

was only intended to humbug them is clear, for at a meeting at Toronto, at the Albany Club, since the date of that dispatch, he boldly says: "The policy we introduced in 1878 we are going to stand by." That of course settles any doubt. You cannot have the protection, and unrestricted reciprocity at the same time.

MR. COLBY OPPOSED TO RECIPROCITY IN NATURAL PRODUCTS.

No later than the last session Mr. Colby, a cabinet minister, speaking for the government as well as himself, was asked the question following by Mr. Mills.

"That the hon. gentleman is opposed to free trade, in natural products?"

Mr. Colby answered "Most decidedly. I say that free trade between Canada and the United States in all agricultural products, would be the worst probable thing that could happen to the farmers at the present time.

No member of the Government made any attempt to repudiate or deny the statement by Mr. Colby of the policy of the Government.

Farmers of Canada, this is the real policy of the Government however they may try to change or vary it.

Is it your policy? Are you going to vote for that policy? What can you think of a minister that has deliberately entered upon that course, in view of the records of our trade and commerce with the nations of the world? Where is the man who is possessed of ordinary business sense, who desires his best customer to be cut off his list? Where is the man with the least degree of common sense in commercial life who desires to have his customer estranged from him and his trade cut off? Yet the hon. gentleman declares that to have free intercourse with the United States in trade would be injurious, the worst thing that could happen to our farmers and to others. Out of \$4,417,170 that we exported as the produce of the mine, the hon. gentleman asks that the country which takes \$3,753,351 worth of it, should be cut off, and that we should not send any there at all. Of the total of our fishery products of \$7,000,000 in round numbers, nearly three millions go to the United States, and the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall cut them off as our customers, that we will have no trade with them. What do you think of a minister of finance and a government that have entered on a policy like that? What think you of a Government that have declared their belief that as regards the products of the forests, which amount to \$23,000,000, in round numbers, of which the United States take \$11,000,000, charging a duty of \$2.00 per thousand, these products should not enter that market free, and it would be the worst thing that could happen if the market were free? What think you of a Government that as regards animals and their products, of which we export to the value of \$23,894,000, of which the