

works have been enlarged, and are to be improved, chiefly with the view of attracting the trade of the West; they are now beyond the actual requirements of our own internal traffic. Under these circumstances we will continue to offer every inducement to the Americans to make use of these public works. A similar provision was included in the Treaty of 1854, and that, of course, lapsed when the Treaty was repealed. We did not then close our canals, for we believed it was the wisest policy to keep them open on the same terms as before the expiration of the Treaty. With respect to the river itself it has been always practically open to Montreal, and by the Treaty it is to be nominally open from St. Regis to Montreal. This territorial concession is, therefore, virtually a worthless privilege. No one can urge the advisability of shutting up the river when it is actually for our advantage to make it the outlet for the surplus produce of the great West. I think the navigation of Lake Michigan should have been conceded on the same terms as the navigation of the St. Lawrence, but I have no doubt that the right we have given to the Americans to use our canals will always secure to us the right to navigate that Lake. Then there is the bonding system secured to us—it is true it must become of less value according as our railways are extended; but nevertheless it will be always a benefit to us. Then the trans-shipment privileges accorded by the Treaty are entirely new. It is held by the Americans that a voyage from Portland to San Francisco is a coasting voyage—it is a most extreme construction of the regulations; but those regulations are modified by the Treaty so far as our inland trade is concerned. With respect to the Fenian raids I intend to say very little. I think the course pursued by the United States with respect to those marauders has been one most unworthy of a great nation. We have always most strictly discharged our duties as a friendly neighbor; and therefore we must consider their neglect most discreditable to them, and I have no doubt that it will redound very much to their dishonor on the pages of history. With respect to these claims, our government could do no more than they did—we had no representative at Washington—any representations that we had to make must be through the British Government. Our Government pressed the claims of this country as strongly as they could, and then their power to effect anything ceased. I think they made the only arrangement that was open to them. The Bri-

tish Government assumed the cost of the raids, and I have no feeling against allowing England to bear it when the losses were not incurred through any fault of our own. These expenses were incurred because these misguided people thought they could best injure England by striking a blow at Canada. I have always held it would not have been an extraordinary stretch of liberality on the part of the British Government had they guaranteed the whole cost of the Canada Pacific Railroad. Such a guarantee would be invaluable to the interests of the Empire itself—it would tend to develop her strength on this Continent, and increase the prosperity of this great branch of the British family. England might have given this guarantee without a single risk on her own part, and it would have benefitted her in the end to an incalculable degree. So far from thinking that we are lowering ourselves by taking the guarantee of £2,500,000 we would willingly humiliate ourselves by taking a much larger one. (Hear.) I think the simple question at issue is whether we save anything by accepting this guarantee. If our bonds can be sold at as good a rate without it then of course there is no necessity for the guarantee; but we all know perfectly well that we shall save money and be in a better position to promote great public undertakings by accepting the guarantee granted to Canada by the British Government. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. HOLMES—I must take advantage of this opportunity of expressing my unqualified satisfaction with the policy pursued by the Government in relation to this important matter. I am of the opinion that this Treaty will in many respects be as great a benefit to the country as the Reciprocity Treaty decidedly was, and it is difficult for me to understand the reasons that prompt some hon. gentlemen to oppose the measure. We have a prosperous country, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and abounding in resources, and I have no doubt whatever that the results accruing from the Treaty which we are about to ratify will give a great stimulus to its progress, and ensure its peace for many years to come.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—I must ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes whilst I give expression to some thoughts on this very momentous question. I had quite dismissed the question from my mind—in fact, I had heard so much about it, that I was beginning to be quite nauseated. Among the elite of Ottawa, in the hotels, in the House, in the press, everywhere it has been the Treaty.