

British islands that we did fourteen years ago, and during that same interval the American market has shown no growth whatever. The hon. Finance Minister spoke of our very large sales of cheese and beef, and indicated that, with continued energy and skill in studying the demands and conditions of the English market, we could fit ourselves to compete in that market with respect to other articles. There is no manner of doubt about it. Any one who is interested in agricultural pursuits, and who studies the question in a practical way, must know that there is no practical reason why we cannot sell butter, and eggs, and poultry, and many other products of the farm in the English market, much more largely than we do now, and to greater advantage than we ever could in the American market. Further, I am proud to say, there is on the English horizon a cloud the size of a man's hand, indicating a change of policy to our advantage. That may not afford our hon. friends opposite as much pleasure as it does us, but it excites in some of us the hope that, before we are many years older, we may, by means of new political adjustments, find in the old country, for the products of our farms, a much larger market than we have hitherto found. A very small difference of duty, a duty of 5 or 7 per cent. in the English market in favour of our wheat, and our barley, and our beef, and our mutton, and our poultry, and our eggs, and our lumber, would guarantee the very rapid building up of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that it is perfectly whimsical to talk about such an event, because it will never happen. They say that the leading statesmen on the English platforms have declared against it. They often quote what Mr. Gladstone and other leaders have said, but I say the utterances of Mr. Gladstone and the others on this question are not half so significant as were the utterances of leaders of opinion in England four years before the corn laws were repealed. Let hon. gentlemen read the speeches in the English *Hansard* of 1842-44 against this repeal, and then turn to the *Hansard* of 1846, and they will find that too much attention cannot be paid to those declarations of Mr. Gladstone and the others. Hon. gentlemen will remember that within five years the voters of England have been increased by 2,000,000. Before the last reform Bill there were 3,000,000, and to-day there are 5,000,000 voters, and the 2,000,000 who have been added are almost entirely the farming population. It is Hodge who has come in; it is the agricultural labourer largely who makes up those 2,000,000. The farming population of England, the landlord, the tenant and the farm labourer, are almost a unit in favour of differential duties to protect themselves against the American products and the products of Russia and Germany; and the chambers of commerce, in city after city, which show the indications of a movement even among the manufacturing classes, have declared in favour of this charge. If you notice the very significant articles which have appeared in the *London Times* three times in 6 months, in January, April and May, indicating a very significant change in opinion in England, and if you notice the very significant answers which the Prime Minister there has given within ten days to the people who made enquiries of him in reference to it, you will conclude that there will be great inducements to farmers to go on to the prairie land, and that enormous prospects are open to us in the

islands across the sea. I have only to say a word in reference to unrestricted reciprocity and then I have done. The hon. gentleman, in attacking the position of the Government and the Finance Minister, said the Government were not friendly to any reciprocity, and were not in earnest in attempting to obtain any reciprocity. That was a statement which he made at twenty minutes to six. At a quarter after nine, he said the Government were too eager for reciprocity, that they were waiting for the beck or nod of Mr. Blaine to take any reciprocity they could. I must leave the hon. gentleman to reconcile his two statements. It would very greatly enlighten the Canadian public and would clear the public mind if the hon. member for South Oxford would make a clear and emphatic statement and, speaking for his party, an authoritative statement, as to what form of trade policy his party desires. Sometimes they are in favour of free trade which strikes down all the custom-houses on the 49th parallel and along the other portion of the boundary line. At another time they put the custom-houses back again. In fact, they are playing and juggling with names. We ask them in all candour and frankness to discard names and deal with things, and we ask the hon. gentleman to tell us whether he is in favour of unrestricted reciprocity or of commercial union? The hon. gentleman does not deign to answer. I would ask another question: Whether in the event of the hon. gentleman failing to secure what he calls unrestricted reciprocity he will take the responsibility of pressing on for commercial union? Now, the hon. gentleman does not think it necessary to give an answer. I tell the hon. gentleman that the record under my hand shows, as he knows very well, that the American people, with whom he has been bargaining and intriguing for the last two years, are not in favour of what he calls unrestricted reciprocity. There is not one responsible man in the United States in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Neither Democrats nor Republicans will have it. Mr. Hitt and Mr. Butterworth, speaking of his own friends, will not have it. Mr. Wiman will not have it. The four or five senators of the United States who have been working with him will not have unrestricted reciprocity. Need I weary the House by reading extracts from the speeches of these gentlemen to show that they will not agree to this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, that they will not allow Canada to have a lower tariff than they have under this scheme, that they contend that our tariff must come up to theirs, and that Canada is not to be the back door for smuggling into the United States? Let me read a few words from responsible men in this country and from leading Americans on this question of unrestricted reciprocity, as to the proposal that we should have a lower tariff than they have, and the policy of striking out the custom-house line altogether. The Hon. Mr. Laurier made a speech at Abbotsford last October, and he describes what he understands reciprocity to be. He said:

"This policy involves full and absolute reciprocity, not only in natural products, but also in manufactured articles, without any restrictions whatever. When the Liberal party comes into power it will send commissioners to Washington, according to the principles affirmed by the Cartwright resolution of 1888, to propose a mutual agreement by which there will be free trade along the whole line, doing away with restrictions vexatious and detrimental to both countries alike, and removing the