

April 30, 1872

extreme protectionists to desire independence as the only means of accomplishing their object.

It seems strange, however, that it has not occurred to those persons that under the commercial treaty in existence between England and the United States and which provides that the manufacturers of England shall be admitted to the United States on the same terms as those of the most favored nations, it would be impossible for the United States to enter into such an arrangement with an independent State, and if this country were independent it would be necessary for her to enter into a commercial treaty with Great Britain which would contain a similar clause. The object then of the advocates of independence is unattainable by the means which they contemplate, and few of them, I hope, are inclined to recommend annexation, any agitation for which would, in my humble judgment, be neither more nor less than an agitation for a civil war.

I have now, Sir, completed my task, and I have to thank the House for the attention with which they have listened to me. (*Loud cheers.*)

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) necessarily called for some comment from his side of the House. They would recollect that last year the hon. gentleman had told them that the amount of debt which it would be necessary to incur in order to carry out the terms of the union with British Columbia would be \$25,000,000. He had increased it to \$30,000,000 a few days ago and now he stated \$40,000,000 as the sum for which we should have to make provision in the future.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said most unquestionably the total estimate for the extension and enlargement of the canals was \$15,000,000.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that the estimate could scarcely be considered at present, as there was no means of estimating its correctness. He referred to the loan of our millions sterling upon the Imperial guarantee, for which he (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) assumed to himself and colleagues credit. He endeavored to make the House believe that Government had made on the whole a very good bargain, and that by some means the Imperial Government was to be coaxed into giving a guarantee for a million and a half more—which, for the present, they had declined.

He hoped no Canadian Ministry would ever again go on a begging expedition to the Imperial Government for any such purpose. He looked almost with loathing and disgust upon the course the Ministry had pursued, and upon the communications between the two Governments on this subject with the utmost possible humiliation. (*Cheers.*) Nothing had taken place in our history which had filled his mind with so much humiliation as this huckstering to obtain the small amount of money mentioned,—as a conciliation, too, for yielding up the opposition the Government pretended to have felt towards the Treaty. For some time they spoke

in strong, he would not say most offensive, terms to the British Government with regard to these claims, affecting our rights of property, and the Fenian outrages.

In insisting that the Fenian claims should have been considered in the Treaty of Washington in a different way from that observed, he would never have made the slightest reference, or if so, only the slightest, to money considerations; but he did feel humiliated as a Briton and a Canadian that, while the Americans were forcing the consideration of the Alabama claims on the British Government, we had not pressed our claims against them for offensive outrages upon our frontier people. He felt humiliated that the British and Canadian Governments should have yielded so tamely to the rejection of this as a legitimate subject for discussion and reparation, and for an apology on the part of the United States. It seemed to our Government as if the amount of money concerned was the chief consideration; and now we were asked to rejoice at the arrangement proposed by the Government, and to be submitted to the House in a few days whereby we obtained the Imperial guarantee for two and a half millions as payment for the loss incurred in the raids, and as some equivalent for the surrender of our territorial rights to the Fisheries.

Nothing had been said by the hon. gentleman as to the direct loss the Treaty otherwise involved. They all knew there was another claim this House would have to make good, which had not been referred to; but the discussion upon the Treaty could scarcely be said to be introduced today, although these remarks were necessarily precipitated from us by the course of hon. gentlemen in this matter.

He denied the accuracy of the Finance Minister's figures as to the value of the proposed guarantee. Assuming again by it, however, we had this huckstering for the sake of saving at the very outside about \$120,000 a year. A humiliation had been imposed upon us which he was quite sure the country would not submit to for twice that amount. We were able to pay our way, and interest on our debt, and to contract whatever debt we might require for national improvements, even if the Imperial Government should decline to aid us by guarantees. It was known they set their face against any; and in going to them for a four million guarantee and receiving the offer of one for two millions and a half, and seeing the hon. gentleman opposite say, "Its a bargain" then come here and ask the House to rejoice with the Government because they had succeeded in extorting in this way this miserable pittance from the Imperial Government,—he could not tell how much he felt humiliated over the transaction. (*Cheers and ironical cheers.*) He would not for the entire interest on our debt be placed in the wretched position in which the celebrated statesman opposite, and Government of which he was a member, had succeeded in placing the country.

The hon. gentleman who just sat down had referred to the mental trouble occasioned him by the freaks of the Secretary of State for the Provinces (Hon. Mr. Howe). His former colleague on this side of the House also came in for a share of this denunciation, and the Finance Minister had called on him, his colleague that was, and he supposed his colleague that was to be again, to retract the opinion