

will look at. Any one who has read the United States papers the last four years and the debates in Congress knows very well what kind of treaty the Americans are prepared to make with Canada—and they are prepared to make it to-morrow, and nothing else, and we may as well recognize the situation. It is all very well to attack unrestricted reciprocity as discriminating against England; but are we not discriminating against England now, and have we not been discriminating against her ever since the adoption of the National Policy? Has it not been the fact that our trade with England has been going down steadily while our trade with the United States is going up steadily? Of course, it will be different in future, because we are practically shut out of the United States market by the McKinley Bill, and we will have nothing to do with it. So far as Newfoundland is concerned, which is a subject germane to this matter, I think that colony acted rightly and properly, and it was exceedingly undignified and exceedingly unbecoming for the Government of Canada to interfere with the Colonial Secretary and defeat the treaty that Mr. Bond was then consummating on behalf of Newfoundland with the United States. Is it any wonder that such friction has existed between Newfoundland and Great Britain, that we read in the papers that on the Queen's Birthday an attempt was made to burn down the flagstaff on the public buildings at St. John's? What right had Canada to interfere with an independent colony, simply because it was weak and we were strong? Our position was not a dignified one. We are just served perfectly right, and Newfoundland has taken the course that any other independent or patriotic colony should take under the circumstances. But it has done a vast deal of harm, this interference of Canada. It has alienated the people of Newfoundland from Great Britain, because the Imperial authorities have attempted to squeeze Newfoundland—and for what? To gratify the people of Canada and give them a better vantage ground in making a treaty for themselves with the United States. If the United States had Newfoundland as a source from which to get bait and trade with the fishing vessels they would not be as dependent on our coasts in bait as they now are. We should lose, no doubt, but it is our own fault. We did

not choose to cut in in time and make such a treaty as the United States would agree to. Newfoundland did cut in in time, and the treaty would have been perfected but for the interference of Canada. I say it is a very sad thing that one of the oldest colonies of the British Crown should be alienated from the mother country by the action of one of the strongest of her colonies seeking to thwart and take advantage of her weakness.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I hope that the remarks and the sentiments of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat are not shared by any other hon. gentleman in this House. He knows very well why we have not had a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The reason is, that the colleagues of my hon. friend who went to the United States to promote a treaty made the Americans believe that we were willing to surrender everything to them, and that the time was sure to come when we would surrender everything they wanted, and in effect become politically subject to the United States. But my hon. friend must know very little about Nova Scotia, and the hon. gentleman from Halifax will hardly endorse what he has said. I say that the Government of Canada would be recreant to their duty, and to the interest of the fisheries, the importance of which my hon. friend is so ignorant of, if they had not taken the position they have done. They would have been recreant to their duty had they allowed the Americans to come in and take advantage of and destroy our fisheries without return. I hold that it was the duty of the Government to take the position they did, and to prevent such a calamity as the destruction of our fisheries. I do not believe that my hon. friend can grasp the importance to the Dominion, directly and indirectly, of our Canadian fisheries. His remarks made to-day, if they are the views of the party to which he belongs, will certainly not find favour with the Maritime Provinces.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I speak for myself.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If they are, I say he cannot expect sympathy from any of our fishermen. I say, if the Newfoundland Bill had been allowed to pass it would have destroyed our fisheries *in toto*.