

Hon. Mr. BUREAU.—It is only those relating to Canada that I want.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he had mentioned the treaties with Hayti and Tunis to show how very general those treaties were in which Canada was incidentally more or less interested as part of the British Empire. It might not be convenient to publish the whole of them.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said he had been unable to distinguish very clearly from the motion on the paper or the remarks of the mover the nature of the desired information. The hon. gentleman had taken occasion to travel round the whole circle, and indulge in a general review of the state of the country. That was not a fair way to discuss public questions, and he felt it necessary to reply to some of the observations of the honorable gentleman. He did not believe the sentiment of the country would justify the comparison between the Washington Treaty and the Ashburton Treaty. In Nova Scotia, at all events, the former was looked upon as a statesmanlike measure, so much so that some of the strongest supporters of the Ministry—then the Opposition—voted and spoke in favor of it in the House of Commons. In that Province the Washington Treaty had proved advantageous to the people, and he did not think there was any real ground of complaint against it in Ontario, unless it was the giving of the navigation of the River St. Lawrence to the Americans. That, however amounted to nothing, for the navigation of the river, where given to the Americans by the treaty, was broken by rapids, and the use of the canals, which would alone be valuable, was not thrown open to our neighbors. But supposing the river was navigable from the lakes to the ocean, it would be merely a cession to them in time of peace for the purposes of commerce. In time of war it would be held by the strongest. But was it not an advantage to Ontario, instead of a disadvantage, to attract not only the American trade, but the trade of the world through the canals of the St. Lawrence, if that were possible? Would it be safe to pursue such a course as would drive away trade and commerce so necessary to the prosperity of the country.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU—I have not said a word on that subject.

Hon. Mr. MILLER wished to know in what respect the Washington Treaty was deserving of the denunciations of the honorable gentleman as worse than the Ashburton Treaty. The comparison was not a fair one, and would not be endorsed by the House or

the country. As to the question of damages due to Canada under the treaty, great delay had unnecessarily arisen in the settlement of the matter. The legal construction of the clause referred to was a matter for argument. High an opinion as he entertained for the legal acumen of the honorable gentleman, it did not follow that he thought his construction of the clause was the right one. Many good lawyers held a different opinion. If justice should not ultimately be done to this country in regard to these damages the honorable gentlemen opposite would be more to blame than any one. Shortly after the advent of the present Government to power, the Premier, in a speech to his constituents, belittled the value of our claims for damages. He depreciated our claim under the treaty, and thereby lessened the chances of our obtaining adequate damages. When Mr. Brown was sent to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty he looked upon our claim as a mere bagatelle. The blame would, therefore rest with the Government and their authorized agent, if justice should not be done to Canada, ultimately, in this matter. The honorable gentleman (Mr. Bureau) had entered into a very long argument with respect to our right to impose differential duties, and spoken in terms of praise of the action taken by the Minister of Justice during his visit to England last year, in connection with the alteration of the Royal instructions. It would be remembered there was wonderful mystery and importance attached to that visit, and on his return from England his doings there were alluded to by one of the ablest organs of the Ministry as one of the greatest magnitude and importance to the people of Canada. After the laboring of the mountain a very ridiculous mouse was produced, in the shape of this report, as the result of the honorable gentleman's visit to England. The subject of obtaining for Canada the right to impose differential duties did not trouble him much. Why was not something more done to alter that important instruction which prevents this Parliament imposing differential duties. He fully agreed with the position taken by Sir Alexander Galt on that question, and read to this House by the honorable gentleman from Fredericton, that it was the undoubted right of this country, under the free Constitution we possessed, to pass such acts.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said it appeared to him that the contention of the Minister of Justice in Downing street applied to all the instructions which directed the Governor General to refuse his assent to bills. The