

The American returns for the same period give somewhat different results. According to the American results the imports from all British America, Newfoundland and British Columbia included are as follows :

Imports from the United States, 1854	
to 1866 inclusive.	\$343,326,000
Exports to the United States, 1854	
to 1866 inclusive.	318,760,000

Balance of trade in favour of United States. \$ 34,566,000

The balance of trade by the American returns is \$34,566,000 and by the Canadian returns \$73,052,000. Now, the American people in abrogating the treaty in 1866 were governed to some extent by the impression that the treaty was working against them; that the balance of trade was against them and in favour of Canada. This was the case in the last year; it was the case because the notice of the abrogation had been given a year in advance, and there was great pressure to rush into the United States everything that it was possible to get in during the time that was left, before August, 1866. But the operation of the treaty during all the period it was in force was to the advantage of the United States, and gave to that country during that period a substantial balance of trade in its favour—seventy-three millions, according to our returns; thirty-four millions, according to their returns. No reason was given for the abrogation of the treaty, which was really to the advantage of both countries, and would have been more advantageous as the years went by. The abrogation was an act of folly on the part of the United States and an act of unfriendliness as well, and the policy pursued since that time and up to a recent period has been one dictated. In my opinion, by the belief that the inflicting upon us of a repressive policy would drive us into the arms of the republic.

The truth was, Mr. Speaker, that we were obliged to seek new markets. The truth was that the abrogation of the treaty revolutionized the trade of Canada. The truth was that this act of the American government gave a new face to the history of this continent, and turned aside the tide of the forces that were setting powerfully in the direction of bringing these two peoples together, and put in place of these forces other forces that repelled them from each other, and brought them to the position they occupy to-day. In 1866 our direct exports of farm products to Great Britain were \$3,544,000, and to the United States, \$25,042,000. In 1902 our direct exports of farm products to the United States were \$7,694,000, one-third of what they were in 1866, while to Great Britain they were \$80,661,000, a twenty-two fold increase during the same period. And so our whole fiscal history was reversed. Now conditions were introduced, conditions which the Americans were not aware of, which they have only recently become aware of. All this time they have

been living in a fool's paradise, supposing that we were dependent upon them for a market and that they could exercise the same influence on sentiment in Canada which they did in 1866. Our total export trade last year in animals and their products was \$59,161,209; and in agricultural products, \$37,152,688, a total of \$96,313,897. Of this amount Great Britain took \$80,661,501, or 83.7 per cent of the whole amount; the United States, \$7,694,478, or eight per cent of the whole amount; and all other countries, \$7,967,918, or 8.3 per cent. So that England last year took over four-fifths of our total export of farm products to all the world. This is a condition of things greatly different from what existed in 1866, when the United States took twenty-five millions and Great Britain less than four millions.

Under these conditions it is not surprising that the Canadian farmer has practically forgotten about the American market. The benefits that he enjoyed by free access to that market during the existence of the reciprocity treaty are largely a matter of history to him. He has had no practical lessons of those benefits. He realizes in a sort of abstract way that two markets are better than one, that it could do no harm to have access to the American market, that it would indeed be quite beneficial to him; but he has not that keen desire for access to that market that he would have if he were aware of the conditions that would exist if the restrictions were removed. So that, in debating this reciprocity question to-day, we have to recognize a certain degree of apathy with regard to it existing in Canada as well as in the United States.

We have opposed to this treaty, I think we may say, the manufacturing interest; we have probably opposed to it the transporting interest; and we have opposed to it the political influence which is represented by the people in this country who believe that nothing good can come out of the United States, and who do not want to have anything to do with the Americans. We have in favour of this treaty a sort of passive feeling on the part of the agriculturists, and keen desire for it on the part of the lumbermen and the fishermen. These are the forces arrayed for and against the proposition to secure better trade relations with the United States.

We have some developments of our trade in farm products—for I am dealing with this question largely from the farmer's standpoint—that are rather singular, rather unexpected to those who have never examined the question, and are rather suggestive. Last year, while we exported to the United States \$7,694,478 of farm products, we imported from that country for consumption, according to the unreviled list which I have, and which will not be varied very much by the revised list, \$15,437,213, or somewhat more than double the amount we exported to that country. Among our imports of agricultural and animal products where our purchases