

the Government of Canada to consider the best method of securing the best relations between Canada and the United States, and to ascertain on what terms greater freedom of intercourse between the two countries can best be secured, and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

In addition to this Mr. Blain, whose influence is paramount to-day in the United States, has clearly stated that he is willing to enter into negotiations with Canada, for freer trade relations, on the basis of Unrestricted Reciprocity.

But if this is an objection to the policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity, what is the position of Sir John Macdonald? He says he has dissolved Parliament simply because he wishes to negotiate with the United States a certain kind of limited, restricted reciprocity, confined to a few articles and products. The people of the United States have not been slow to give him an answer. Mr. Blain over his signature has plainly told Sir John that the people of the United States will have nothing to do with Sir John's limited reciprocity, or any kind of reciprocity except Unrestricted Reciprocity. This objection is then settled. The United States have declared that they will accept the kind of reciprocity proposed by Mr. Laurier, and that they will have nothing to do with that proposed by Sir John.

#### *The Second Objection.*

is that reciprocity with the United States would be disloyalty, in fact treason.

This objection is really too childish to require much discussion.

In the first place we have once had reciprocity with the United States, and Sir John Macdonald himself approved of it. Was anyone guilty of treason then? In the second place, when the National Policy so called was advocated by Sir John and his followers, the very object then stated to be had in view was to obtain Reciprocity. The words of Sir John, that he would have reciprocity in trade or reciprocity in tariff are familiar to every one. Was there any treason in that? In the third place we do now trade with the United States more than with any country in the world. Are all those engaged in that trade traitors? Then there there must be a great many good Conservatives who are traitors. They now trade under two hostile tariffs, pay heavy duties while trading, and as a consequence remain poor. If we get reciprocity these same men will simply go on trading, will pay no taxation or duties, for there will be none to pay, and get rich.

Is it loyalty to trade and remain poor? And is it treason to trade and get rich? The Jew in Russia is called a traitor, because he gets rich, but thank God in no part of the British Empire has man ever heard of such monstrous doctrine. What does England herself say about this extension of our trade? Why, there is not an English statesman that has not time and again declared that it was the right