

most a rebellion was provoked in Manitoba because its people were not able to secure access to the markets lying in the south. Their trade naturally tends to such cities as St. Paul, Minneapolis and Chicago; and notwithstanding all the restrictions placed upon it, an immense and ever growing trade has sprung up between Manitoba and the North-West and those cities. And when we pass on to British Columbia, what do we find there? Why, nature decrees that British Columbia must have extended trade relations with Washington, Oregon and California. These are commonwealths in the same geographical group as herself. To carry on commerce with the east necessitates crossing five ranges of mountains and a thousand miles of plain at great cost; the incurring of this expenditure for transportation is unnatural. Trade by this outlet must be forced, and natural conditions compel British Columbia to trade extensively with the three American States on the Pacific slope; and to remove all the restrictions existing between British Columbia and these States would be to confer untold benefits on the former. Take these four geographical groups of the Dominion—the Maritime Provinces, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the Province of Manitoba and the Territories of the North West and British Columbia—nature has decreed that each one of the four shall trade more naturally and on more advantageous terms with the country to the south of the line than with any other geographical group in the Dominion. Now, I say in each nature asserts itself, notwithstanding the policy of my hon. friend and his party, as shown in our trade returns of last year. Our imports for consumption from, and our exports to the United States and other countries in 1888, were as follows:—

United States.....	\$91,053,913
Great Britain.....	79,383,705
All other countries.....	22,612,482
	<u>\$193,050,100</u>

Our imports for consumption during the same year were:

From United States.....	\$48,481,848
do Great Britain.....	39,298,721
do all other countries.....	15,066,531
	<u>\$102,847,100</u>

Our exports were:

To United States.....	\$42,572,065
Great Britain.....	40,084,984
All other countries.....	7,545,951
	<u>\$90,203,000</u>

And this in spite of hostile tariffs—this by virtue of the decrees of nature and geography, and in spite of the policy of hon gentlemen on the opposite side. We imported from the United States over \$9,000,000 worth of goods more than we did from Great Britain, and we exported to the United States \$2,500,000 worth of goods more than we did to Great Britain, by virtue of the inexorable decrees of nature and geography. We had a period, as I said a few moments ago, of twelve years free trade with the United States, and during that period our trade with the United States developed to an extent which must teach a lesson that cannot fail to be understood. Reciprocity was brought about in 1854. We began in 1854 with an export trade to the United States of \$10,473,000. That was without the stimulating effect of free trade. The next year, under free trade, that export had risen to \$19,316,000, an increase of \$9,000,000—an increase of nearly 100 per cent. in one year under the operation of free trade; and during the twelve years, from 1854 to 1866, that export trade to the United States increased from \$10,473,000 to \$39,950,000—an increase of 260 per cent. in twelve years. That included all the Provinces now comprised in the Dominion. In 1854, the exports of Old Canada to the United States amounted to \$8,649,000; the next year, under free trade, they jumped to \$16,727,000; and in 1866 they reached \$34,770,000. And this, without

estimating shortage in inland returns, which were very much less in 1854 than in 1866. Now, with an increase of trade between the various Provinces of this Dominion of 280 per cent. in those twelve years, with an increase of trade between Old Canada and the United States of over 300 per cent. in the twelve years under free trade, I wish to contrast the condition of our trade since then under the policy of protection; but before doing so, I will say that had the annual increase between 1855 and 1866 been maintained to the present time, our exports to the United States alone would last year have reached \$94,000,000, and had the ratio of increase been maintained in the twenty-two years following the abrogation of the treaty, that was maintained during the twelve years of the operation of the treaty, our exports to the United States last year would have exceeded \$150,000,000.

Mr. BOWELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend may smile, but I believe the exports would have been greater than are indicated by this calculation. Now, against this increase of \$29,476,000, or an actual increase, estimating the inland returns shortage, which was \$3,413,000 greater in 1866 than 1855, of \$31,490,000 during this period of free trade—what have we to say with regard to the increase of trade since? Our exports last year were only \$2,620,000 greater than in 1866, or, deducting difference in shortage at inland ports between 1855 and 1866, our increase in exports in 1888, as compared with 1866, was but \$1,522,000 against \$31,490,000 in the 12 years during the operation of the treaty. This fact speaks volumes, and needs no comment. If the one policy gave this country an increase in exports of \$31,490,000 in 12 years, and the other policy gave in 22 years an increase of \$1,522,000, the two facts placed side by side, tell their own story, and need no comment. Great as were the advantages this country derived from free trade, those advantages were minimised by certain currency troubles that existed in the United States, at the close of the rebellion. From 1862 to 1866, the reckless gambling in gold, the depreciation of American currency, the reduction in the purchasing power of that currency, greatly diminished the advantages that this country would have derived from free trade had there been stable currency in the United States; and when the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated, almost immediately following that event came a more stable condition of American currency and a revival of business in that country, and an improvement in trade in consequence of that revival. We had the good effects of reciprocity minimised by this condition of currency, and we had the evil effects of the abrogation of the treaty for the first few years minimised by the return of the United States to a sounder currency; but even with these evils minimising the advantages in the one case and the disadvantages in the other, the results, as I have explained them to you, strikingly illustrate the great advantages to be derived by this country from free intercourse with the United States. What do our farmers remember about the years during the years which the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation? Talk with any farmer who lived then, and he will tell you of the excellent markets we had for our produce and cattle and stock. He will tell you that buyers swarmed in the country, he will tell you that there was an active demand for everything he had—and these are the days the farmers look back to as the bright days in the history of their country, these are the days they desire to see come again, and these are the days they are going to vote to have come again. These are the days that my hon. friend's resolution promises shall come to them again, and they will try that resolution, at all events, before they are convinced that they cannot have them again.

My hon. friend in his speech the other night showed, I was sorry to see, that he did not know