

year of the war Canada sold to the United States 27,800 horses, 141,600 cattle, 36,600 swine, 168,000 sheep and 600,000 barrels of flour. What the effect of a lack of these large supplies of munitions of war would have had upon the success of the Northern army at that time our American friends may imagine.

The termination of the reciprocity treaty did not, however, diminish imports into the United States from Canada. During the twelve years the treaty was in force our sales to that country aggregated \$286 982,174, or an annual average of \$23,915,181, while during the succeeding twelve years, when American duties were levied and collected, our sales aggregated \$364,685,594, or an annual average of \$30,390,449; and for eleven years after that the annual average of sales was \$39,161,088, showing that the volume of exports to the United States was not influenced by the American tariff. In seventeen years, from 1872 to 1889, Canada bought of the United States to the amount of \$885,764,449, and the United States bought of Canada to the amount of \$609,751,941, leaving a balance of trade against us of \$276,006,508, being an annual average of \$16,235,677. If this feature of our commercial intercourse with the United States is gratifying to our neighbors it certainly is not to us.

One noticeable feature of trade during the reciprocity period was that about all the wheat Canada had to export went to the United States. The latter country was then, as now, an exporter of wheat; and whatever of the article it bought of us it made money on. If it was converted into flour the grinding was done in American mills, and when it was exported, either as wheat or flour, it was through American ports and by American shippers. When, however, the treaty was repealed, the grinding was done in Canadian mills, the transportation was done in Canadian vessels and over Canadian roads, and the ocean voyage was from Canadian ports.

Perhaps our American friends think that by shutting certain Canadian products out of their market they are stimulating what would otherwise be an unsatisfactory state of affairs at home. The Canadian barley which they seem to dread is of a character entirely different from what they produce, and if they prohibit the importation of barley from this country they cannot produce anything to take the place of it. Therefore, while Canadian farmers may feel that they have to pay the American duty, American consumers are very pronounced in declaring that the duty is paid out of their pockets. The difference in the price of barley in Toronto and Buffalo indicates the higher price the American consumers have to pay for the article because of the McKinley tariff rather than the lower price the Canadian producers have to take.

So, too, as to horses. Canada produces breeds of horses superior for certain purposes to what can be produced in the United States; and when our American friends find that they have to have our horses, they not only pay full value for them in Canada, but they also pay the American duty upon them. Some Canadian stock-raisers who think the McKinley tariff injures their business are turning their attention to raising horses for the British market; and it is a fact that such horses as are suitable for cavalry service in the British army command from \$70 to \$80 more than what could be realized from sales to American purchasers.

The British Trade Report shows that the American export trade of cattle and sheep to the United Kingdom is decreasing rapidly. The following table shows the falling off in five years:

	Horned Cattle.	Sheep and Lambs.
1883.....	154,987	89,983
1884.....	139,213	30,317
1885.....	137,319	11,829
1886.....	113,756	5,551
1887.....	94,642	1,927

A falling off in five years of 60,000 cattle and 87,000 sheep.

In a recent open letter from Senator Wark, of New Brunswick, to Hon. Benjamin Butterworth, of Ohio, after an exhaustive analysis of the trade relations between Canada and the United States, he sums up as follows:

I have endeavored to show from your figures (1) that although your people were constantly complaining that the advantages of the reciprocity treaty were all on our side, yet during the first nine years the balance of trade was largely in your favor; (2) that the termination of the treaty did not, as was intended, reduce the amount of your purchases from us, but that they expanded more rapidly under your tariff than under the treaty; (3) that for the last seventeen years the balance of trade has been continually in your favor to a very large annual average of \$16,335,677; (4) that the termination of the treaty by giving the trade of Canada a new direction gave a vast impetus to many of our flagging industries and resulted greatly to our advantage.

It cannot fail to cause surprise to anyone looking into these questions of trade, that while the British Empire takes two-thirds of all your exports, and you have to search all the rest of the world for a market for the other third, yet you purchase from us only about one third of your imports, and your legislation appears to be intended to contract even your limited purchases from us. I think the history of trade fails to furnish an example of any civilized country continually buying from another that refused to reciprocate. It may be thought that necessity compels Britain to come to you for large quantities of food, and that cotton can be had nowhere else, but the permanency of this is far from certain.

The colonies in the near future may furnish all the food England requires, and as to cotton, there is a lesson to be learned from China and her tea. The Chinese appear to have thought at one time that for all time to come they would be the only producers of tea, and they would only part with it on their own terms, which were very stringent. England tired of this state of things; she saw that in India she possessed everything necessary for the cultivation of tea; good soil, a good climate and cheap labor, and the cultivation was commenced, and has been carried on most successfully, and last year, instead of going to China for her whole supply, she purchased there only 98,000,000 pounds, while she obtained from her own eastern possessions 118,500,000 pounds, and she need not have gone to China for so much but that she purchases to sell to countries that have no direct trade with China, and it is worthy of note that while China at one time required specie payments, she last year took British goods to the value of \$31,696,510 and sold to Britain \$32,288,365.

Now as to cotton, Sir Samuel Baker, who, from his thorough acquaintance with the interior of Africa, may be considered a very high authority, has stated that there is no finer country in the world for cultivating cotton. Two wealthy English companies have now undertaken to civilize and develop the resources of two extensive districts of that continent, and there can be little doubt that the cultivation of cotton will be among the first of these undertakings. As I am now in my eighty eighth year I do not expect to see the result, but I have a strong conviction that at no very distant day large quantities of cotton will be produced in that country, every bale of