

at Washington or to prejudice the cause of the right hon. gentleman opposite and the British Commissioners—in fact to destroy those hopes of a new Reciprocity Treaty being carried out which had been previously indulged in. This, however, was not the fact. On the 6th of March, the British Commissioners proposed that the Reciprocity Treaty should be restored in principle. That was declined. The question of the fisheries was further discussed on the 7th, 20th, 22nd and 25th of March. In the course of these discussions, it was proposed or suggested by the American Commissioners that coal, salt and fish be reciprocally admitted free; also lumber, after the 1st July, 1874; and it was not till the 17th April, thirteen days after the unlamented demise of the National Policy, that the British Commissioners—the right hon. member for Kingston being one of them—rejected the offer as inadequate, and insisted on lumber being at once admitted free and the arrangement supplemented by a money payment. So, not only was the incipient treaty crushed and rejected at Washington thirteen days after the National Policy had been finally extinguished here, or something like a month after the first fatal stab had been given, but the right hon. member for Kingston was one of those who annihilated it. No more was heard about a national policy for some time. He supposed they might assume, without saying anything discourteous, that the advent of the general election of 1872 first recalled it to the mind of the right hon. member for Kingston. But, even on that occasion, the right hon. gentleman did not assert that what he now promised—a National Policy—was necessary in the interest of the country. In fact he spoke in a very different strain. He was at Peterborough in July, 1872, and the following was an extract from the speech he delivered on that occasion. The right hon. gentleman said:

“A very good friend of mine—a great personal friend—but one whose political principles differ from mine, who is what we might call a Grit—said to me the other day: ‘What fortunate fellows you are, Macdonald. Here you are with everything prosperous around you. The sun smiles upon you; our fields

are teeming with prosperity, and everything is shining upon you, while in days of old, while our poor friends were in the Government, we had clouded skies, dried up fields, and no crops, and you appropriate all this to your own merits and the country will be foolish enough to give you credit for what is an act of the climate.’ ‘Sir,’ said I, ‘it should only show you that Providence is on our side, and if you are a wise man, if you are a prudent man, if you wish a continuance of the same skies, the same rain, and the same crops, you will keep us where we are. Be sure, my good friend, that the weevil will come in with the Grits.’”

That was the right hon. gentleman's opinion regarding the state of the agricultural community, after the repeal of the National Policy in 1871. He need hardly say that the speech, so far as it went, did not in the slightest degree indicate any intention to carry out the principle of Protection. The right hon. gentleman went on further and said subsequently:

“Although we have been without reciprocity from 1866 until now, although we have been virtually excluded from the markets of the United States, our farmers are richer than ever, and easily find a sale for their products in the markets of the world. They are increasing their farms, and improving the breed of their live stock. In every branch of the agricultural community you see they are rising superior to the temporary disadvantage caused by the loss of the United States markets.”

That was then the opinion of the right hon. gentleman, who, to-day, asserted that it was only by opening the markets of the United States of America, by a process to which he (Mr. Dymond) would refer by-and-bye, and which he ventured to think would not have the sympathy even of that House—certainly not of the country—that the great agricultural interests of Canada could be saved from extinction; that, in 1872, was the opinion pronounced by the right hon. gentleman who, to-day, assured them that our agriculturists, as a matter of simple justice, must have access to the United States market. The hon. gentleman subsequently went to Hamilton, and there he also made a speech. He said:

“One of the most important questions of the day was the commercial policy of the country.”

MR. DYMOND.