

a continuous communication with the Hudson River, and not for any local purpose alone. In answer to another question with reference to the coasting trade, the hon. gentleman had said that we could not expect a treaty to be altogether such as we wanted. It was very easy to say we will have this and we will have that, and we might very easily make treaties to suit ourselves, but in reality we could only get what both parties agreed to. He agreed with the hon. gentleman's observations, but had he not displayed that eagerness about the matter, had he held himself a little more aloof and taken, if not a high and mighty, at any rate a proper, fair and independent attitude, willing to make a treaty, but not willing to go a-begging for it; and had he been a little more reticent, the authorities at Washington might have shown a far stronger disposition to advance. He hoped that some of the other objections taken by the Board of Trade would be cleared up. Some of them might easily be arranged with a little more time and attention, and perhaps a little less eagerness, such as discharging of cargoes on Lake Champlain, the bonding system, and a few other similar points. Then a remark had been made as to the indifferent phraseology of the schedules, an additional proof pointing to the eagerness and anxiety of the hon. gentleman to obtain the treaty, which was not in accordance with the feeling of the people of Canada, who were satisfied with their own business and prosperity, anxious to be good neighbours, and desirous of increasing their trade by any fair means—willing to make reciprocal terms with the United States, and believing that they could give as many advantages as they could hope to obtain. The hon. gentleman concluded by repeating that so far as they were able to judge, though the hon. member for Toronto held the language of independence—which was the language of the country—yet in his actual conduct he had gone beyond that and shown that eagerness and desire to get this treaty which, perhaps tended to defeat its object, and which was not the reflex of the people of the Dominion. Instead of a simple narrative of the negotiations at

Washington which the hon. gentleman had given them, he considered they should have had an official statement from some responsible member for what had been done.

The Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL having resumed his seat,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. He considered it very inexpedient to discuss a measure like the present on a mere motion for papers. If the hon. gentleman opposite wished to criticise or censure the acts either of the Government or of the Commission, the reasonable way would have been to have passed the Address, and when the House was in full possession of the facts, then to have put a notice on the orders of the day to enable him to discuss the subject at length. The course would have been the more desirable considering the position the question was in. It had only gone through the first stage, and would have had to pass, not only the Legislatures of the United States and the Dominion, but that of England as well, so that, whatever shape the treaty was in at the present moment, no one could say what would be its final appearance after it had gone through the various Parliaments whose concurrence was necessary before it could be adopted as a treaty. He did not propose to answer his hon. friend. He thought the hon. gentleman who, with Sir Edward Thornton, had arranged the terms of the treaty, had given to the House a very full explanation of his proceedings at Washington. He had been charged by the hon. leader of the Opposition with having been too eager about the matter, and with having gone cap in hand to the authorities at Washington, and that in his arguments to secure the attention of those authorities he had endeavored to show that the last treaty had been rather prejudicial to Canada and to the advantage of the States. He would leave his hon. friend to clear himself from the insinuations of the member for Kingston. We would simply advert to the initiation of this question by the Government of Canada. His hon. friend would remember that, since the abrogation of the treaty in 1864, the people of Canada and the States, particularly the Western States, desired its renewal, and the at-