

called upon to act as a censor upon the language which hon. gentlemen in the heat of debate may have used on the hustings, nor, in fact, does it know anything about it, nor is it called upon, nor is it its duty to know anything that was said on those occasions. I dare say a good deal of language was used on both sides that might not be strictly in order in this House, or might not be strictly approved of by gentlemen in this House in the course of our serene and calm debates, but that does not seem to me to have much bearing on the matter. Possibly hon. gentlemen did say a good many things that, perhaps, they thought afterwards might have been said in a more statesmanlike and diplomatic manner, but they were right in the spirit of one class of remarks very generally made, that any measures tending to the absorption of this country into the neighbouring Republic, any measures tending to place under the control of the neighbouring Republic the finances and financial system of this country, were to be deprecated and opposed with all the might and main of the country.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Who proposed such a theory? I never heard of it before.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend will remember, if he reflects on what I said, that I did not charge anybody with making such attempts. I only said that the sentiment which pervaded what was said on the side of the Conservative party in the last election tended in this direction—that any proposition, coming from whom it might, in this obnoxious direction, should be opposed.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It could only be a reflection on the Liberal party; the Liberal party gave utterance to no such sentiment. Those were sentiments flung at them by the Conservative party, who tried to make it appear that they had made such statements, although the leaders of the Liberal party over and over again disclaimed them. It is scarcely fair for an hon. gentleman occupying the position of leader of the House to repeat such statements.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I am very happy to hear my hon. friend's animated disclaimer, because it shows that he did not entertain such sentiments.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman did not give us the information that we are entitled to. He read an extract from His Excellency's Speech; there is nothing new in that. Of course, it was clothed in such admirable language by my hon. friend that we all felt it was something new and fresh. Anything coming from him is interesting. But my hon. friend did not give the House the information asked for. We are entitled to be assured that the negotiations will in no case lead to unrestricted reciprocity, because the vast majority of this House is committed against that in the most decided way, and they are entitled to know before the Bill is passed that it will not lead to that consummation.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I admire the Protean attitudes of my hon. friend.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think that is treating the House with proper respect.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I suppose the House will have no objection to passing the Bill through its last stages.

HON. MR. POWER—I shall have no objection if the hon. gentleman will give the information asked for.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Does the hon. gentleman ask that as leader of the Liberal party.

HON. MR. POWER—I ask the information for the House, and I think the House is entitled to have it.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On the second clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I think the House is entitled to some information with regard to the second clause.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The language of the clause is very plain.

HON. MR. POWER—Perhaps the leader of the House will give the committee some information with respect to the existing position of Newfoundland. Early in the