

or any foreign people. Such departure were bad faith, ending in confusion and trouble.

Not long ago the Russian minister laid before our Department of State the fact that we admitted hemp, produced in a British province (India), at a duty of \$25 per ton, while Russian hemp paid \$40.

The matter was examined, the surplus duty paid back to Russia, and her hemp admitted at \$25 per ton duty. Already the *Sheffield Telegraph* (England) says: "What the United States is suffered to import into Canada at specific duty or free, that also it will be arranged may be imported from the United Kingdom (Great Britain) on the same precise terms. * * * Free trade is the thick end of the wedge, of which some Americans call Reciprocity the thin edge.

What the *Telegraph* says can be "arranged" by Great Britain, can be claimed and "arranged" by France, Germany, etc., as well. We have too high respect for the sagacity patriotism and law-abiding spirit of the Senate and House of Representatives to suppose that the one will consent to, or the other in any way approve, a Treaty, the consummation of which would violate sacred Constitutional obligations and binding agreements with great commercial powers, open the way for constant and just complaints from fifty foreign nations, and end in shameful and disastrous re-adjustments of our commercial relations, or in serious and perhaps warlike troubles.

If it be said that no such troubles grew out of our Reciprocity with Canada from 1854 to 1866, we reply that nations have grown more vigilant with the vast growth and vital importance of their industries and trade, and that it is far better to avoid than to blindly follow a bad and dangerous precedent.

Remonstrance.

In our statements and arguments we have mainly confined ourselves to our own industry, and to interests most