

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER AND INDUSTRIAL WORLD.

REPORTED
TO
HOME INDUSTRIES,
COMMERCE,
FINANCE,
INSURANCE,
RAILWAYS &
MINING.

VOL. II.

TORONTO, ONT., MARCH 22, 1883.

No. 7

RECIPROCITY AGAIN.

Mr. Ross (Middlesex) moved in the House of Commons on Monday last for copies of correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, or any Board of Trade in Canada or the United States, upon the question of reciprocal trade relations between the two countries upon the general basis of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. He made the motion, he said, for two reasons. In the first place, he wanted to see whether, as predicted, the National Policy had caused the Americans to sue for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. In the second place, he wanted to impress upon the House the necessity of reciprocal arrangements with the United States. Our population since Confederation had increased but thirty per cent., while our exports had increased eighty per cent. Thus it would be seen that our produce increased with greater rapidity than our population. With such an increase of our products, our prosperity must be injured unless an outlet was secured for them, nor with the opening of the North-west would a solution of the difficulty be found. On the contrary, the North-west would for years be a producing rather than a consuming country, and would add to the necessity for enlarging our outside markets. Canada had spent a vast sum to develop internal communication. The items of note were forty millions. Not only this, but the whole fiscal system was changed, and the teachings of England and her political economists, as well as the tradition of our own country, were in favor of the American systems. Further, we had spent the enormous sum of \$3,104,000 on immigration in the last ten years. He contrasted an increase of population of 30 per cent. since Confederation with an increase of exports of 80 per cent., taking these figures to indicate that the home market was not keeping pace with the productive capacity of the people, and that some means for extending trade was absolutely essential to continued success.

His next point was that 90 per cent. of the export trade was done with Great Britain and the United States, the latter being the largest customer. In Ontario the total exports were \$37,000,000, of which the United States took \$29,000,000. From Quebec the United States took \$6,000,000. Nova Scotia sent one-half, New Brunswick, one-third, British Columbia, one-half, Prince Edward Island, one-third, and Manitoba, one-sixth, of their exports to the United States. Taking another set of figures to exemplify the same point and to show that Canadian raw materials, which were such a source of wealth to Canada, were just what the United States wanted,

he showed that the Americans took 60 per cent. of our agricultural products, 43 per cent. of the products of the forest, and 30 per cent. of the exports of animals and products. Further, he proved that we bought from our neighbors nearly as much as we sold them. Referring to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, he quoted figures to show that it had increased the Canadian trade from \$17,000,000 in 1853 to \$82,000,000 in 1865. He admitted that trade increased even after the treaty was abrogated, but held that Canada had simply been compelled to seek other markets, and had prospered, not because of, but in spite of, abrogation. He conceived it to be Canada's duty to seek for a renewal of that treaty, or one equally favorable to Canada. The Dominion was now in a better position than ever before to seek for such renewal. The people were in a prosperous condition; Confederation had been firmly established, and the country was assuming a position almost of nationality. Besides all this, the arrangement under the Washington Treaty, by which Americans hold our fisheries, would soon expire, and we would have this advantage to offer in any negotiations carried on. Canada could go in a dignified way, therefore, to seek negotiations on the subject of reciprocity, and only in that spirit would he have the Dominion's representatives approach the United States.

Mr. White (Cardwell) thought that in view of the probable abrogation of the Washington Treaty, the speech made by the hon. gentleman was at this time most inopportune. What was the meaning of such a speech? It implied that the future commercial prosperity of the country was largely dependent upon the action of the Americans, and that they had it in their power to cripple us by simply refusing to renew commercial trade relations. In the tariff bill of 1879 there was a standing offer to our neighbors on the other side of the line to come into reciprocal relations for all the natural products of the country. That bill actually contained a provision that as soon as the United States chose to withdraw the duty on our natural products our Government would withdraw the duties on similar articles upon this side. Surely no more practical or substantial evidence could be given of the willingness of the Government to renew reciprocity. If reciprocity could be got on fair terms, accept it; but nothing good could result from our going hat in hand to our neighbors and letting them know that our commercial success depended on having free access to their markets. By maintaining a dignified and self-reliant attitude we would be able to live independent of any policy which they might adopt on the other side, while we would always hold ourselves ready to meet them on fair terms on the