

Should the Treaty be abrogated, a large portion of Canadian wheat would, no doubt, still be purchased by the American manufacturers, to mix with their own growth of wheat, or otherwise; and as our Canadian lumber is so far superior to the American in the Chicago and other western markets, a large business would still be done, even if the lumber so exported should be subjected to a moderately high American tariff.

What we want is, not abrogation of the Treaty, but entire Reciprocity in all our manufactured as well as natural and raw products. Our manufacturers would then have additional reasons for desiring its continuance, apart from those already referred to; for as it now is, the Americans purchase our raw products and pay for them in manufactured goods, both processes being decidedly to their interest and prejudicial to our manufacturers, to whom it increases the price of the raw material, while subjecting them to an unfair competition in an exceedingly limited market, and results in a large annual *balance of trade* against us.

If we compare the annual excess of imports from the United States, over exports thereto, both prior to and during the Treaty, we shall see that it has worked more for the benefit of the American people than for ourselves.

For the years 1852-3, the average annual excess of imports over exports was \$2,069,468. During the year 1854 the Treaty came into operation. For the first five years of the Treaty, 1855, 6, 7, 8, and 9, the average annual excess of imports from the United States over the exports thereto, was \$4,642,128; showing the balance of trade against us under the Treaty, and before the Rebellion, to have been more than double the amount of the excess prior to the Treaty.

During the years 1860, 1, 2, and 3, the four years of the civil war, the annual excess of imports over exports with the United States was \$4,674,087.

These facts go to show that, with increased facilities for disposing of our raw products to the United States, their facilities for supplying us with manufactured goods more than doubly increased under the Treaty; and yet their people, press and congress, with the exception of some of the western States, urge that the benefits are all, or nearly so, on the side of the Provinces, even with the advantages they derive from the fisheries and the free navigation of our canals and rivers, consequent upon the Treaty.

Senator Ramsey, a western State representative, having a more correct appreciation of the subject than most of his co-legislators, in a speech delivered by him during the discussion on the *notice to terminate the Treaty*, said:—

“We exported in 1863 from the United States into Canada, \$12,339,367 free of duty by the Reciprocity Treaty, and \$6,595,599 free of duty by Canadian tariff—an aggregate of \$19,134,966. As the whole exportation from the United States into Canada was \$23,109,362, this leaves only \$3,974,396 subject to the Canadian tariff, of which the value of \$1,855,690 was of articles not produced or manufactured in the United States. In other words, while Canada admitted free of duty \$19,134,396 from the United States, the whole amount of our produce and manufactures which were subject to taxation by the Canadian tariff was \$2,118,706. The average taxation being twenty per cent, the Canadian consumers paid \$423,741 into the treasury of the Province. The importations from Canada during 1863 were \$20,050,432, or an aggregate of trade with the United States of \$43,159,794. I will not extend these statistical statements. They concur with my former impressions, as a citizen of the Northwest, that the Treaty is mutual and beneficial.”

In view of these facts and figures, and especially comparing the excess of imports from the United States before and during the Treaty, we do not see how its termination can injuriously affect the general industrial interests of the Province.

WANT OF PUNCTUALITY.

If there is one evil more prevalent than another amongst business men, in this country, it is the want of punctuality in keeping appointments, and in fulfilling engagements generally. Too many allow themselves to be elected to office, where no emoluments are concerned, merely for the *honor* it confers upon them, and then feel under no particular responsibility to perform the duties they may have assumed. Others with whom they have to act may attend promptly at the hour of meeting, and have to wait half an hour or an hour, before business can be commenced, or adjourn until some other day—perhaps then to meet with a similar disappointment. We have in numberless instances known business men, of punctual habits, meet a number of times in succession, without having sufficient of their colleagues present to enable them to proceed to business, thus having their valuable time sacrificed through the culpable neglect of others.

Mechanics and employees too often enter into rash engagements to have work done, or some other services performed by a stated time, when, if they had properly calculated their opportunities, it would be apparent to them that they could not possibly fulfil the engagements thus rashly entered into. Disappointment and injury is thus caused to others, and their own reputation for truthfulness and reliability is destroyed.

In matters of apparently but trifling importance,