

British premier, to the Government of the United States, in which the Queen's Government is favorably inclined to the proposal to revert to the treaty of Washington without suggesting a pecuniary indemnity. A settlement on this basis would be honorable to all concerned, and, we believe, satisfactory. If such settlement is made, the argument in the preamble of Mr. Butterworth's bill loses its point, and the necessity of the passage of that bill, on that account, ceases. If such settlement is made, the terror of retaliation on the part of the United States, so vividly and pyrotechnically displayed by Mr. Wiman also ceases, and the discussion of the reciprocity question must be conducted on its legitimate and proper grounds. It is not to the credit of the intelligence of any man, in either country, to suppose that Canada could be driven into the measure by fear of brute force on the part of the United States, or that the American people could desire to settle the fishery question by such means.

As stated by Mr. Joseph D. Weeks, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in his letter published in this issue, the manufacturers of the United States do not desire this reciprocity, and that as protectionists they view the question as one of national and not of international importance. Protection to American industries became the settled policy of the American Government on the accession to power of the Republican party in 1860, and under that policy the United States have grown to be probably the richest and most powerful nation on earth. England has always viewed that country with a covetous eye, and ever since the days of Cobden has sought to break down the barrier of protection which kept her manufactures to a large extent out of the American market. The free trade element in the United States, to whose cause Mr. Wiman is lending his energies and influence, is constantly endeavoring to change the policy of the Government, but the recent revival of trade there, and the extension of manufacturing industries into all parts of the country, particularly the Southern States, which have heretofore always been of free trade proclivities, have strengthened the protection sentiment most wonderfully, and this move looking to unrestricted Canadian reciprocity is nothing but an effort in a new direction to accomplish the breaking down of the protection barrier, and the establishment of Cobdenism and free trade. That defeat which could not be accomplished at one blow is now being attempted in detail; and if reciprocity could be established with Canada there would be no sufficient reason why it should not be extended to Great Britain and the rest of the world.

Mr. Wiman speaks truly when he says that a strong belief exists in Canada that a complete interchange of natural and manufactured products would result disastrously to the young and promising manufacturing interests of the Dominion, and that these fears would provoke an intensity of conviction and bitterness of discussion. The letters from Canadian manufactures being published in these columns reflect the "strong belief" that the writers entertain on the subject. The animus of the whole matter lies in the arguments made by Mr. Wiman that "reciprocity would result in the building up of a great trade to and from Canada, and in making her vast natural resources contributory to the progress and growth of the United States;" that reciprocity means for the United States "the freest access to every natural product of Canada, which she

greatly needs;" and that the advantage to the United States would be "in the free access to the vast mineral resources, timber limits, phosphate beds and other products of Canada which she so greatly needs." But if the United States need these vast and valuable Canadian resources for their further and greater aggrandizement, surely Canada has greater need of them for the promotion of her own welfare. If American capitalists, iron masters, lumbermen and manufacturers generally desire Canadian ores, and access to Canadian forests; and if Canadian phosphates are desired for the enrichment of American soil, Canada will gladly welcome the erection within her borders of blast furnaces, lumber mills, factories, foundries, workshops and every other character of industrial establishment for the consumption of such products. But Canada does not propose to allow herself to be denuded of all her rich and valuable natural products, the same to be carried away in their crude condition to a foreign country, to give employment to untold millions of capital invested there, and to teeming millions of artisans and skilled workers. Valuable natural resources and a generous protective tariff raised the United States from a lower level than that which Canada now occupies, and placed them in a most enviable position. Canada also possesses similar valuable resources and a national tariff policy which will undoubtedly elevate her to a similar position among the nations of the earth. But to be so elevated she must rigidly adhere to her fostering care of her infant industries, and discourage and prevent the exportation of her valuable products in their crude condition. They must be manufactured on Canadian soil.

We resume our

SYMPOSIUM.

From MR. THOMAS COWAN, president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and proprietor of the Galt Foundry Engine and Machine Works, Galt, Ont.

"Regarding 'Reciprocity in manufactures,' allow me to say that I question if our industries are sufficiently developed yet to cope with the old established and long protected concerns of the States. All manufacturers are aware that it takes considerable time to settle down and fully develop special lines of manufactures, though much has been done in that way in Canada of late years. With their long experience and their well-known preference for 'specialties,' I fancy manufacturers in the United States would have the advantage of us at the start. There would also arise the vexed question regarding patent rights, for in reaching the American market it might be found necessary to wade through a sea of expensive patent-right litigation in the American courts. From a patriotic standpoint I should judge that none of us would propose reciprocal trade relations with a foreign country and deny the same privileges to Great Britain so long as we remain part and parcel of the Empire. Apart from all this I very much prefer the idea of working out our own destiny.

"We have a country of vast extent and unlimited resources, the value of which we are only beginning to realize. Then why not continue as we are doing, to develop the latent wealth of 'Field, Forest and Mine' in our own country, and to occupy the new markets with our own products? I am glad to be able to assure you that already some of our industries are taxed to their utmost to fill orders for new markets recently created by the completion of our 'National highway.' Why then drop the reality to catch at the shadow? In these opinions I believe I am sustained by those in the same line of manufacture as myself, and I do not venture to give the views of those