

a young giant shackled and manacled, not free in his movement, and the only thing he wants is to be set free from his shackles and to have the opportunity of extending his energies abroad. This is the policy we have been pursuing for years, and, although the policy has not been accepted on the other side of the House I am aware that many other hon. gentlemen on the other side have in their hearts been compelled to admit that the policy that must be adopted is to find markets for our products somewhere. On the other hand, there are many of our colleagues on the other side who, not many days or weeks or months ago, indulged in the hope that Great Britain would alter its policy in regard to trade and that we would find a larger market than we possess, that Great Britain would depart from the principle of freedom of trade and would discriminate in favour of colonial products, while the colonies would discriminate in favour of British products. That question has been settled on the floor of the British Parliament the other day, when the answer was given that no such hopes could be indulged in, that Britain would depart from her policy of freedom of trade, so that all the hopes which have been indulged in by some of our colleagues on the other side of the House have passed away and can no longer be entertained. It, therefore, becomes the duty of these men who believe in their hearts that the situation could be amended in that respect, to turn over a new leaf in the book and seek for markets somewhere else. It is manifest, after what was said the other day on the floor of the Imperial Parliament, that Britain will not depart from her policy of freedom of trade. I am bound to say, however, that there is grandeur in the policy, in the economic policy of Britain which is greater than that of any other country. She opens her doors to the whole universe, not minding whether the rest of the universe opens its doors to her or not. But it is manifest at the same time that the dream which was entertained fifty years ago by John Bright and Cobden as to freedom of trade has not been realized. It was expected in those days that nation after nation would follow the lead of Britain and adopt freedom of trade. Those hopes have not been verified. England is the only nation that has adopted freedom of trade, but, although the dream has not been realized to the fullest extent, still it is manifest that the idea of freedom of trade is gaining ground. It is coming in a different manner, it is coming by means of commercial treaties. Nations which are protectionists to-day, not because of any love of protection but simply because they fear that if they adopted freedom of trade they would give an advantage to their neighbours, are passing legislation which gives freedom of trade to the neighbouring countries in exchange for the freedom of trade offered by them. For example, we find this in Germany. The German Zollverein is one of the most protective societies to be found on the face of the earth, but we find that within the last twelve months the German Zollverein has been offering reciprocity of trade to Switzerland, Belgium and Italy, and, I believe, also to Austria and Spain. Then we have the example of the policy of our neighbours to the south of us, who have extended freedom of trade to all the nations of Southern America, and also to the West Indies. This is also the policy of the Liberal party of Canada. I

admit that it is not possible for us to obtain or accept freedom of trade as we would desire to have it or as it exists in England, but the policy we have in view is to extend freedom of trade by means of commercial treaties with other nations. This is the policy which I believe commends itself at the present time not only to this party but to the most civilized nations of the earth. It is true that on this question we have not been met with any favourable action on the other side of the House. They are Conservative, and therefore slow to adopt new ideas, but there must be something sound in the policy which we have propounded, seeing that about ten days or two weeks ago they paid a visit to Washington. I do not propose to-day to discuss the question of unrestricted reciprocity which does not come within the four corners of the Speech from the Throne, and which we will have occasion to discuss again and again during the session; but the hon. gentleman stated that we on this side of the House did not understand what was the position of the Conservative party in regard to reciprocity. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand what unrestricted reciprocity is. At all events they profess not to understand it, or they certainly grossly misrepresent it. The hon. gentleman, who, I am sure, is a good Conservative, has told us that his party was anxious to obtain reciprocity in natural products. If he had been in this House last session, or for some time before, he would have known that this may have been the policy of his party in antiquated days, but that it was their policy no longer. Did we not hear, two or three years ago, a Minister of the Crown state on the floor of Parliament that reciprocity in natural products would be the bane of Canadian farmers? That is not an isolated statement, but the statement has been repeated on the floor of this House time and again by the rank and file of that party. Only last session we heard again and again the statement that reciprocity in natural products would be the bane of the farmers. Therefore, I ask myself, what is the reason why the Canadian Ministers went to Washington some little time ago? Perhaps, in their hearts, after all, they do not adopt the policy of their old colleagues or of some one of their followers, but in their heart of hearts they may believe, as must appear to every reasonable man, that reciprocity in natural products would be beneficial to the Canadian farmers. We are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity on this side of the House; but if we cannot have unrestricted reciprocity we are quite willing to accept reciprocity in natural products, as we are desirous of securing to the fullest possible extent the advantages of trade between the two countries. But if the Government and their supporters will not grant this country reciprocity on the old lines, if they will to-day, or to-morrow, or at any time, obtain reciprocity even in ever so few articles, they will have the support of the Liberal party on this side of the House. Sir, we have been told again and again that unrestricted reciprocity was not possible, that the Americans would not grant it. I would like to quote on this subject from a speech delivered in New York a few days ago by the Hon. Mr. Foster, who holds, as I understand, a high position in the State Department at Washington. After speaking of the tendency and the policy of