

to their own markets—that is to say, A says to B, ‘If you will make your duties such that I can sell in your market, I will make my duties such that you can sell in my market.’ But we begin by saying, ‘We will levy no duties on anybody,’ and we declare that it would be contrary and disloyal to the glorious and sacred doctrine of free trade to levy any duty on anybody for the sake of what we can get by it. (Cheers.) It may be noble, but it is not business. (Loud cheers.) On those terms you will get nothing, and I am sorry to have to tell you that you are practically getting nothing. The opinion of this country, as stated by its authorized exponents, has been opposed to what is called a retaliatory policy. (A voice, ‘No, no.’) Oh, but it has. We, as the Government of the country at the time, have laid it down for ourselves as a strict rule from which there is no departure, and we are bound not to alter the traditional policy of the country unless we are convinced that a large majority of the country is with us—(cheers)—because in these foreign affairs consistency of policy is beyond all things necessary. (Cheers.) But though that is the case, still, if I may aspire to fill the office of a counsellor to the public mind, I should ask you to form your own opinions without reference to traditions or denunciations—not to care two straws whether you are orthodox or not, but to form your opinions according to the dictates of common sense. I would impress upon you that if you intend, in this conflict of commercial treaties, to hold your own, you must be prepared, if need be, to inflict upon the nations which injure you the penalty which is in your hands, that of refusing them access to your markets. (Loud and prolonged cheers, and a voice, ‘Common sense at last.’) There is a reproach in that interruption, but I have never said anything else. . . . Now, I am not in the least prepared, for the sake of wounding other nations, to inflict any dangerous or serious wound upon ourselves. We must confine ourselves, *at least for the present*, to those subjects on which we should not suffer very much whether the importation continued or diminished; but what I complain about of the Rabbis of whom I have just spoken is that they confuse this vital point. (Cheers.) They say that everything must be given to the consumer. Well, if the consumer is the man who maintains the industries of the country, or is the people at large, I agree with the Rabbis. You cannot raise the price of food or of raw material, but there is an enormous mass of other articles of importation from other countries, besides the United States, which are mere matters of luxurious consumption—(cheers); and if it is a question of wine, or silk, or spirits, or gloves, or lace, or anything of that kind (a voice, ‘Hops,’ and cheers)—yes, there is a good deal to be said for hops—but in those cases I should not in the least shrink from diminishing the consumption, and interfering with the comfort of the excellent people who consume these articles of luxury, for the purpose of maintaining our rights in this commercial war, and of insisting on our rights of access to the markets of our neighbors. (Cheers.) As one whose duty

it is to say what he thinks to the people of this country, I am bound to say that our Rabbis have carried the matter too far. We must distinguish between consumer and consumer, and while jealously preserving the rights of a consumer who is co-extensive with a whole industry, or with the whole people of the country, we may fairly use our power over an importation which merely ministers to luxury, in order to maintain our own in this great commercial battle. (Cheers.)”

The words, “at least for the present,” which I have italicised are somewhat significant

It has been alleged that Lord Salisbury at a recent speech in Liverpool repudiated, or endeavored to explain away, what he said last year at Hastings. Let me now quote from the *Times*’ report of this repudiating or explanatory speech, together with the *Times*’ comment upon it, and let the reader judge whether Lord Salisbury explains away, or modifies, or in substance reaffirms his former utterances:

“I am very nervous to allude to it, because I have found when I have uttered most innocent and tentative observations that I am always accused of re-imposing a duty upon corn, and you will therefore forgive me if I say that I look upon the duty on corn as outside the dreams of any politician, and I am perfectly convinced that if a duty upon corn be re-imposed it would be so precarious a hold that no sane man would invest a farthing on the security of its continuance. Having put that question aside, I will invite your attention to the very curious and remarkable fiscal problems, which are now being worked out for our benefit by other nations. The great question which I think really divides us on the question of fiscal legislation is, whether it is lawful, and if lawful, whether it is expedient, to use your tariff as a fighting weapon. I have always been of opinion that the doctrine held by distinguished free-traders on this subject is somewhat too absolute, and when people say that reciprocity means protection I am tempted to doubt whether they have taken the trouble to clear their thoughts, which is necessary in dealing with fiscal science. But the matter, I hope, will be one which need not be settled in controversy. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Blaine, by his calm legislation, undoubtedly succeeded in securing some very advantageous stipulations for his country in negotiations with other Powers. The results have not been so definite nearer home. France and Italy, France and Switzerland, may be said, in a tariff sense, to be at open war. One thing is quite certain—that that war does infinite harm to both parties concerned. How it will end it is impossible for us to guess, but we must watch the issue of the campaign with the very deepest attention, for