

watched the progress and checked the untutored zeal with respect to the French Treaty, and I believe that had the French Treaty, if it had been left to his unaided exertions without the delays, restrictions, conditions and red-tapeism which the hon. gentleman complains of, would not have been so satisfactory to the people of England, and its renewal was earnestly desired. Those delays, although curbing the desires of Mr. Cobden to come back to England as a successful negotiator and thus annoying him, eventuated in a satisfactory treaty—satisfactory to England, though I am sorry to say not so satisfactory to France. Canada has been progressing rapidly in prestige, in population and in wealth, so that although I rather dislike the want of taste shown in these resolutions in saying that we are the most important of Her Majesty's colonies and entitled to have a different position from the others, yet we are, with a population of 4,000,000, rapidly approaching to 5,000,000, a people of sufficient importance to claim of the Mother Country the important advance in our position that we have a right to claim—additional assistance, greater energy and a larger meed of independence in our negotiations than when we were scattered, separate and feeble Provinces and colonies. I must say that, rapid as our progress has been, we never yet made an advance that England has not, after due consideration, met more than half way and assisted Canada in all the negotiations she has made. She is not a step-mother, she is as anxious to see Canada prosper as she is proud of Canada and her colonies, and if we look back we will see that Canada never desired assistance without obtaining it at her hands. Even in cases when the commercial policy of the Mother Country might vary from ours, she has always tried to carry out our wishes. The hon. gentleman read in contravention of that statement, a despatch of Lord Kimberley when he was Colonial Secretary, stating that while in obedience to the express wishes of the Canadian people, the British Government would do anything that they could to promote a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; yet in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government—that Government which was then a Free Trade Government as it is now, and Lord Kimberley, a Free Trade doctrinaire of the most restricted and illiberal kind, if I may use the term—yet, neither he nor Her Majesty's Government, I am satisfied, by word or expression at Washington in the negotiations with the American Government, ever for one moment allowed their own opinions as to what would be best for Canada, to interfere with their pressing her claims and expressing our wishes. The whole correspondence will show that England did everything that persuasion, argument, ingenuity and pressure could produce to induce the United States to renew that treaty. The hon. gentleman says that we are exceedingly embarrassed, because England makes treaties, having reference to the Mother Country. Sir, whenever Canada or any of the colonies express a desire to be included in those treaties, I am satisfied that that wish will be granted. The reason why England of late years—I do not speak of old times—of a quarter of a century ago—had limited those treaties with foreign nations was this: It was to leave the trade of Canada and the colonies unrestricted by any of the conditions of those treaties. The "favoured nation clause" that England has until lately put in all her treaties is a clause that would operate greatly against the interests of Canada, because wherever Canada entered into a reciprocity treaty we would be obliged to grant to every nation the privileges we had granted to the country with whom we had made a special arrangement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You do that now.

Mr. MILLS. There are many treaties in which this is applied to Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is exceedingly mistaken, there are not many; there were one or two and there is one of these that works so prejudicially to Canada—a treaty with some of the German States—that it greatly hampers and would greatly hamper her in negotiation with other countries. As I have said before, it is useless to talk of asking the Queen to allow us to send our envoys to other countries unless those countries are willing to receive us. We have the example the other day of what France did. When M. Lefavre, the French Consul in Canada, opened an un-official correspondence with the best intentions—an officious correspondence they would call it in France—for the purpose of developing trade between France and Canada, the French Government were exceedingly annoyed at it, and M. Lefavre received a rebuke and a reproof at the hands of his own Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is because he was never authorized.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course he was never authorized. The hon. gentleman knows that the consular system of France is altogether different from that of England. Consular agents in England are merely commercial agents, holding no diplomatic character whatever, while in France they are a branch department, they rise from being consuls to being ambassadors, while in England the two services are entirely separate. And so M. Lafavre, as consul here, was not authorized to deal with any particular subject. We opened an unofficial correspondence for the purpose of seeing whether steps could not be taken so as to superinduce an official negotiation, and yet this act was repudiated. Sir, as matters stand now, I think Canada's position is as favorable as it well can be. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that we can, by legislation, without anything like a treaty, regulate our commercial principles and practices, and the hon. gentleman quoted three of the clauses of the Tariff of 1878, showing that we have exercised that power by legislation—in fact to make treaties according to those three clauses, with every nation who chooses to meet Canada on those terms. But the hon. gentleman says that is not sufficient. Well, what is sufficient? As we cannot have ambassadors he says we must have special agents of our own. Well, Sir, besides the impossibility of our agents being received in a foreign country, and the importance the language of the resolution would claim for them, I can see that, great as we are, powerful as we are going to be, when we have the prestige of England, the whole diplomatic service of England, however strong and able we may be, we are greatly strengthened and aided in advancing our interests and developing our trade. Now, Sir, I am not aware that before 1878, any step of any kind was taken by the Government to develop our trade. But the first thing we did was to attempt to develop our trade with foreign countries, and after the deliberate expression of the people of Canada in favor of the National Policy, we at once, as it was our duty to do, made a forecast of the future, and we had to discount posterity to a certain extent. We had to provide for an occasional over-production, we supposed there might be sometimes a plethora of manufactures, that our markets would be glutted, and so we commenced at once negotiations, *pari passu* with our National Policy, in order to make arrangements with foreign countries which would be likely to exchange commodities with us. I am not sure but that we got a great deal of sympathy from the hon. gentlemen opposite, though we did incur a good deal of ridicule, and I do not know but that before we get through this Session we may have a special vote charging us with our extravagant course in our first humble attempt to have an ambassador. We are told now that he is good for nothing, that we had better withdraw him, that our very first attempt to have commercial independence is costing us tens of thousands of