

ket for those articles in the production of which they are engaged. In this way they would be largely benefited. Then, again, there are a large number of men in Nova Scotia and neighboring Provinces ready to be engaged on fishing vessels; they want money to support their families, and if the American fishermen were allowed to come upon the Canadian shore for the purpose of engaging men to go out to the deep sea fisheries, large numbers of Canadian people would obtain employment and earn money with which to support their families; and so in a hundred ways our people would be largely benefited, much more benefited in this particular respect than any injury that might accrue by the concession of the point in dispute between the two countries. There is another point to which I beg leave to draw the attention of the House. Suppose that the Canadian Government is not willing to concede this point, what is to be the outcome? The consequences might lead to trouble and excite an irritation the results of which might be deplorable. The Americans propose to themselves three alternatives of settling this matter. I would place them before the people of this country and ask which they prefer to accept? I will read from an official document presented to the Congress of the United States by a commission that was appointed to report upon the matter. The commissioners say, speaking for the United States, first:

"We must live under the treaty, and be constantly embroiled with the British Government as to its proper interpretation."

That is what she has been doing for a great many years. She has been embroiled with the British Government a great many times since 1818, and she has been particularly embroiled with the British Government since 1885, leading to irritation and annoyances which are not pleasant to either country. Or, second:

"We must reform that interpretation by a fair and just agreement between this country and the British Government."

Is not that a just and right way to solve the difficulty—to interpret that treaty along the lines of international equity which should exist between great nations in the settlement of disputes. Or, third:

"We must abandon the treaty and adopt a policy of retaliation to protect our rights."

I do not suppose there is any hon. member, on the Conservative or on the Reform side of this House, who would like to see the last alternative adopted by the United States. We were told the other day by the leader of the Government that he did not fear retaliation. But if retaliation should come—and there is no improbability in the matter—it would certainly affect the interests of Canada as well as those of the United States, and if we are a wise people we can settle the difficulty on a better principle than that of allowing one Government to enter upon a policy of retaliation against another. It would at least be wise and honorable to go half way and to say to the United States: Come, let us reason together on this matter and settle it on the lines of equity and honor between nation and nation. This is an important question, and in relation to it the people of this country should not act as partisans. It is a matter particularly affecting Canada. It is one that affects Reformers as well as Conservatives and every true Canadian, and it is to the interest of everyone that politics and partisanship should be laid aside, and like men and Canadians ask ourselves: What is the best way of settling a dispute which has caused so much irritation and annoyance? I am not speaking from a political standpoint to-day, but from a Canadian standpoint, and if we are in the wrong let us yield, but if we are in the right, according to the judgments of the very highest authorities, let us maintain that right with dignity. But surely there are wise men who can find a way by which this question can be settled, and at the same time maintain the friendly

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

relations existing between the two countries. Mr. Speaker, there is another question which is of great importance to this country. It came before us the other day. It is a question which should be thoroughly ventilated and discussed by both parties with a view to arriving at a proper conclusion. It is a question into which our political partisanship should not run, but it should be decided in the interests of our country, not only of our present country, but of our future country, which we expect to be much greater and grander than anything we possess to-day. But if we are continually considering questions from political and sectional standpoints, the future of this country will not be as great as it is expected to be; but if we stand shoulder to shoulder like true Canadians we will arrive at wise conclusions in regard to these national questions that are pressing upon our attention. We, as Canadians, possess a country which contains within itself the greatest possibilities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am very glad to know there are very many hon. gentlemen opposite who entertain bright expectations with regard to the greatness of our country. I also do so. I am a Canadian, born in Canada, and I love Canada far above even Britain herself, and it is our duty as Canadians to work out our own destiny. This country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, containing within itself every element of greatness, has a great destiny in store for it, if Canadians are true to their country and to themselves. We possess vast tracts of the finest agricultural land upon which the sun ever shone; we have vast forests of timber, the finest that stands upon the continent of America; we have the finest mineral resources to be found in any nation, in different parts of this country, and only awaiting capital and labor for their development, and we have fishing interests in the east and the west surpassing any other fishing interests in the world. With these vast storehouses of natural wealth around us, and with a people full of pluck, vigor and skill, we shall work out a great destiny, provided we stand shoulder to shoulder and apply our great natural forces to accomplish that end. We have great responsibilities resting upon us. We have the responsibility of developing these vast resources; and in order to be placed in an equal position with the other countries surrounding us, I hold that we must have a wider and greater constitutional freedom to open up markets for our products. Even at the present time we have the home market glutted, and we are compelled to send a large portion of our product to foreign countries, and if we hope to compete successfully in the markets of foreign countries with rival nations, we must possess equal privileges with them. We must possess the power to make our own commercial treaties with foreign countries. Again, there is great responsibility resting upon us in view of our geographical relations to the great country to the south. We are contiguous with the greatest nation on this continent for three thousand miles, and it behooves us to act so that we may avoid everything of an irritating character between the two countries. It becomes us to watch that there be no overt act committed that may give umbrage to the United States Government, and that nothing shall be done that will interfere with trade and commerce between the two countries. I believe, if we possessed the constitutional powers to make our own treaties, and if we were able to send a representative direct to Washington, we would be better able to avoid contentions than we are under the present system. It is our duty to go to Great Britain and ask Her Majesty's Government to extend to us the constitutional liberty to make our own treaties, so that we may be better able to develop this portion of the Empire, and, by developing this Dominion, add to the dignity and prestige of the British