

was exactly, technically and literally correct, and he now reiterated it. The article stated :

“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, St. Lawrence, and other Canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion, and the Government of the United States engages that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and, further, engages to urge upon the State Governments to secure to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty the use of the several State Canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line between the Possessions of the High Contracting Parties on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.”

There was a distinction at once. If the canals on the Upper Ottawa could be reached by American vessels, they could be used, while the United States only promised to use their influence with the several States to allow us to use the canals contiguous to the boundary or waters traversed by the boundary.

Mr. TUPPER: None of them have been conceded. All that has been done is that the Government of England has agreed to use her influence with us.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I said that.

Mr. TUPPER: You said we were placed beyond any administrative or legislative action on our part.

Mr. MACKENZIE said his point was, while certain canals only were to be conceded to us by the United States, we were to concede to the United States the whole of our canals under the same condition. He and the present Government had taken the ground that the canals connecting the Hudson River with the lakes ought properly to come under these terms. They had some difficulty in getting the right conceded, and, when it was, it was so hampered with conditions as to make the use of the canal of very little good. By the 30th Section of the Treaty, if Canada refused the Americans the use of our canals, they could refuse us the right of transportation over their territory. The hon. gentleman had not

Mr. MACKENZIE.

shown that he was wrong about the rivers. Our right to navigate the Stikcoen and the Yukon Rivers was not so great under the Washington Treaty as it was under the Treaty with Russia, the conditions of which had not been altered by the purchase of Alaska by the United States.

Mr. TUPPER held that he had shown that under this treaty Canada had the same right to close its canals against the Americans whenever it considered it desirable to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have something to say.

Mr. HOLTON rose to a point of order. The discussion should be confined to the item upon which concurrence was asked.

Mr. SPEAKER took the same view.

Mr. MITCHELL said England had never protected our rights, and therefore the Treaty with Russia was of no practical use.

Mr. HOLTON again rose to a question of order.

Mr. MITCHELL objected to the Canadian Government paying for Mr. Rothery's mission as well as half the expenses of the Commission.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said the payment was made on the basis of an arrangement made with the Imperial Government before the present Government here came into office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think not.

Mr. MITCHELL said he had no recollection of such an arrangement.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions agreed to as follows :

1. Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1877, the sum of \$1,625,395.99 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.