

Pelletier it was accompanied with a seat in the Senate?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes.

The House adjourned at 4 p.m.

FRIDAY, Feb. 16th.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 p.m.

After routine,

PRIVATE BILLS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved that the time for the reception of petitions for private bills be extended to February 27th. He said the new rules are now in force. It would have been too expensive to advertise them in all the papers in the Dominion, but the best publication that could possibly be made was given. Parties sending notices for publication in the *Gazette* were informed of the existence of the new rules, and copies were forwarded to them.

The motion was carried.

The House adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

MONDAY, Feb. 19th.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

After routine,

TREATIES RELATING TO CANADA.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a copy of every clause or article relating to Canada contained in any treaty or convention or other international agreement now in force between Her Majesty's Government and any foreign power, and not published with the Statutes of Canada. He said it was important for us to know the different conventions and treaties that related to Canada, inasmuch as they might affect tariffs which the Government of this country might frame. Not only in Canada, but elsewhere an impression seems to prevail that we have no right to impose differential duties. This error arises from the Convention of 1815 between the United States and Great Britain, by which no differential duties are to be established, but Canada and the West Indies were excepted. That treaty was only for four years, and it was then extended for ten years more. Since that time he could find no such Convention in existence between the United States and Great Britain, from which he concluded that we possessed the power of imposing differential duties if we think it necessary. This is important, because Canada is placed

in a difficult position in regulating her tariff. Under the Washington Treaty for ten years, and for two years after its expiration, we have no right to impose duties on exports to the United States. In the Imperial House of Commons last year, the Government were asked if any demand had been made on the United States with reference to the surplus money, some \$10,000,000, remaining after adjusting the Alabama claims. The *New York Tribune* of Jan. 8th published, an interview with President Grant in which he expressed the opinion that Congress ought to extend the class of cases for which damages were claimed in order that no part of the award should go back to England, because he considered the entire amount was less than the value of the ships destroyed. He also expressed the opinion that any surplus remaining should be used to restore the mercantile marine of the United States to the condition in which it was before the depredations of the rebel cruisers. Another report published the 3rd of January expressed similar views. It is probable, therefore, that a new bill will be passed by which another class of claims will be admitted and the balance then remaining will go to improve their mercantile marine. In England, judging by the answer of the Government, they entertain very little hope of ever having one cent of the money refunded. In the part of that Treaty affecting Canada, we have been as happy as in the Ashburton Treaty. Under articles 22 and 23 of the Washington Treaty, Commissioners are to be appointed to settle the amount we are to receive for our fisheries and for other purposes. Those articles provide for three Commissioners, and the question arises whether they have the same powers as the Commissioners appointed under Clauses 1 and 13 for the adjustment of the Alabama claims. Contrary to international law and to what would have been honest and fair, the Commissioners in our case must be unanimous. In the first part of the treaty it is set forth in a clear manner that the decision of a majority of the arbitrators is final, but if the United States Commissioner in our case should dissent from the opinion of the other two arbitrators, no award can be given. In that treaty there was a neglect of duty somewhere; yet he did not regret the Washington Treaty, because he preferred peace before anything. He contented himself with stating those facts, because he was of opinion we must decide for ourselves what will be the result of that treaty. He would now refer to the complaints which were made that some of our interests were neglected.