

was sound constitutional doctrine, and could not be successfully controverted.

With reference to the speech of the Minister of Marine (Hon. Senator Mitchell) at Montreal, undoubtedly the general inference in Montreal from it was that the deepening of Lake St. Peter would be placed upon precisely the same footing as those other improvements which were referred to in the Speech from the Throne. But the point he wished to make was, that there was an important variance between the Speech from the Throne and the utterance of Ministers. He regarded the utterances of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Langevin) on the Treaty as at variance with His Excellency's Speech, which indicated that the Government had determined to take the true constitutional course and accept the responsibility for the Treaty. He would like to hear from the Premier on that point, and to be told by him that he did not endorse the monstrous doctrines—doctrines entirely subversive of colonial rights—laid down by the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North)** thought he saw nothing that should delay the action of the House in respect to the Address. He had hoped that the practice of passing the Address without debate would be followed by this Parliament. The hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had discussed at considerable length questions which he could not agree to. With respect to the Treaty of Washington referred to in the Address, they were promised so much of the correspondence as could, with due regard to Imperial and Canadian interests, be laid before them. The question is one of great importance, and we could easily see that it might be highly expedient that there should be some reserve in discussing the question. The House would look with great anxiety for such correspondence as the Government may think it expedient to submit. He had no hesitation in saying, that after reflecting upon the subject, and having discussed it with his constituents he felt it his duty to say at once that he was prepared to ratify the Treaty of Washington.

If he understood the Finance Minister (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) that the Government is prepared to throw any obstruction in the way of or prevent the full ratification of the Treaty he felt sure that many in that House would be opposed to them. He dared say that the correspondence when sent down would show that everything had now been arranged satisfactorily to Canada. He did not hold himself responsible as a Member of that House for opinions which he had expressed at various times, and at Hamilton recently as a private citizen, but he would say that we should accept the Treaty as a portion of the empire, or be prepared to change our political relations with the Mother Country. He considered the speech or pamphlet of the Hon. Secretary of State for the Provinces (Hon. Mr. Howe) very injudicious, as coming from a gentleman holding a Ministerial office.

**Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS** rose to explain that the hon. gentleman on the opposite side had misunderstood him as saying

that the Government was opposed to the Treaty, what he intended to convey was that the Government as a whole were opposed to the Treaty, but that since the signing of the Treaty a correspondence had been going on with the Imperial Government on the subject, and that on the correspondence coming down, the House would see that the two Governments were in entire accord.

---

## AFTER RECESS

**Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North)** in resuming the debate said he would not continue his remarks further as he thought it inexpedient that the House should discuss the question of any change of constitution at the present time. They were there to pass the laws necessary in the interests of the country.

He was very well satisfied with the terms of the Address and the indications of the policy of the Government, although many important measures which the circumstances of the country required, and which ought to be dealt with during the present Session were not mentioned but no doubt these measures would be submitted as the session progressed. He concluded by particularizing a law for the trial of controverted elections as especially necessary.

**Mr. STREET** said he wished to make a few remarks on the paragraph of the speech respecting the canal system. Great agitation had prevailed through the country on the subject and he considered that the declaration made in the speech that the matter would be vigorously taken up would give very great satisfaction, and he trusted that the promise given would be carried out fully by the Government, and he was sure that they would be fully sustained by the House in voting any money for the carrying out of any satisfactory schemes.

**Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne)** said he rose to take exception to a remark made by the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) in designating Mr. Riel as a leader of banditti.

He contended that so far from this being the case he was the leader of the whole French population of Manitoba, and said that if he wished he could at the present moment be returned to Parliament for half the counties in the Province. He did not wish to defend what Mr. Riel had done, but there was great injustice in the term made use of by the member for Lambton.

He then referred briefly to the withdrawal of the troops, maintaining a statement which he said he had previously made that that withdrawal had caused very great dissatisfaction among the people of Canada, and cited the report of the Hon. Mr. Campbell on the subject in his support.