

Sir John A. Macdonald carried those elections with a slight majority, although before the close of the poll the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Blaine, had publicly disclaimed having made any offer of a discussion looking to reciprocity in natural products. This did not prevent Sir John A. Macdonald's Government from sending to Washington, in the month following the elections, a delegation to see if the door could not be opened. That delegation was composed of Sir Charles Tupper and the Honourable Messieurs Thompson and Foster. The situation which confronted our Canadian delegation when they reached Washington was somewhat delicate. They went to the British Ambassador to be introduced. The British Ambassador made his official request, and Mr. Blaine answered in writing to Sir Julian Pauncefote that he desired first to have it recognized by the Canadian delegates that no negotiation had been initiated by him for a treaty based on an exchange of natural products only. And Sir Charles, who led that delegation, when he returned to Canada empty handed as usual, made the statement, and wrote it in his report, that his first declaration when he entered the presence of the Secretary of State was to agree with him that it was not the United States nor himself, Mr. Blaine, that had initiated the proceedings for reciprocity in natural products. Although they had seen each other, nothing came of this visit. The situation remained as it had been since 1866. There remained on our statute book, as I have said, "a standing offer of reciprocity," covering practically every item which had formed the basis of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854-66.

When Sir George Foster in 1894 modified the tariff, he again in the new act devoted five clauses to an effort to obtain reciprocity in natural products with the United States. These clauses in the statute of 1894, chapter 33, are the seventh, eighth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth, fairly reproducing the standing offer that had been on our statute book from 1879. But all these pilgrimages to Washington, as well as the correspondence which passed between Canada, Great Britain, and the United States, were in vain till 1911, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding at last succeeded where their predecessors had failed. We then saw that what up to that date had been thought pure gold for the two parties, and for the Conservative party especially, had changed to lead over night. When this policy of reciprocity in natural products was pro-

pounded by Sir John A. Macdonald and offered to the people twenty years before, it was an ideal policy, and when the election of 1891 was over and won, as I said, by all the people declaring themselves in favour of that policy, we all felt assured that we could die under the British flag. But when the Liberals succeeded in getting what the people had voted for unanimously in 1891 it became downright treason.

The campaign of 1911 was carried with the aid of a few slogans. The hoardings were covered with British and American flags, with these words underneath: "Under which flag?" Speakers in every village proclaimed that we should have no truck nor trade with the United States, and the manufacturers throughout the land were mobilized in a fierce assault against the reciprocity pact called the Taft-Fielding pact. These manufacturers were probably the same men who in the Red Parlour in Toronto had accepted the statement of Sir John A. Macdonald in 1891 that they were not touched by the arrangement—that the treaty did not affect the degree of protection which they had enjoyed up to that date; and yet, after adhering to the principles of Sir John A. Macdonald in 1891, after standing by and helping with their subscriptions, as the rumour went, in 1911 they went into hysterics and forced the Conservative party to renounce old policies and principles, and to inveigh against the dangers of restricted reciprocity with the United States in natural products.

In 1911 the manufacturers of Canada occupied exactly the same position with regard to the United States that they had occupied in 1891, and nothing justified them in assailing the Treaty and closing the American market to the products of the farm. They dictated a new policy to the Tory party. I was present in the gallery of the House of Commons when Mr. Fielding made his statement outlining the advantages which would accrue to Canada under the Treaty, and it would not have been possible to repress the Conservative members of the House who, one after another, interrupted the Minister of Finance to ask him whether a certain article in which they or their county was interested, was on the free list, and when Mr. Fielding said, "Yes, it is," they applauded and leaped with delight. I saw that happen in many instances, as the report of the debate in the House of Commons will undoubtedly show. Yet in a few days all was changed. The manufacturers, as I have said, set out to dictate