

negotiations with the authorities of the United States, and was treated in the contemptible manner in which the Minister of the Interior was treated, and he had not the spirit to resent that treatment though it has cost the people of this country many and many a dollar. I come again, then, to make good my position in regard to the absolute futility of relying on the good will of the United States or upon the United States view of international law as heretofore expressed in connection with any scheme or proposition that aims at the development of the Dominion of Canada. I have just as high an opinion of individuals in the United States as any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House, and when I charge against that government hostility to this country, when I charge against that country every ungenerous effort that can be made to thwart us in advancing Dominion interests, I refer to their pernicious system of politics, deplorable and humiliating, and I believe many thousands of Americans are as much disgusted with their system of government as are our own people so far as relations with Canada are concerned. I am against voting a single dollar or a single acre of land in Canada, mineral or otherwise, to any project that depends on the good will of the United States for the successful carrying out of that scheme for which the land is appropriated. We may have done so before, if you like; but having had experience of the United States, we should look at the facts, and look the position in the face, and place our lines and arrangements and our plans, as we can do and as this country is rich enough to do and willing enough to do, wholly apart from them and wholly irrespective of what they wish or seek. I say we cannot rely on those people showing towards us the slightest measure of fair-play. Some hon. gentlemen seem to speak with bated breath when referring to the conduct of the United States; it is an awful thing to say anything respecting even a United States citizen in this House of Commons, as I have heard during this debate. If there is any British subject afraid of saying what he thinks, I have under my hand the authority of those who advise directly Her Majesty the Queen to show that they are not built of that stuff. I have under my hand the language of those advising the Queen now that points out directly, emphatically and in the strongest language possible not only how those people to the south of us, represented by their Government, will not only twist and vary treaties and will twist and torture principles of law, but will scheme and arrange so as to grasp every advantage possible, regardless of any consequences whatever. Let me give the House an example. For instance, there has been a difference of opinion in this House as to whether the Treaty of 1825 gave the people of this country the right to navigate the Yukon. Mr. Blake,

no mean authority, was of the opinion, contrary as I have endeavoured to show, to the opinion prevailing in England, that we had under that treaty, notwithstanding the purchase of the country by the United States, the absolute right to navigate the Yukon. No one will doubt we got the right, whatever the other question may be, under the Treaty of Washington, and we got the right to navigate the Stikine under that treaty, if we did not enjoy it in 1871 under the Treaty of 1825. Yet there is the best authority to show that after that Treaty of 1871 and for several years thereafter no British bottoms could go up the Stikine River. There was the treaty. Hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to risk the resources of this country on the assumption that the United States will understand and carry out a treaty as we read it; and yet with the Treaty of 1871 it is a fact that in 1873 the customs officers of the United States Government on the Stikine prevented and were instructed to prevent any British bottom ascending the waters of that river. We have the authority of Sir Donald Smith, the present Lord Strathcona, who in this House stated, notwithstanding the contention of Mr. Blake, notwithstanding the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, who even now think that under the Treaty of 1825 we have a right to navigate the Yukon, British bottoms were not allowed to navigate that river. Let me give the House the language of Sir Donald Smith during the discussion on the Treaty of Washington, as reported in the "Globe." He said:

As to the assumption that free navigation of the Yukon in the North-west was of no practical use to Canada, he thought it was otherwise. That river goes into British territory for a distance somewhere of 300 or 400 miles, and while it now takes the Hudson Bay Company several years to get their goods from England to points on that river, they will, if the treaty is ratified, be able to get their goods to their destination in eighteen months.

The hon. gentleman read a letter from the Secretary of State of the United States to prove that no vessels other than those of United States citizens can go up that river. As to the Stikine River, the fact is, that, notwithstanding the Treaty of 1871, as late as 1873 the British vessels were not given their rights under the terms of that treaty, and for confirmation of that I refer hon. gentlemen to the correspondence in the Sessional Papers, vol. 11, for the year 1878. These are facts pertinent to the very case in point, and let us see whether that excuse cannot be given again by the Americans in connection with the proposition now under consideration. They can say: Oh, yes, the treaty did arrange that you should navigate the Stikine, but the regulations concerning the treaty and the instructions have not been sent forward to the officers on the Stikine River, but they will be sent forward. In the meantime, notwithstanding the treaty,