

we adopted the policy of unrestricted reciprocity in 1888, the tendency of the American tariff was a downward tendency. There were many indications of that. The first was the Message of President Cleveland, addressed to Congress in the fall of 1887, in which he had directly attacked the system of protection.

Mr. SPROULE. The McKinley Bill showed it more.

Mr. LAURIER. I will come to that. It is true, shortly afterwards a wave of protection passed over the United States, which resulted in the McKinley Bill; but the McKinley Bill was the last spasmodic effort of a system which was about to fall to pieces and which exists no more. The hon. gentleman knows that the McKinley Bill has been condemned in emphatic terms by the American people in the last election, and he knows that it will be repealed at the next session of Congress. He knows that the party now in power are not only in favour of free trade as a general principle, but in particular are in favour of reciprocity with Canada. Now, Sir, of all the speeches I have listened to during this debate, there was one to which I listened with peculiar pleasure. That was the speech of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). It was almost a Liberal speech. It is true, it was still tainted with some Conservative heresy, but on the whole it was a very good speech; and when I listened to the hon. gentleman speaking as he did, it seemed to me that he was very much in the position of King Agrippa for the preaching of St. Paul, when he exclaimed: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." I presume that the hon. gentleman is almost a Christian—I mean Liberal; he is trying to lift his party up to a higher sphere; he is in favour of tariff reform; he is even in favour of reciprocity; and he said—I marked the sentence—that he hoped that the Government were also in favour of reciprocity. He hoped it; he was not sure; neither am I. I think they are not; but if they are, then they have an opportunity of getting reciprocity. They can have it. I stated a moment ago that the Democratic party were in favour of reciprocity with Canada. I have the proof in my hand, and I will give it to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is aware that one of the most important members of the Democratic party to-day in the United States is Mr. Campbell, the ex-governor of Ohio. In the month of December last Mr. Campbell delivered a speech on Staten Island, in which he referred to this very question of reciprocity with Canada. First of all, he referred to the policy of reciprocity put forward by the Republican party in the clause of the McKinley Bill, containing a standing offer of reciprocity to the tropical and semi-tropical countries of South America. Then Mr. Campbell spoke as follows:—

Reciprocity—the kind of reciprocity that that distinguished gentleman, Erastus Winan, advocates, is something. That kind of reciprocity actually means something, because that means that you shall take the produce of Staten Island whether they be of the farm or of the workshop, and take them to some great country with which you have a large trade, like the provinces north of us, the Dominion of Canada, and exchange them freely for all the products of that country with equal freedom. If you had reciprocity, actual reciprocity with the nations of the world, what would you have?

A voice—"Free Trade."  
A gentleman says "Free Trade." Why, it is no use for me to come all the way from Ohio to tell you anything about the situation as to reciprocity. There you have it in two words. If you had reciprocity it would simply mean that you could go down to the harbour of New York with anything you have, lay it on any vessel there and send it to any part of the earth and trade it for anything you wanted and bring those goods back and sell them whenever you pleased.

I sometimes give a definition of reciprocity which is a bit humorous, but which fits the case exactly. It is this: Maude and Claude are a couple of young people. There has been a great deal in the newspapers about reciprocity, and Maude is like most women. She has not bothered much about politics. She had to get several new dresses this autumn and has been pretty busy generally, and she says: "Claude, I have been reading about reciprocity. Now, what is reciprocity?"

"Why," he says. "Don't you know? Now, if I kiss you and you kiss me back, that's reciprocity." To which she retorted that she always supposed it was something nice.

I am in favour of that kind of reciprocity between us and the country we trade with. If we are going to kiss them, we want to be kissed back a little in return, and when we pick out the girls we are going to kiss, instead of picking out the black ones of south America, I would pick out the white ones of Canada and Europe.

It's a matter of taste, and I believe that the Democrats would just as soon that it would be white.

Now, if my hon. friend will only persuade the hon. Minister of Finance to go back to Washington and offer his cheek for a chaste osculation, the thing will be done at once. But, Sir, it may be said to me: What is the use of having reciprocity, even in natural products, if the condition of the farmers in the United States is worse than the condition of our own farmers? I am sure that I need not give an answer to this question to my hon. friend from East Durham, because he is in favour of reciprocity; neither need I give it to my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), because he is in favour of reciprocity. But there may be some other gentlemen on the other side of the House who are of the opinion of a former President of the Council, Mr. Colby, who was against reciprocity even in natural products. The advantage we should have in reciprocity, even in natural products, would be this, that protection is one and the same thing on both sides of the line; and if we had free trade only in natural products, the condition of the farmers on one side and the condition of the farmers on the other would be benefited to that extent. But I know that besides the hon. member for East Durham and the hon.