

informed by the Government, when we are told that we should pass this Bill because negotiations are on foot, whether those negotiations are likely to go as far as unrestricted reciprocity, or whether they are to stop short at reciprocity in natural products; because I feel that the hon. gentlemen opposite, no matter what disloyal men like myself might be prepared to do—I feel that hon. gentlemen opposite whose very existence is loyalty—that those gentlemen might vote against the Bill if it was understood that it was intended in any way to pave the way to negotiations which might end in unrestricted reciprocity. I think, as I say, the hon. gentlemen will see that there is really a reason why there should be some general declaration on the part of the Government as to what sort of treaty they propose to make. There are one or two other points which I think deserve to be noted. I have noticed this fact in connection with the Government, that while there have been certain annoying Customs regulations made against the United States, which have caused a great deal of dissatisfaction and irritation amongst the people of the adjoining country, without any benefit to us, in substantial matters the Government have always yielded, and they are yielding now. When there is something substantial in question they yield. The yielding, we are told now, is done in the interest of peace—we wish to conciliate our neighbours so that our negotiations may be conducted in good temper on both sides. That is a very desirable thing; but during the election campaign which took place a few months ago the very gentlemen who now tell us that we must be conciliatory used language of the most irritating and objectionable character in connection with the country which they now wish to conciliate.

HON. MR. PAQUET—The elections are over.

HON. MR. POWER—The elections are over, certainly, but in this Chamber we are supposed to live in a calm and serene atmosphere, which is above the level of those elections.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—You have dived down into it.

HON. MR. POWER—It may be that hon.

gentlemen opposite do not live in that serene atmosphere, but we on this side do. I hope we shall have a declaration from the hon. leader of the House that in no case are the Government prepared to go so far as to accept a treaty which will provide for unrestricted reciprocity, and on the other hand that this is the last time we shall be compelled to give up our rights in the interests of peace. The statesmen of the United States maintain their rights; they make no concessions to us, and I think they will respect us the more if we maintain our rights, provided always that we talk about them and treat them in a respectful manner, and do not indulge in the kind of language which was used in the recent election campaign by the orators and newspapers of the Conservative party.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I quite agree with my hon. friend in hoping that this is the last time that the Government will have to come to this House and ask for an extension of the protocol of the draft treaty of 1888. I am with my hon. friend in saying that the bank fishermen of the Province of Nova Scotia, and particularly of the county from which I come—and they do the bulk of the bank fishing—disapproved, at the time of the negotiation of the treaty of 1888, of this *modus vivendi*. They did not like it; but under the circumstances, anticipating that ere long the minds of the public men and the Congress of the United States would be changed to adopt that treaty, they conceded that it was advisable that this protocol should pass. Ever since then, year by year, they have felt it in opposition to their interests to allow the Americans to have these privileges. I am persuaded, from what I know of the fishermen, that if they were consulted to day they would say: "Yes; it is expedient that we should not open up this irritating question, and expose ourselves to the adverse feeling of the United States, and it is wise and prudent, when we are endeavouring, if possible, to get closer trade relations with them than we have at present, to forego our interests in order that a satisfactory treaty might be negotiated." As regards the position of the Government and Conservative party in the campaign, it is well known that they went back to the treaty of 1854 with such modifications and restrictions as would suit existing circumstances—that we were in favour of