

are not two men on that side of the House who can agree upon a basis. They are all opposed to complete reciprocity; on this they agree; upon everything else they disagree. Some are opposed to reciprocity in coal. For instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will never agree to reciprocity in coal. He told his electors, and he told the country generally, that he had taken Sir John A. Macdonald in hand, and had forced him to abandon his reciprocity notions concerning coal. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) will not have reciprocity in natural products. Yes, I beg his pardon, he will agree to reciprocity in some products. And what are they? Horses, lambs, hay, barley and eggs.

MR. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Also potatoes from Prince Edward Island.

MR. LAURIER. That was an afterthought, because the articles I mentioned are those he first included. If the hon. gentleman spoke for his party, they want reciprocity in those articles which we always sell to the Americans, but which the Americans do not sell us; they expect that the Americans will agree to give us their markets for our horses, lambs, hay, barley and eggs, and even potatoes from Prince Edward Island, and at the same time, that we will keep our markets closed against all their goods. If that is the idea entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite of reciprocity, let them call it by some other name, and I advise the Government to stay here. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has given them the basis on which they should negotiate, and that basis is unrestricted reciprocity in natural products and in manufactured products as well. But hon. gentlemen opposite would not agree to that. They have voted down my hon. friend's resolution; and I may ask them now, for what purpose are you going to Washington? Mr. Blaine has told Congressman Baker in his letter, that it was of no use, that

#### NO RECIPROCITY WOULD BE ADOPTED

except upon a basis of unrestricted terms. Still, if the commissioners to Washington secure the settlement of the Behring Sea difficulty and of the Atlantic fisheries question they will have the hearty support of this side of the House. But this will not settle nor even advance the great problem of finding a market for our productions, and this is the question to be settled. I affirm again on the part of the Liberal party that the true policy to be followed on this question is unrestricted reciprocity. This brings us face to face with our policy. I know very well that this policy from its sweeping character will be likely to excite alarm among the timid and timorous, but I never heard it seriously questioned that unrestricted reciprocity would not favour Canada at large. The only objection I have heard against unrestricted reciprocity is perhaps it would injure some special classes of manufactures. If unrestricted reciprocity were to injure manufacturers but were to benefit everybody else and every other interest, what would you do? Would you abandon it? I do not hesitate to say that I would still be in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. If it is proved that unrestricted reciprocity, although it might injure the manufacturer, would at the same time favour the farmer, the lumberman, the

miner  
man s  
have  
hesita  
a nat  
as wel  
son!  
ers ma  
this co  
consum  
would  
to wh

It is s  
nothin  
tion, l  
extend  
and th  
out of  
extort  
marke  
and I  
distur  
dersta  
this is  
a strug  
interer  
interer  
they v  
me cal  
was in  
day, s  
wicked  
manuf  
to pre

their  
and th  
sugge  
And t  
that t  
interer  
at onc  
forth,  
own c  
strugg  
folly,  
all th  
find t  
sourc