

needed to be done to improve that condition. It is to be remarked that upon that occasion not a word was said to the contrary by the hon. gentleman or by anybody supporting him. Then, what conclusion should be drawn? This conclusion: that the Government themselves shared in that view. Then you would expect that, sharing in that view, they would have brought forward some measure of reform, since they admitted that there was an evil to be cured. But, Sir, we could not expect them to go that length. They knew the evil, but they presented no remedy and they let the evil remain. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I agree with those hon. gentlemen in their opinions respecting the evil, I say there is a remedy to be sought for in our condition. Though this is their conviction, they do not act upon it. That conviction is the basis of the policy which we support on this side of the House. The policy we support asks that some reform should be made in the condition of our country. I wish, for my part, that I could agree with hon. gentlemen opposite in the remedy they have suggested; I wish, for my part, I could believe that we could find for our surplus agricultural products a market in Great Britain; but, certainly, I cannot agree in the policy which has been suggested to us, for that policy, to say the least of it, is a singularly foolish one. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to establish a trade with Great Britain. They propose to induce the people of Great Britain to take our surplus products—and how? By opening our doors to the trade of Great Britain, which doors are now closed to that trade? Not at all. By inducing Great Britain to open her doors to us? No; they are already open to us and to the world. But it is to induce the people of Great Britain, if possible, to shut their doors to the rest of the world and keep them open to ourselves. Hitherto the policy has been Canada for the Canadians, but hereafter the policy will be England for the Canadians. The object the hon. gentlemen have in view is to induce British workmen to remove all competition from the products of the American farmer and thereby to enhance the price of bread and foodstuffs for themselves. Will the British working classes adopt such a policy? It is preposterous to assume it. What have hon. gentlemen opposite to offer to the British workmen for the sacrifice they will be called upon to make? Do they offer to admit here British products free of duty? No; on the contrary, it is proposed to lower, by a few inches only, the barriers which the hon. gentlemen opposite have set up against the productions of British workmen. And that is what they call fair trade. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have the candor to believe that the British public at large can be induced to adopt such a policy. It is impossible to conceive that the British people would adopt a policy so absolutely delusive. Where are the public men in England who would countenance such a policy? You could not find them in the ranks of the Liberal party, or in the Radical party, or in the Conservative party, although the Conservative party in England are entitled to the reproach that they have opposed every reform that has made England what she is to-day. Yet as soon as some reform has been adopted it becomes the common inheritance of every Englishman, and the last reform carried in England was the adoption of the great principle of free trade. England has

Mr. LAURIE.

been the pioneer in trade, as she has been the pioneer in the science of government. She obtained a full measure of fair trade 100 years at least before any other continental nation. It was so also with respect to free trade. They adopted a system of freedom in trade, as in politics and everything else, and so paved the way for the other nations to follow. It is true, as has been often stated, that their policy has not been answered, that other nations have not responded, and that the idea, the dream and the hope of those who advocated the gospel of free trade has not been realised. I do not believe so. Only fifty years have elapsed since the principle of free trade was proclaimed in England, and fifty years, it must be admitted, form a dot on the ever revolving panorama in the life of a nation. Fifty years is but a dot in the life of the world, and it cannot be expected that that great principle should germinate, blossom and fructify within half a century. But if it cannot be said that the expectations of those who have proclaimed the principle has been fulfilled, it is manifest that it will be fulfilled yet, and the first nations to adopt it will be those nations of British blood and tradition, the offshoots of England. It is true that Canada and the United States are to-day far from this position, but the time may come, and it may not be distant, when Canada and the United States will adopt a policy—which we on this side of the House have advocated—a policy not to seek a market on the other side of the ocean, but to seek a market on the other side of the line; and it would seem to me that this consideration should commend itself to our friends on the other side of the House, that if we were to effect a commercial alliance between these two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family, it would be a great step towards effecting what they have in view, and that is, our obtaining a market at some ultimate day in Great Britain and Ireland. In this respect I do not consider the Government will ever change their policy; but it must be apparent to the right hon. gentleman opposite, from the feeling manifested among his own supporters, a feeling not in favor of reciprocity but yet a feeling in favor of a change, that the change we propose is the more logical one and is bound to be carried out at no distant date. In the Speech which was delivered yesterday there is an important paragraph, and an important paragraph only, it is the paragraph in reference to the difficulty we have in respect to the Behring Sea. It is now more than three years since Canadian vessels fishing for seals in Behring Sea were ousted from those waters by the American authorities. Three years had elapsed, and after three years this is the reference to the subject by His Excellency. His Excellency informs us, practically, that Canadian fishermen have laid their claims before the Canadian Government, that the Government have referred those claims to the English Government, and His Excellency goes on to say:

“I feel confident that those representations have had due weight, and I hope to be enabled during the present Session to assure you that all differences on this question are in the course of satisfactory adjustment.”

Well, certainly caution could not go any further than it goes there. His Excellency informs us that he believes—what? That the difficulty will be settled during the course of the present Session? No; but that they were in the course of satisfactory adjustment. That is all he can assure