

other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home; will restore prosperity to our struggling industries now so sadly depressed; will prevent Canada being made a sacrifice market; will encourage and develop an inter-provincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for the country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade." This, Sir, is the National Policy in the germ. We have before us a part of the monstrosity, after thirteen months' gestation, by the hon. leader of the Government. What does this mean? What does the hon. gentleman mean by fostering inter-provincial trade? For what reason is it to be fostered? If it is profitable, it does not require to be fostered. Self-interest will keep it alive. For what reason, then, is it to be fostered? Is it on grounds of public policy, wholly apart from economic reasons? I admit that inter-provincial trade, mutually advantageous to those who engage in it, is of great political importance. But the political importance of our inter-provincial trade is not diminished by Free-trade with our neighbours. If it is a political necessity that Ontario should use Nova Scotia coal, and that Nova Scotia should use Ontario flour, why do you wish to divert the coal trade to Boston and the flour trade to New York by a treaty of reciprocity? The fact is, the resolution is made up of mutually destructive propositions. If inter-provincial trade in all things produced in the Dominion is necessary, why should you seek a reciprocity of trade with our neighbours, when you know it will greatly diminish our inter-provincial trade? If Ontario ought, for reasons of State, or for occult reasons of political economy, hidden from Free-traders and Englishmen, but revealed to the Premier and those who follow him, to purchase Nova Scotia coal, why seek to bring about reciprocal Free-trade in coal? The resolution of last year affirms that Protection is necessary to stimulate and vary the industries of the country; that it is necessary to keep up inter-provincial trade; that both are

necessary to national unity and to diversified industry. So far your course is inconsistent, your aim intelligible, but you intimate your desire to eventually secure a reciprocity of trade, not with all the world, but with the United States. And what is to be the effect of this ultimate blessing? According to the doctrine of this resolution, it is to stop the growth of manufactures and diminish inter-provincial trade. Hon. gentlemen will find that they have surpassed the public expectation. I say to these hon. gentlemen, you pointed out to the people of Canada what an illiberal policy the Congress of the United States had pursued towards this country; you aroused their indignation; you told them that they paid some millions of dollars yearly into the United States treasury. The majority had too much sense to believe you; but—no matter what the consequence might be—they were ready to retaliate because they were offended at the unwise and illiberal course which Congress had pursued. They favoured retaliation, but they were not converts to the policy of Protection. We, Sir, took a different view. We were not disposed to engage in a Japanese duel with them, because we knew well that it was greatly against the interest of the people of this country, and we preferred being the victims, rather than the instruments, of public folly. Our part was the part of honest men, and I rest contented, notwithstanding the taunts of hon. gentlemen opposite, being perfectly confident, when passion has subsided, what the public judgment will be. But I say, Sir, to these gentlemen upon the Treasury benches, and to those behind them, you have exceeded your authority, you have fallen short of your promises. Much that you promised you have not undertaken. Much that you have undertaken you dared not have promised. You profited by the indignation that you aroused against the United States. You won by it. It was a foul success. How have you used it? Why, Sir, to make war on the commerce of the United Kingdom. You told the farmers that you favoured reciprocity (although we knew the contrary)—that you did not want a one-sided reciprocity. Why, then, do you level the shafts of your malignant policy against the commerce of the British Islands? Why do you