

May 3, 1872

of people into reciprocity. It was too late in the day to claim that, but for the action of this House, the result desired by the country would have been obtained—for the hon. gentleman must have known well everything that transpired at Ottawa.

Again we were told to be thankful because we still had the Hudson's Bay as a reserve, and that in the course of 12 years we would find good fish there; but we had Hudson's Bay before. The hon. gentleman had asserted that those who were chiefly interested in the fisheries were very willing that the Treaty should take effect. He did not know how the hon. gentlemen from the Lower Provinces might vote, but he knew how one of the Local Legislatures had acted, and that a prominent member had made the strongest statements, and he quoted figures from the statement prepared by the Minister of Marine (Hon. Senator Mitchell) showing how great had been the growth of the fisheries under the system commenced in 1870. The growth was in consequence of our retaining possession and control of the fisheries in our own hands, and not allowing the Americans to ruin them.

He also quoted from a speech of a member of the New Brunswick Government to show the strong feelings that pervaded the Province, and said that the Lieut. Governor's speech itself was in the strongest terms in condemnation of the Treaty. He next called attention to a statement of the Premier regarding the navigation of the St. Lawrence. It was true that while the words literally sought to be construed as giving Americans no control over the canals, the hon. Premier would soon find that if he refused them the use of those works he would be told to do so in such a message as had frightened the Commissioners last year, and we would be told that we had practically annulled the treaty. The Americans would again set their hearts on securing the use of the canals, and having set their hearts on anything seemed to be ground enough for the British Commissioners to grant them anything they desire.

He maintained that Canada had the best of claims to the site of the St. Clair Flats Canal, and stated that one of the highest United States engineering authorities had come to the same conclusion. Respecting his speech about the navigation of Lake Michigan to which Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald had referred, he stated that he still held the opinion that we were as much entitled to the navigation of Lake Michigan as we are to that of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. We never claimed we could exclude the Americans from the Georgian Bay, but they had taken the pains to establish their control over the Straits of Mackinaw by erecting a Custom House there and charging tolls on Canadian vessels. He could not see any difference in the position between the Mackinaw Straits and the St. Lawrence between Cornwall and Montreal.

He did not believe that the Commissioners at the time had made provision respecting the Alabama claims or knew anything about the Russian treaty with England on the subject. The Premier had omitted to tell the House why the Commissioners had neglected to secure to British subjects the navigation of the Columbia river—a most important item—as that river was situated in exactly the same

position as the St. Lawrence, but British subjects had no right to use it because its mouth was in the United States territory.

It had not been his intention to speak at all that evening, as it was the intention of his friends to place on record their views on the subject, and he therefore deferred further remark until the second reading. The Premier had referred rather severely to the views expressed by some of the leading journals in the Province. Before this matter closed, perhaps he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) would show to the House how different were the views which the governmental journals expressed at the time the Treaty was negotiated from the opinions they now put forth. He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) recognized his status as a Canadian and British subject, and he was willing to accept his share of the responsibility of all Imperial transactions; but he was not willing that an Imperial policy affecting us should be adopted without our sanction, without our having a voice in the matter; and the only Imperial policy that could ever be successful in meeting firmly the many branches of the Imperial family was one based upon the interests of the entire British possessions over the globe, and if we were to be restrained from expressing our views as to what Imperial policy in that respect should be, then there would be an end to the free discussion—an end to that free deliberation which that House was used to and which Canada expected should have some influence in deciding her future destinies.

And yet the hon. Premier asked the House to accept the money consideration, and reproached him because he ventured to object to that principle. How easy it was to refer to the denunciation which the Government had itself very properly hurled against all money considerations in regard to great political objects. The Government, in their note of the 25th July, saw that the principle of money payment for the cession of territorial rights had ever been most repugnant to the feelings of the Canadian people. Now, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues in this despatch spoke of our ceding territorial rights, but when presenting his argument here in another place, he denied that any territorial rights were ceded at all, and he asked the House at any rate to accept money for what was conceded. The hon. gentleman said, in effect: "You have been paid for the Fenian claims; you are to get some assistance in the shape of an Imperial endorsement to build this great Pacific railway. There is an opportunity for you, and if you behave yourself properly you may even get the loan of £1,400,000 sterling, which was guaranteed to fortifications, applied to railway purposes also, as there is no more need of fortification, and the danger of trouble arising between England and the United States is at an end".

Well, if there was no more need of fortifications and defensive preparations, was the House to have no militia estimates this year? (*Hear, hear.*) Was the hon. gentleman opposite, the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir George-É. Cartier), to forbear purchasing the equipments and supplies necessary to keep 40,000 soldiers in the field? Was he to disband this army, and spend no more money in maintaining these soldiers in a state of efficiency? Surely that might be the case if a millennial era of peace and happiness was dawning upon the country in consequence of the negotiations that had been