

along our border. We are now making great efforts to extend the commercial advantages we possess by the renewal of the reciprocity treaty with our neighbor. While it is of course impossible that all can gain every advantage they each desire in the matter, I am perfectly satisfied that Quebec will reap enormous advantages over all other places under the proposed measure, which will no doubt greatly extend our trade relations on both sides of the line."—*Speech of Hon. A. Mackenzie, Dominion Prime Minister.*

"Here are extracts from the testimony of Mr. W. E. Sanford, of Sanford, Vail & Bickley, wholesale clothiers, Hamilton:—'We employ a capital of over \$500,000. Our employés number over one thousand. We can obtain as much labor in Canada as we wish; if we had reciprocity or free trade with the United States we would be pleased, as we are confident we would be enabled to clean out our warehouse in sixty days.' Mr. Sanford is evidently not afraid of being ruined by a market of forty million people being thrown open to his firm, nor is Mr. E. Gurney, stove founder, Toronto, who says:—'If the tariff arrangement were reciprocal, we could enter their (the American) territory.'"—*Halifax Chronicle.*

The *Ottawa Citizen*, November 27, 1874, says that Mr. Rathbone, of Mill Point, a leading lumberman, spoke to a meeting of lumbermen in Ottawa, and impressed on them the importance of the treaty to their trade and their country.

Canadians want reciprocity because it will relieve them of the payment of duties on their raw products which are sent to this country.

"The crop of wheat in the United States is officially estimated at two hundred and forty millions of bushels. We, as a Dominion, imported more wheat and flour than we exported in 1872, as per our government official returns. It is, therefore, very evident that we could not influence in the least degree the market price of wheat in the United States, and that *if we send our wheat there we lose the duty.* The proportion of our *surplus* of horses, cattle, sheep, and wool to the amount they consume is so very small that it is equally plain that we can not influence the price in their market, and that *we lose the duty.* The Americans consumed last year nearly forty million bushels of barley, of which we gave about one-tenth. If one-tenth can control the market price, then we can dictate the price of barley in the United States, and compel the consumer to pay the duty. We think that *our farmers lose the duty on barley*, or at least