

deny, first, that in so doing she exercises harshly an extreme and harsh law; secondly, that her conduct with respect to the navigation of the St. Lawrence is in glaring and discreditable inconsistency with her conduct with respect to the navigation of the Mississippi. On the ground that she possessed a small tract of domain in which the Mississippi took its rise, she insisted on her right to navigate the entire volume of its waters; on the ground that she possesses both banks of the St. Lawrence where it disembogues itself into the sea, she denies to the United States the right of navigation though about one half of the waters of lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron and Superior, and the whole of Lake Michigan through which the river flows, are the property of the United States.

An English writer upon International Law cannot but express a hope, that this *summun jus*, which in this case approaches to *summa injuria* may be voluntarily abandoned by his country. Since the late revolution in the South American Provinces, by which the dominion of Rosas was overthrown, there appears to be good reason to hope that the States of Paraguay, Bolivia, Buenos Ayres, and Brazil, will open the River Parana, to the navigation of the world."

On reading a report of a speech of my hon. friend the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) on this subject—a very able and interesting speech, if he will allow me so to characterize it—I find that in speaking of the navigation of Lake Michigan, he stated that that lake was as much a portion of the St. Lawrence as the river itself. I do not know under what principle my hon. friend made that statement, but those inland seas are seas as much as the Black Sea is a sea and not a river. The lake is enclosed on all sides by the United States territory; no portion of its shores belong to Canada, and England has no right by international law to claim its navigation. Sir, she never has claimed it, for if my hon. friend will look into the matter, 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 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 these ports, for 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 there from 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 the question of the fisheries we had none to get reciprocity except the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

I admit that for any practical use or purpose whatever, except for the purpose of giving extension to trade, for the purpose of enlarging our relations with the United States in any way, neither were the fisheries or the St. Lawrence any value; but the real substantial value is in the canals, and these canals and the right to them 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," for fear that it might be held in argument that whereas 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 an argument might be hung upon it that the ascent might be open to the United States and that therefore it might imply as a matter of argument, that the canals were available for that purpose". And so the next clause provides and specifies that these canals are especially 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 the navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine.