

Americans at the same time. The United States may be selfish in politics, but they have never prepared anything quite so selfish as that. What course shall we take between the policy of the United States and that of Britain which are so opposite? We are between the two. What course shall we take? If we imitate the United States we shall proceed to double our duties on almost everything that we tax now. Every sane man will admit that we cannot afford to do that. We simply cannot afford to make living in Canada dearer. If we imitate Great Britain we shall at once reverse all our previous policy. We cannot afford so violent a disturbance as that. Is there any middle course?

For answer I shall indicate these points that I have thought out, though I shall barely do more than state them.

First—That to fill the gap made by the McKinley Bill in our volume of trade we must look chiefly to an increased trade with Great Britain. Great Britain is just as much our natural market as the United States. She is ready to take almost everything we produce, and distance by water is of far less consequence than distance by land. It is clear that we must buy more from her, as well as sell more to her, if we are to largely increase our dealings with her.

Secondly—If we are to have Commercial Union with only one country, it would certainly be more natural to form such a union with Great Britain than with the United States. There would in that case be less disturbance even of our own manufacturing interests, for the differences between Canada and Britain have led here to lines of manufactures, in which, under any arrangement with her, we could easily hold our own, or even preserve an unchallenged supremacy. On the other hand there is not a single line of manufactures in which the United States are not our keen competitors. Again, in any such union with Britain we could depend upon her staple trade policy and her friendliness, both matters of importance, as the history of our relations with the United States for half a century abundantly show.

Thirdly—Retaliation by us would be ridiculous. I do not say that retaliation is out of the question in every case. Sometimes it is the best way of bringing others to a reasonable frame of mind. Canada and Britain will not get any reasonable measure of free trade with the United States till unitedly they can offer something which, in the opinion of Congress, is as good as that which we want from them. Now, if Canada would agree to abolish its duties on British products and manufactures, or even keep on them a small revenue tariff for a short time, and if Britain would agree to discriminate against countries refusing any reasonable reciprocity with her and with us that would give us the weapon we need. That course would have other advantages. In my opinion it would be the best course, not only for Canada, but for Britain. This would teach the power of free trade to the farmers of the United States. They could not complain even a little, for imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Besides, they have already done their worst. If you agree with me on these points it follows that we should approach the British Government with a reasonable offer, and find out whether any arrangement can be made. We have approached Washington time and again. Should we not try London now? We are dogmatically told that Britain will

never discriminate. It will be time enough for us to believe that when we are willing to share in the sacrifice that any change requires, or when she herself says so. It is clear that if we are to throw in our lot fiscally with any other nation we should do so with the Mother Country. It is also clear to me that the trade theory of Britain is right, though it does not follow that no exceptions can ever be allowed, or that there are no relative degrees of rightness. Since our neighbors will not trade with us we must do everything in reason to open the avenues of trade, not only with Britain, but with other countries. Commercial treaties with the West Indies on our side, and Australia and New Zealand, are all moves in the right direction. The deepening of the St. Lawrence canals, a cable and a line of steamships to Australia and New Zealand, are all moves in the right direction.

The alterations in the United States tariff which especially interests farmers, and not given elsewhere in this article, are as follows:—

	Former Duty.	New Duty.
Apples, green or ripe	Free	5c. lb.
Eggs, dried	Free	5c. doz.
Straw	10c. bush.	30c. bush.
Barley	20c.	45c.
Barley malt	10 p.c.	4c.
Beans	4c. lb.	6c. lb.
Butter and substitutes	10 p.c.	1c. each
Cabbages	4c. lb.	6c. lb.
Cheese	\$2 ton	\$4 ton
Hay	8c. lb.	15c. lb.
Hops	10c. bush.	15c. bush.
Oats	4c. lb.	1c. lb.
Oatmeal	10 p.c.	40c. bush.
Onions	20 p.c.	40c.
Peas, green	20 p.c.	15c.
" dried	20 p.c.	50c.
" split	20 p.c.	25c.
Potatoes	15c. bush.	25c.
Wheat	20 p.c.	25 p.c.
Wheat flour	1c. lb.	2c. lb.
Mutton	10 p.c.	3c. lb.
Poultry, live	10 p.c.	5c. lb.
Poultry, dressed	10 p.c.	5c. lb.

The New Restrictions as They Affect Live Stock.

The change that the new tariff will have on live stock exported from Canada to the United States is given in the following table:—

	Old Tariff.	New Tariff.
Horses and mules	20 per ct.	\$30 per head
Horses worth \$150 or over	20 "	30 per ct.
Cattle over one year old	20 "	\$10 per head
Cattle 1 year old or less	Free	\$2
Hogs	20 per ct.	\$1.50 "
Sheep one year old or over	20 "	\$1.50 "
Sheep less than one year old	20 "	75 "
All other live animals	20 "	20 per ct.

By the above it is easily seen that to be on as good a basis as regards the amount of tariff charged against our Canadian horses for work as formerly, \$150, or a few dollars less, must be the valuation. The present regulation is aimed to prohibit the trade in cheap horses. It has long since been foreseen that the horse breeders of the Western States were sooner or later to be considered. They have, like ourselves, a superabundance of cheap horses that no buyer wants, and as it was therefore necessary for the Government to make a show of assisting the producers of this class, hence the clause in the Bill as it now reads. Therefore the day for getting rid of cheap Canadian horses in the United States is practically gone. They have found an outlet hitherto principally for street car work in the eastern cities, which was only temporary, as there is no doubt the day for street car horses is nearly numbered, as the larger cities are fast changing to cable and electric cars.

With cattle the case is somewhat similar. The very best fat steers, fit for the English export

trade, have no higher tariff charges per head than the light-weight stockers, and the present tariff will put an end to this outlet for scrub steers, and will in this case also favor those that are breeding the right class and do more to banish the poor miserable trash that has been tolerated than columns of newspaper controversy.

With sheep the aspect is somewhat different. As regards butchers' lambs for the Buffalo market there will be no great change, as the shippers under the old regulations contrived to so undervalue their stock that they were admitted at the nominal rate of 60 to 65 cents per head, while the present tariff stands 75 cents per head for lambs and \$1.50 for sheep. The worst feature in sheep is in the duty that will be collected on breeding sheep that are not recorded. Many car loads have gone over for breeding purposes free that answered the purpose as well as recorded sheep for ranch and farm sheep raising, therefore the present Bill is a direct stroke at this trade, as the present \$1.50 per head will practically close this trade, and our farmers will have to feed sheep of this class for the English export market, the \$1.50 per head tariff being more than the difference between the two markets. That this tariff will be a benefit to us in the long run is easy for us to see, for with our own Northwest to stock we shall have no competitors in the British markets that are much account, as far as the live sheep trade is concerned, the South American countries being too far to develop an extensive live stock trade, and the United States having but a very small proportion of the mutton breeds, and the closing out of the class of sheep that are just the right foundation for mutton flocks will in time to come damage themselves, while in reality it will benefit us. As regards the commercial class of live stock this is as near the situation as a review of this regulation at present discloses. It will necessitate more care in all lines of stock breeding. They will still want the best class of horses for carriage and saddle use, and they will go into the hands of people who will pay for them. There will also be a demand for all the heavy horses for city dray work we can furnish, and the present Bill does not interfere with those horse that are recorded. In cattle it will prevent any trade whatsoever outside thoroughbreds of some of the recognized breeds. A glance at the Bill as it affects breeding stock will here be of interest, and reads as follows:—"Any animal imported specially for breeding purposes shall be admitted free: Provided, that no such animal shall be admitted free unless pure-bred, of a recognized breed, and duly registered in the book of record established for that breed: And provided further, that certificate of such record and of the pedigree of each animal shall be produced and submitted to the Customs officer, duly authenticated by the proper custodian of such book of record, together with the affidavit of the owner, agent or importer that such animal is the identical animal described in said certificate of record and pedigree. The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such additional regulations as may be required for the strict enforcement of this provision."

With horses and cattle the matter is plain, as animals that are eligible for the record that is established for the breed they represent are generally to be found already registered. The high value of the animal, in proportion to the fee for recording, and the comparative small number held by each party, encourages them to