

ment made at Washington, and last session we passed a Bill which continued it in force until the close of 1890. Now, while I think it is perfectly right and proper that we should do nothing to irritate our powerful neighbours, at the same time we ought to respect ourselves, and if we do not respect ourselves and do not assert our rights our neighbours are likely to undervalue the rights which we ourselves treat so cheaply; and further, they are likely to think that possibly we are afraid to maintain our own rights. When the Washington Treaty was rejected by the United States Senate I think we should have gone back to the condition of things which existed before. The privileges with regard to buying bait and ice and other supplies, which supplies the American fishermen were entitled to under the *modus vivendi*, are privileges of considerable value to them; and in certain portions of the Dominion our own fishermen—the bank fishermen—look with a good deal of jealousy upon the rights which have been given the American fishermen under the *modus vivendi*. As I said last year, I fail to see why we should have continued this arrangement under the circumstances. Last year there was not any special reason given for our passing a Bill similar to that now before us. This year we are told that there are negotiations pending with the United States. It seems to me that when the hon. leader of the House told us that, he did not tell us enough. It was not sufficient to say there are negotiations pending—they are to begin in October, I understand—with the United States. I think he should have gone further, and given us some inkling as to what the character of those negotiations was likely to be. (A laugh.) I am not, as I think the hon. gentleman will allow, an unreasonable member of the House, and I am not an unreasonable opponent. I should not ask the Government to give us a detailed statement as to what they propose to do; but there are certain general lines which I think the Government should have indicated. I think the leader of the House will recognize the force of what I say. During the recent election campaign there were two policies before the country. The policy of the Liberal party was unrestricted reciprocity. That was reciprocity which extended to the manufactured as well as to the natural products of the

two countries. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends through the country declared that reciprocity in natural products was consistent with the most exuberant loyalty, but that when you came to add manufactures to natural products then reciprocity, from being exuberant loyalty, became treason, disloyalty, annexation, and a number of other awful things. I think we are entitled to know to-day on which basis these negotiations are to be conducted. One might suppose, from the declaration of the Government, that there was no fear that they were likely to agree to unrestricted reciprocity, that abomination of abominations, as it was in their eyes during the election campaign; but hon. gentlemen may remember that in the organ of the Government, the paper which is recognized as usually expressing the sentiments of the Government party, published in the city of Montreal, of which the hon. leader of this House is so distinguished a citizen, there appeared on two occasions paragraphs with respect to these negotiations—they were not paragraphs in the ordinary sense; they were editorials—one of which stated distinctly, at the time the delegates were about to go to Washington, that they were prepared to negotiate even on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity. It is well known that the hon. gentleman who was to be our commissioner, and who is very well known as our High Commissioner in England, on a previous occasion had expressed himself in terms which were generally understood to mean that he was prepared to advocate unrestricted reciprocity. He said in 1888, in the House of Commons, that he had made to Mr. Bayard an unrestricted offer of reciprocity. That was taken by most people to mean an offer of unrestricted reciprocity but I understand that the hon. gentleman, at a subsequent period undertook to distinguish an unrestricted offer of reciprocity from an offer of unrestricted reciprocity. We have at any rate the fact that there were these two kinds of reciprocity before the country. We have the fact that the Government organ in the city of Montreal declared editorially that the commissioners who were then about to go to Washington, or the delegates, or whatever you choose to call them, were prepared to negotiate even on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, I think the House has a right to be