

he will find that these great lakes have ever been treated as inland seas, and as far as magnitude is concerned, are worthy of being so treated. Although Her Majesty's Commissioners pressed that the navigation of Lake Michigan should be granted as an equivalent for the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the argument could not be based on the same footing, and we did not and could not pretend to have the same grounds. It is, however, of little moment whether Canada has a grant by treaty of the free navigation of Lake Michigan or not, for the cities on the shores of that lake would never consent to have their ports closed, and there is no fear in the world of our vessels being excluded from those ports. The Western States, and especially those bordering on the Great Lakes, would resist this to the death. I would like to see a Congress that would venture to close the ports of Lake Michigan to the shipping of England, or of Canada, or of the world. The small portion of the St. Lawrence which lies between the two points I have mentioned would be of no use, as there is no advantage to be obtained therefrom as a lever to obtain reciprocity.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: My hon. friend says "Hear, hear," but I will tell him that the only lever for the obtaining of reciprocity is the sole control of our canals. So long as we have the control of these canals we are the masters, and can do just as we please. American vessels on the down trip can run the rapids, if they get a strong Indian to steer, but they will never come back again unless Canada chooses, (hear.) The keel drives through those waters and then the mark disappears forever, and that vessel will be forever absent from the place that once knew it unless by the consent of Canada. Therefore as I pointed out before the recess as we had no lever in our fisheries to get Reciprocity, so we had none in the navigation of the St. Lawrence in its natural course. The real substantial means to obtain reciprocal trade with the United States is in the canals, and is expressly stated in the Treaty; and when the treaty in clause 27 which relates to the canals uses the words—"The Government of Her Britannic Majesty engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland and St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality, &c.," it contains an admission by the United States, and it is of some advantage to have that admission, that the canals are our own property, which we can open to the United States as we please. The reason why this admission is important is this; article 26 provides that "the navigation of the River St. Lawrence ascending and descending from the 45th parallel of north latitude where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries from to and into the sea shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the

United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain or of the Dominion of Canada, not inconsistent with such privileges of free navigation." Therefore lest it might be argued that as at the time the treaty was made it was known that for the purpose of ascent the river could not be overcome in its natural course, the provision granting the right of ascent must be held to include the navigation of the Canals, through which alone the ascent could be made. And so the next clause provides and specifies that these canals are specially within the control of Canada and the Canadian Government, and prevents any inference being drawn from the language of the preceding article. I know, sir, that there has been in some of the newspapers a sneer cast upon the latter paragraph of that article which gives the United States the free use of the St. Lawrence,—I refer to that part of the article which gives to Canadians the free navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—My hon. friend again says, "hear, hear." I hope that he will hear, and perhaps he will hear something he does not know, (hear, hear.) I may tell my hon. friend that the navigation of the River Yukon is a growing trade, and that the Americans are now sending vessels and are fitting out steamers for the navigation of the Yukon. I will tell my hon. friend that at this moment United States vessels are going up that river and are underselling the Hudson's Bay people in their own country, (hear, hear), and it is a matter of the very greatest importance to the Western country that the navigation of these rivers should be open to the commerce of British subjects, and that access should be had by means of these rivers, so that there is no necessity at all for the ironical cheer of my hon. friend. Sir I am not unaware that under an old Treaty entered into between Russia and England the former granted to the latter the free navigation of these streams, and for the free navigation of all the streams in Alaska. But that was a Treaty between Russia and England, and although it may be argued, and would be argued by England, that when the United States took that country from Russia it took it with all its obligations; yet Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to that question. The United States, I venture to say, would hang an argument upon it, and I can only tell my hon. friend that the officers of the United States have exercised authority in the way of prohibition or obstruction, and have offered the pretext that that was a matter which had been settled between Russia and England, that the United States now had that country, and would deal with it as they chose, and therefore, as this was a treaty to settle all old questions, and not to raise new ones, it was well that the free navigation of the rivers I have mentioned, should be settled at once between England and the United States, as before it had been between England and Russia. Before leaving the question of