

lutions the meeting adopted, was the following declaration of their views on the question of a reciprocal tariff:—

“1. They are satisfied that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Financial Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining, and manufacturing interests of the Dominion.

“2. That no such readjustment will be satisfactory to the interests affected or to the country, if adopted as a provisional means only to meet a temporary exigency or to supply a temporary deficit, nor unless it is made and carried out as a National Policy.

“3. That, until a reciprocity of trade is established with our neighbours, Canada should move in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs so far as her varied interests may demand.

“That it is the duty of the people of Canada to force upon the attention of the Government and Parliament of the Dominion the necessity of carrying out their views, and to withhold or withdraw their confidence from any Government which may fail, from want of will or want of ability, to enforce them by legislative enactment.”

That, it was true, was almost as vague and indefinite as the present amendment; it might be anything or nothing. But they began to see a little light when they read the newspaper organs of the right hon. gentleman, and also some of his speeches. The Toronto Conference not only expressed confidence in the the hon. gentleman, but also in his organ, the *Mail*. Such faithful organs as the *Belleville Intelligencer*, the *Montreal Gazette*, the *St. John Watchman*, the *Halifax Herald*, the *London Herald* and the old *Toronto Leader* were not recognized; but the *Mail* was announced as the special exponent of the right hon. gentleman's policy. To learn what the right hon. member for Kingston had in his mind and what was understood by his party with respect to reciprocity of tariffs or reciprocity of trade, they had only to turn to the *Mail* and they would find that, for the first time, reciprocal trade with the United States was fiercely assailed and vehemently denounced. If, as the *Mail* declared, Protection would be a benefit to the country, and if we were to follow the example of the United States, which had built round itself fiscal barriers, and were thus to exclude the products, not

only of Protectionist America, but also of Free-trade England, what did we want with reciprocity of trade? If we were to have “Canada for Canadians,” and adopt a policy of retaining our own products in the country, of making wealth out of our own industry by accumulating it within our own limits, what did we want with reciprocity of trade? He believed the country desired reciprocity with the United States on fair and reasonable terms. He could imagine no sensible man, no man who had the real national interests at heart, who did not wish to see all fiscal barriers broken down, except those necessarily retained for revenue purposes, by two kindred nations lying alongside of each other as did the United States and Canada. If it were only in the interest of peace, to strengthen the feeling of amity and friendship which should exist between two great nations speaking the same language, united by their institutions, and, to a large extent, by their religious sympathies, and by everything that tended to make us feel as one people, a man could not have the heart or soul of a man who did not desire to have reciprocity of trade with the United States, if that could be obtained on fair and equal terms. The right hon. gentleman's organ, the *Mail*, declared that reciprocal trade would be impossible, and, if possible, would not be beneficial but mischievous; and it went on to furnish an argument which the Americans might use against Canada in negotiations for a reciprocity treaty, namely, that such a treaty would not only involve the admission of British goods to the injury of our own manufactures, but that the Dominion might become a vast smuggling field to their injury. He thought therefore, the House might come to the conclusion—and he would allude presently to some observations of the right hon. gentleman himself to sustain his argument—that the right hon. member for Kingston did not care for reciprocity of trade, but preferred the other alternative, reciprocity of tariffs. He thought, in justice to truth and to all the evidence before them, whatever might have been the right hon. gentleman's motive, whether it was the conviction of his own mind, or, like his