

member it was afterwards rejected by the United States they thought they could settle it without going to the Dominion and saying—You shall have a share in this Treaty, you shall grant us your rights over the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Subsequently a demand was made by our Government for the protection of our Fisheries, and indemnity for the losses we sustained from the Fenian raids. When the Postmaster General went on that mission he must have felt that he was not treated as a Minister of the Crown ought to have been. The replies of Lord Kimberly were certainly given with a harshness that this country did not deserve. However we had to submit, and then ensued the proposition to the Washington Government to renew the negotiations which had been broken off between the two Governments for the settlement of the Alabama difficulty. The Minister of Justice was appointed one of the Commissioners, and I admit that the moment he accepted the position he separated himself from his colleagues and became an Imperial officer; but at the same time I cannot believe he could divest himself entirely of his position in Canada, or of the feeling that his Government would be to a certain extent responsible for his position. Now it is urged that the Treaty is a good one. It seems to me that it is a great deal like the other treaties passed between Great Britain and the United States; we have always had the worst of it. If we go back a good many years we see a large portion of our Western Territory was taken from the Colonies for the sake of peace. Later we find, in 1842, that a Commission was appointed to settle the question of the boundary of New Brunswick, and Quebec; and here again a very valuable section of our territory was handed over to the United States. That Treaty was characterized in the Parliament of England as a sort of capitulation, because the United States obtained what did not belong to them. It was, besides, the mistake of British diplomacy that led to the difficulties connected with the Island of San Juan, and which have to be settled by an arbitration. I do not contend that we should not be placed in a position to assist England in her efforts to ensure peace with the United States, but I do say that when we are paying the full amount of her debt we should be treated in a different way. We ought not to see the Fenian claims disposed of in the way that was done on the Commission; for the moment they came before it, the reply was that they could not be considered—they

were not named in the stipulations and must therefore be set aside as of no value whatever. Might it not then be said with truth that our rights had been sacrificed and the Treaty was a capitulation? In compensation we are to have a guarantee for £2,500,000, but that really amounts to nothing but the endorsement of a vote which would never be protested on the market, whilst we continue to enjoy our present prosperity. Then our territorial rights, the fisheries and the navigation of the St. Lawrence, have been ceded to the United States without adequate compensation. All that we are to receive for all we give up is the free entrance of fish and fish oil into the American market. The Hon. Postmaster General acknowledges that there was a clamor against the Treaty, but now it is all drowned by the votes of the other House. I do not pretend to say that the result of the vote is not to a certain extent the expression of opinion of the country, but I do say this, if the Government examine this vote, they will find that certain sectional interests have been predominant. For instance, you will see a number of persons who are trying to get a free market for the only products of their country; and it is not strange that they should go for the treaty; but they must remember that they do so at the expense of the other portions of the Dominion. It is true that the majority is large, but it is formed chiefly by those members who are most anxious to obtain access to the markets of the United States. We know that an effort was made for a larger award; it was proposed by the American Commissioners, that fish, fish oil, coal, lumber, and salt should be admitted, but the result was that the British Commissioners said that they could not accept those terms until they conferred with their Government, and so valuable time was lost, for when at a later period they came to consider the question, they found the American Commissioners would not agree to the original proposition. The Americans then found the British Commissioners ready to accept any conditions that might be imposed upon them. The result was, that instead of obtaining free admission for the articles I have mentioned, they had to be satisfied with a market for a single commodity. When we consider the famous national policy of gentlemen opposite—that it alone was to give us Reciprocity, it is difficult to understand their present position. If we had allowed things to remain as they were, and not mixed up our questions with matters of deep Imperial import, we would be in a