

judge from all past expense of works constructed under control of the Royal Engineers, as he supposed these would be, the expense would very far exceed the estimate, and new demands for more money would be made in each successive session. No one could doubt that the works would cost the country more than double what Government asked at this moment. Moreover, his firm conviction was that the defences to be erected at Toronto and Hamilton would be utterly useless. Colonel Jervois in his report did not assume that these places could be defended in the sense of what we called defence. He merely considered that by having works at certain places we would be able to hold them for a time. Admitting that the rest of the country would be occupied by the enemy, he considered that in these places we would have a nucleus around which, in certain emergencies, the militia of the country might congregate. But suppose these places were held, what was to hinder the United States from landing their troops at almost any point along Lake Erie, at any point on the Detroit River, on the Rivers Thames and Sydenham, on the east shores of Lake Huron, or at any point on the Georgian Bay from Owen Sound to Collingwood? Where then would be the use of maintaining works at Toronto or Hamilton, if the whole country otherwise was to be occupied by foreign troops. Mr. Mackenzie went on to show that it would be next to impossible in a time of war to get gunboats up the St. Lawrence into Lake Ontario along a route a great portion of which would be commanded by the enemy, and argued that the best measures we could take for our defence were the maintenance of a well drilled force of say 25,000 volunteers to preserve internal order and be ready for service in case of any sudden emergency and a good militia organization under well trained officers ready for service in the event of war. He yielded to no man in loyalty or in willingness that our means or resources should be employed in the defence even of Imperial interest in this continent; but he objected to our going into a recklessly extravagant system of fortifications that would be productive of no real good. He proceeded to discuss the probabilities of war with the United States, and showed that these were vastly less now than they were supposed to be in 1862, 1863 and 1864, when the United States had an immense army, and it was thought that the causes of irritation then existing might lead to war with Britain. When their own war was settled,

he showed that much more friendly feeling existed, that the United States had disbanded their army, except what was required to keep the South in subjection, and that their experience of the difficulties of governing a conquered country in the South would be to deter them from trying a similar experiment on their northern border. He argued that it would be too great a burden on our resources, not only to erect, but to maintain such fortifications as were now proposed, and referred to the history of the American civil war to show that impromptu earth works thrown up in a few days had often proved more effectual to stop an enemy's operation than the most elaborate fortifications.

Mr. Cartwright agreed with the member for Lambton that great deliberation was necessary before entering into a scheme of this kind. Undoubtedly the position of this Dominion was a peculiar one as compared with other Colonies of Great Britain. As to the question at issue, he would simply say that though he acquitted the honourable member of desiring to sever the connection with the mother country, yet if the honourable member had been specially retained by advocates of Colonial disunion, he could not have done much more towards such a brief. The true tendency of some of the arguments of the member for Lambton was to show that the people of this country would be mad if they neglected to provide a proper system of defence. Again, the member for Lambton was inconsistent in his course. A motion substantially similar to the amendment now proposed had, on a previous occasion, been placed in the hands of the Speaker of the Province of Canada, and in spite of an amendment proposed by the member for Chateauguay, that motion was voted down—the member for Lambton voting among the nays. (Hear).

Mr. Mackenzie said he would give his reasons for doing so very soon.

Hon. Mr. Holton said the member was mistaken in saying he (Mr. Holton) had moved the amendment alluded to.

Mr. Cartwright resumed. He thought it was idle for them to conceal from themselves that the United States was rather to be regarded as a powerful and sullen rival than as a friendly power. There were, he was sorry to say, too many indications that this had been the true attitude of our neighbours for years past. Moreover, it was not to be supposed for one moment that there was nothing which would be likely to lead to a war between