

opposition in Canada, who, during the last four years, have been persistently portraying the position of their country as that of absolute dependence upon United States markets not only for prosperity but for existence itself. Knowing that the feeling in favor of reciprocity is very general they have assumed the position of champions of this policy; and dreading the effect upon their party which the successful negotiation of of a moderate and equitable treaty in this direction would have, if accomplished by the present Government, they have insidiously used every effort to render such success impossible. Rarely, if ever, do they refer to or admit any of the advantages which would accrue to the United States from the extension of this trade, but they constantly exaggerate the advantages which would result to Canada. Instead of insisting upon the larger purchases from the United States, now being made by Canada, than are now being made by the United States from Canada, as a solid argument in favor of liberal dealing on the part of the United States, they conceal this fact; instead of showing that Canada can curtail its purchases from that country to even a greater extent than the United States can curtail its purchases from Canada, they assert its impotency to do anything in the way of retaliation. If they were engaged as the paid advocates of the United States, they could hardly find an argument in favor of that country's interests which they have not already used. How much further could vile partyism go? In order to get free access to United States markets for our barley, which, every year, is becoming less needed in that country; for our heavy horses, for which the demand is rapidly decreasing, owing to changes in motive power on street railways; for our stock cattle and our young sheep which we ought to fatten at home; for our eggs for which we are opening up a market in England; for our hay, which ought to be fed on the farm, we are asked to admit Yankee flour, Indian corn, oats, fruits, etc., free. So far, the interchange is about equal. But what more? We are asked to exclude from our markets about forty million dollars worth of manufactured goods now purchased from European countries, and confine ourselves to the purchase of the dearer manufactures of the United States. The extra price paid for these goods alone would amount to several-fold more than all the additional prices obtained, under this unrestricted reciprocity, on our exports to that country. We are to imperil our political and commercial relations with Great Britain, abandon our growing commerce with other foreign countries, desert our young and flourishing manufacturing industries, and confine our sphere of labor to the production of raw material for Yankee mill-owners and iron-masters. This outrageous policy is nothing but a piece of cruel irony. Its advocates and promoters know that even were their party in power, they dare not submit such an impracticable and injurious proposition to the verdict of a loyal and intelligent people. Their design is, that sufficient for the present, they can prevent their opponents from effecting the rational and equitable policy of reciprocity which they have been offering to the United States for the last twelve or thirteen years, and which they are now willing to enter into.

Appeals *ad misericordiam* to United States politicians are thrown away. Appeal to self-interest may prevail. If the people of Canada, through the press and through their public

men, would exhibit a little more self-reliance and independence, and show to the Congress of the United States that if they persist in maintaining such prohibitory duties upon a great proportion of Canadian products as to exclude them from their markets, then Canada will feel compelled to adopt a like policy towards American products, especially its manufactures. They may be able to exclude something like ten million dollars worth of Canadian products for which theirs is the best market. We may not find it advisable, in our own interest, to exclude any large amount of American raw products, but we can absolutely exclude twenty million dollars worth of American manufactures and force their manufacturers to establish workshops in Canada. The commerce between the United States and Canada may not be of so much value to the former country as to the latter, from a per capita view, but in the aggregate it is from its nature, as above shown, of greater interest and to a greater number of people in the United States than it is in Canada.

For any equitable trade arrangement, whether by reciprocity or otherwise, Canada is and always has been willing. To coercion or injustice, she will not submit.

BARLEY AND MALT.

THE imports of barley into Canada from the United States last year amounted to 12,217 bushels, of which 8,585 bushels went into Manitoba, and 2,562 into British Columbia. The imports of malt from the United States during the same year amounted to 44,728 bushels, of which 4,401 bushels went into Manitoba, and 39,942 bushels into British Columbia. The Canadian duty upon barley is fifteen cents per bushel and the same upon malt, while the American duty is thirty cents per bushel upon barley and forty five cents upon malt. Ontario and Quebec are the only Provinces credited with exports of barley, and Ontario and British Columbia the only Provinces credited with exports of malt; the malt going from the latter Province amounting to only 279 bushels. It would seem from these facts that Manitoba has malting establishments and that they found it profitable to import 8,585 bushels of barley from the United States for use in them, and that the brewers there found it profitable to purchase 4,401 bushels of malt from that country. The importation of barley into British Columbia amounting to only 2,562 bushels does not indicate the presence of malting establishments there, but the importation of 39,942 bushels of malt indicates the extent of the brewery interest. The malting interest in Ontario is a large one, but it suffers from both the American and the Canadian tariffs. Under the McKinley Bill the duty of forty-five cents per bushel amounts to a virtual prohibition of exports to the United States, while under the Canadian duty of only fifteen cents per bushel American malt supplants the domestic article to a large extent both in Manitoba and British Columbia. The Canadian duty should be very much higher upon both barley and malt, particularly in view of the hostile legislation against these articles in the McKinley Bill. It should be the same as the American duty. If this were done, Canadian farmers would have exclusive control of the home market, now that they are driven out of the American market, and Canadian maltsters would fully supply Canadian brewers instead of sharing their