

Hon. W. J. McDONALD, (B. C.)— I consider myself in a position to look at the question now before this House free from all local feeling, and free from all party spirit, not having been hitherto mixed up with the politics of this country. The causes which led to the negotiations of the Treaty are so well known, and have just been reviewed by the Postmaster General. I need not therefore repeat them. If by the Treaty of Washington our territorial rights have been invaded was this done solely in the interests of England. Was this done to patch a peace with America with a view to future complication in Europe and the balance of power being destroyed and new alliances formed? Such is not the case— this Treaty is as much in the interests of Canada as that of England, and were she not jealous of our rights what difference could it make to her who fished in our waters. It must be evident to all that there exists a strong feeling in England that this country should have peace and tranquility and not be contending for her rights with a foreign State, rights which she has always helped us to maintain and will still do so. The people of this country cannot, and do not wish to have causes of dispute and quarrels left open no more than England does which might at any time lead us into serious complication with a powerful neighbor. and one branch of the Parliament of this country has sustained this view of the question, and deemed it expedient to ratify the Treaty although it was not all that could be desired. History shows that Canadians have always held their ground against the United States, yet we are a commercial and not a military people, and unsettled international questions disturb our industries; unsettle the public mind periodically; cripple trade, and retard the general progress of the country. And this Fishery question unless settled will be a continual bone of contention, and will have the most damaging effect on the credit of this country and must interfere with the great public work now in contemplation. Our duty then in the furtherance of all these interests is to give effect to the Treaty, and should we need further evidence to convince us of this, we have it in the vote given in the House of Commons by the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia members—63 for the Treaty, 21 against. It has been clearly shown by members of both houses that a great stimulus will be given to many branches of trade in the Lower Provinces under the provisions of the Treaty, and that no Province will be injured. The Government of this country

have given the matter their most careful consideration, and studied the question in all its bearings. And all admire and approve of the determined stand taken by them, and the clear and vigorous way in which they placed the views of this country before the Imperial Government, and if finally they accepted a modification of these views and took all that it was possible to get they cannot be blamed. I feel that they have the best interests of the country at heart, and I am bound to give my support to a Government that has ruled the country so well during the last five years as shown by the great prosperity of the country. If under the operation of this Treaty the balance of trade should appear against us, a money payment is provided for equal to such balance. Why should a money payment be scorned? What does all commerce and trade lead to but money? But it appears to me that there is so much sentiment mixed up with the whole question that sight is lost of the reality. The honor of the country cannot be sullied by the negotiations in this matter as we are left free to reject the Treaty. We are free in this as in all things, yet there are certain ties which link us to the mother country which it would not be politic to sever or even to tighten at this time, and if hereafter we have to separate let the responsibility rest with England and not with Canada. If we reject this Treaty, and England withdraws her countenance, withdraws her protection, and withdraws from arbitration in our affairs, are we in a position to protect our own fisheries? Are we prepared to build, man and equip a navy capable of protecting our interests. I contend that we are not able, or in such a position. The rejection of this Treaty means more than the simple rejection, it means a feeling antagonistic to that of the Empire, it means introducing the thin end of the wedge of independence, it means republicanism, it means anarchy and confusion, and the worst feature in independence is the form of government which we would have to adopt. A monarchy we cannot have, and a republic is the only thing open to us. When we have this form of Government I do not wish to live in this country. Imagine this country a republic. How insignificant we would be, hemmed in on the one side by an enormous country and on the other by the North Pole, rent asunder by political factions and a continual struggle for power, without status as a nation, and without weight in the council of nations. As we are now I believe the people of Canada are the most free, the most pro-