

necessary they will contend that they have such a right and find means of making Great Britain acknowledge that to be the case. We know from the sad experience of the past that whenever the United States wish to obtain any concessions from England, they are invariably successful; and it would be just the same thing hereafter should they come forward and put an interpretation on the Treaty that will give them the use of the canals on their own terms. When the Americans asked for a portion of New Brunswick, their demand was resisted in the first instance, a good deal of correspondence ensued, and a Commission was finally appointed with the result of giving the United States all that they demanded. If there is one person in this House who should object to this measure, it is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has said that our fisheries are of so much commercial importance that we ought not to give them up except for sufficient commercial concessions. Gentlemen need not say that we have the canals, and the Americans cannot make use of them except with our consent. If a question should arise in connection with them, I repeat Great Britain will declare rather than get embroiled that they are within the interpretation of that part of the Treaty, giving the Americans the right to navigate the St. Lawrence. In conclusion, I must express my regret that the rights of Canada have been so egregiously sacrificed for the sake of Imperial interests. I regret it because I cannot see that war could be apprehended on account of our deciding to reserve our right to the fisheries and the St. Lawrence, until we obtained the concessions to which we are fairly entitled. The question of the fisheries ought to have been arranged on its own merits—not mixed up with a matter of such vital import to the Empire, as the Alabama difficulty. I do not wish to be considered disloyal to British connection, when I object to the Treaty, for I am only actuated by the desire to express my opinion as a Canadian, anxious to promote the interests of Canada and preserve the honour of England. I have spoken frankly and unreservedly on the subject, and I trust in a manner consistent with true philosophy and historical facts.

Hon. Mr. WARK—I think the hon. member mistakes the feeling of this House altogether when he thinks that he does not at all times receive the earnest attention of hon. members when he addresses them; for all of us must admit that he invariably expresses himself in a

clear, moderate, and intelligent manner. There are perhaps few subjects which have been brought under the notice of the people of this country, that have led to a greater diversity of opinion than the question which we are now called upon to discuss. The hon. Postmaster General has remarked that a great change has taken place in the opinions of many persons since this question came to be discussed. My feelings on the subject have not undergone any change. Perhaps I have viewed the Treaty more favorably than others from the circumstance that I have always held very strong views of the importance of preserving the connection between the mother country and this Dominion. I read the Treaty very carefully and for the reason just stated came to the conclusion that it was a measure which ought to be accepted by the people of this country. I have not failed to see that one defect in the Treaty has been that the question of the right of the Americans to fish in our bays, and within our headlands, had not been settled at the same time with other questions, for we must all see the inconvenience of having this matter left open, to be thrown back upon us at some future time. It is also matter for regret that whilst the parties to the Treaty took so much pains to define everything in connection with ships, they did not define the duties of Government to prevent such scenes as we have witnessed during the last few years in the United States. I believe there is no country in the world which affords so safe a refuge to political offenders as England. We remember a few years ago when the Emperor Napoleon made certain representations, a great English statesman—Lord Palmerston—gave way to him, but the clamor that was raised against infringing on the right of asylum was so great that he was forced to resign. But at the same time these political refugees must keep within the laws of the country. It was well known, however, that these Fenians organized in public, appointed generals, raised money, purchased arms and supplies under the very eyes of the United States Government, and still not a step was taken to arrest their illegal course until Canada had suffered heavy losses. I hold that such a state of things was most unfriendly to this country, and it ought to have been considered with the other questions proposed of by the High Commissioners. We all know the advantages we enjoy as a dependency of Great Britain—in the time of peace our ships are to be found in every part of the world, and in case of difficulty