pursue a course hostile to Canada, we have, at least, this evidence that we can live without them, however desirable it may be to live on terms of amity and goodwill. I do not wish in this discussion to introduce questions which, probably, might arouse the ire of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but I do say this, that we should have less difficulty and less trouble in effecting amicable trade relations in such articles as would be of benefit to both sides of the line, were it not that there are certain politicians in

this country who are so unpatriotic that, in their great desire for power, they urge upon United States statesmen not to make concessions to Canada, because if they did, it would drive us further away from annexation. I say this is a matter of serious moment. It is a matter which every honest and patriotic Canadian should take to heart, that when attempts are made by others to do that which opponents of the Government declare to be in the interests of Canada, they should not throw obstacles in the way of our dealings with foreign countries. If the policy of the Government does not meet their approval, it is their right, as British subjects, to turn them out on the first opportunity. No one can blame them for that. I assisted in doing that on one occasion, and I do not blame any one else for taking the same course, but let them pursue an honourable patriotic course, and not a course which tends to make a foreign people believe that the more they legislate against us, the nearer they are to forcing us into a political alliance with them. I will not weary the House by pointing to the advantages which there are in exporting the cereals of the country to Great Britain instead of the United States. While I am anxious and willing that we should reciprocate in such articles as, I think, would be advantageous to the country at large (not speaking of the advantages to be derived on our side, because it always takes two to make a bargain), I am not prepared as a public man, and a Canadian, to make concessions simply in the interest of a foreign country, which would carry no advantage to ourselves. There is another point which I think is of some interest, and more particularly as it affects that portion of the argument of the leader of the Opposition in which he tells us that we were building up the barriers and preventing the trade of this country increasing. I propose to give one illustration to show what effect the imposition of the high duty has had upon one particular branch of agriculture. In giving that illustration I shall simply content myself with saying that it is applicable to almost every article grown by the farmers. My hon. friend says "pull down the barriers." Let us take the question of the hog product alone, and see whether the protective duty has assisted our farmers in this country, I took the trouble to prepare a table showing the total hog product imported and