

Address said we intended to have a lock similar to that of the United States. That was the original intention, but after the death of our lamented chief, a change was made in the plans of that canal, when I visited the works in company with my hon. friend on my left (Hon. Mr. Smith), to whom I must give credit for assisting materially in changing the plans. Of course we did not view the situation from an engineering stand-point, because neither of us is an engineer, but we lay claim to that quality which enables men to get through the world successfully, the quality of common sense. We found that the Americans were building a lock 600 feet long, 100 feet wide and twenty feet deep. It will be easily understood that with a lock one hundred feet wide, each halt gate must be in the neighbourhood of sixty feet wide. The pressure must be tremendous, and the difficulties in working the gates very great, hence we came to the conclusion, after consulting our engineer, that a lock sixty feet wide, nine hundred feet long, and twenty feet deep, would be much more practical and much easier worked, than one of the dimensions built by the United States; I am glad to know that the engineers, who ought to have better ideas on questions of this kind than two laymen, approved of this; and when in Washington we pointed this out to the United States people, that we would not only have a canal better than theirs, which could be worked easier and cheaper, but that it was to be built on a plan which would enable us to duplicate it whenever the trade of the country shall require it. The entrance to the canal from the Sault River is wide enough for two locks, and the north wall is being so built as to enable us to construct a similar lock to the north of it, when vessels will be able to go east and west without interruption of trade. I say, with all respect, that any Canadian who grudges the expenditure on that work and thinks it unnecessary, in my opinion, has very little regard for the greatness and the future prosperity of his country. The same remarks apply to the negotiations with Newfoundland. The hon. gentleman thought that Confederation was rounded off sufficiently as it was, and that Newfoundland ought not to be brought into the confederacy. I differ from him *in toto* upon that question. I look upon the isolation of Newfoundland, in the present state of affairs, as one of the most serious menaces towards the peace and harmony of this coun-

try, not only as regards the United States, but with respect to other countries as well. Every few months, or every few years, something arises in which the people of Newfoundland are deeply interested, and would like to get a connection with the United States, no matter at what expense to Canada, thereby placing Canada and Canadian fishermen at a disadvantage in the markets of the world. Take the present Bond treaty as an example, and what would its effect be? Every quintal of fish taken by Newfoundland fishermen would be relieved of the tax of 75 cents imposed under the United States tariff, while every quintal caught by Canadian fishermen in the same waters would be under the disadvantage of paying a tax of 75 cents in the same market. That is Mr. Bond's interpretation of the treaty. When the papers are laid before us you will see that the Canadian delegates dissented from such an interpretation, and yet the hon. gentleman says that he was opposed to the policy of the Government last year, but from patriotic motives did not so express himself at the time, for fear he might be accused of advocating a policy which would be detrimental to Canada, or of interfering with the negotiations then going on. The hon. gentleman's colleague in the lower House—the member for Bothwell—was not so delicate. He laid down the broad principle that it was an impertinent interference on the part of Canada to protest against any treaty being negotiated between Newfoundland and the United States. The Government saw the effect which the sanctioning of that treaty by England would have upon the fishing industries of our Atlantic seacoast, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government, who were watching the interests of Canada on all points, whether in minor details or in the case of the great fishing industries of the Atlantic seaboard, to intervene and prevent the ratification of such a treaty if possible; and I am glad to say that they were successful in preventing the ratification of a treaty which would have been so disastrous to our fishing interests on the Atlantic coast. I hope that at no very distant day the people of Newfoundland will see that it is to their interest to come within this confederation, and I also hope the day is not far distant when there shall not be a single foot of British North America that is not under control of the Dominion. It may cost a little money, but