

legislation—in other words, for adopting so much of the National Policy as they did, because they have thereby averted the destruction of our manufacturing industries, and certain ruin and disaster to Canada.

The motto, 'Canada for Canadians,' is a good one, and our fiscal policy should be so framed as to make that motto a reality, and by the protection of labour give our people employment and keep them at home. Our natural resources are unlimited, and only by an adequate system of protection, such as they have in the United States, can many of these resources be fully developed. The cry of unjust taxation under such a protective system has been pretty well exploded among all the great nations of the world, England alone excepted, because when competition regulates prices, a high tariff only keeps foreigners out, and retains the home market for the home producer. At the same time that the United States is the most highly protected country in the world, that nation is yearly becoming free trade England's most formidable competitor in foreign markets.

But if adequate protection to our home industries were not in itself a wise and far-seeing policy for a young country like Canada, it is necessary to our progress and very existence at the present time, in view of the high tariff walls of the neighbouring republic. Our tariff walls should be as high as those of our neighbours, if we desire to deal with them on terms of equality, and we should not deal with them on any other terms. There are not many things in which we should desire to imitate that people, but in this respect it would be real wisdom on our part to flatter them, and never till we do so will we occupy in regard to that country our true level in the race of progress and national development. It is said there are to be tariff changes this session, and it is to be hoped they will be in the right direction, but it is hard to expect any result beyond further mistakes and confusion from a ministry in which one wing is for free trade,—another for protection,—and a third for reciprocity—a travesty on cabinet government.

There is another direction in which the tariff ought assuredly to be amended without further delay. I allude to our commercial relations with Germany. Retaliation is not a nice policy for any country to be compelled

to adopt, but there is no other policy open to Canada in our intercourse with that nation, whose tariff policy towards us is avowedly prohibitory since the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties. This is one of the results of the British preference, bungled through parliament, amid many misconceptions and much shortsightedness on the part of ministers. It is indeed the only result so far, of the abrogation of these treaties. Germany has much more to lose than Canada by a tariff war; we have always purchased much more of her products than she has of ours, and do so now, even under the greatest provocation to close our markets against her. Besides, it is well known that large quantities of goods manufactured in Germany are sent to England to be finished, and are then exported to Canada as British goods under the preferential tariff. A paragraph I came across in one of our city papers a short time ago shows the animus of Germany towards this country. It is as follows:—

London, Feb. 7.—Reuter's Berlin correspondent wires that it is denied by the Reichstag that contracts have been concluded with a Canadian firm for the supply of meat to the German army and navy and they regard as a legend the report that large quantities of Canadian wheat were being imported into Germany. Count Posadowsky said that Canadian wheat was only imported at the autonomous tariff rate of five marks. Regarding flour from Canadian wheat he said it was impossible to determine the country of its origin. Everything, however, was being done to prevent illegal or unauthorized importation from Canada.

Every thing is being done to prevent importation from Canada. This is the assurance a great dignitary was in a position to give the German parliament as late as last month, and it ought surely to be enough to move our government to action—in other words, to retaliation—avowed retaliation. There should be no mincing of words with that selfish and arrogant power, and we shall then have the satisfaction of knowing that we can inflict greater loss on its people than its law-makers can inflict on us. Reciprocity of tariff with all foreign nations whose tariffs are higher than our own should be our watchword, in justice to our people, and in the interest of all our producers—whether the wheat-growers of our great west, or the manufacturers of the older provinces.

I do not feel disposed to censure the government on the treaty concluded between