

all its power in defence of the colonies, and that, as a rule, the colonies themselves should decide as to the nature and extent of contribution they should make to their own defence. Having quoted several passages to this effect from the report made by the two members of the Commission least favourable to the colonies, Mr. Mackenzie read the report of Mr. Elliot, who stated that the benefit of the colonies to the mother country ought also to be taken into consideration, and that the question of defending the colonies was essentially of Imperial interest. In illustration of this point Mr. Mackenzie quoted from the trade returns to show that this Dominion, in proportion to its population, traded with Great Britain to a vastly larger extent than the United States did, which was also in fact an English speaking colony of Great Britain, although now politically independent of the mother country, and that if Canada were separated from the mother country and joined to the United States, the commerce and manufacturing interest of Great Britain would suffer largely by the loss of our trade. But while he urged these reasons why there should be a Commission or Committee appointed by Government or Parliament to ascertain the precise position in which we stood to the mother country in regard to military expenditure, he was not disposed for one moment to take advantage of the argument he had used in order to obtain more money from the British people than would be fair for such purpose. In order, however, to settle the respective amounts which should be paid by the mother country and by the colony, there ought to be an inquiry by some competent tribunal. There ought also to be information as to how the money was to be expended. If the Government policy should succeed, if the House should adopt these resolutions, which he could not believe they would, it would be in the power of the Government to expend five million dollars on works, as to the nature and extent of which they had given the House no information. The Minister of Militia had argued that because the Austrian Government had their Quadrilateral in Italy, therefore, we should have our quadrilateral in Canada—the fortified angles of which should be Montreal, Kingston, Toronto and Hamilton—(laughter)—with possibly a sergeant's guard at Paris, or London. He did not feel competent to discuss military topics, but he did think that such a quadrilateral would bear very little comparison with the original in Italy. We had already organized

[Mr. Mackenzie (Lambton).]

the most extensive system of militia, in proportion to our numbers, that prevailed in any part of the British Empire, including the mother country itself. We had now a force of some 25,000 volunteers, tolerably well drilled, if we were to credit the reports of the Adjutant-General. In 1861 it was stated before an English Commission that in all British America we had but 10,000 volunteers, and that our militia was merely a paper organization. This was still to some extent true of the militia, but we had at large expense trained a body of officers, who were supposed to be capable of heading our militia force, if it should be unfortunately necessary to take them into the field. And now, in addition to all this, we were asked to enter on a system of fortifications, the nature of which had only been imperfectly shadowed forth by the Minister of Militia. We had been told that it was probable an entrenched camp would be formed somewhere in the Western peninsula, but that the works at the lake points would be of a different kind.

Sir G. E. Cartier said he had stated that at Montreal the fortification would consist of earth works and a large entrenched camp.

Mr. Mackenzie said he had inferred from the reports and from the honourable gentleman's own speech that other works besides mere earth works and a camp were to be constructed. Part of the works, it had been stated, would be in the County of Vaudreuil, extending thirty or forty miles beyond Montreal; but however this might be, it was well known that in Western Canada we had a most difficult country to fortify in the sense understood in Great Britain. The English defence commission took the ground that it would be quite impossible to fortify the merely commercial harbours, and their works had therefore been directed mainly to the fortifications of the great naval arsenals and dockyards. In these resolutions it was proposed to fortify three of the lake ports in Western Canada, only one which, Kingston could be held to have any analogy to Dartmouth, Portsmouth, and Plymouth. Mr. Mackenzie again pointed out that when the English harbour fortifications were undertaken, the fullest details of the proposed works were laid before Parliament, and contended that it would be improper and unconstitutional for this Parliament, without any such details, to grant so large a sum to the Government to be expended by them in any way they saw fit. He showed them, if we might