

Hon. Mr. POWER—A coalition, with the majority Conservative.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—I understand the Liberal Premier strengthened his Government by drawing some members from the Opposition, but the Government of New Brunswick has always been known as a Liberal Government.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—The *Halifax Chronicle* has frequently claimed that New Brunswick has a Liberal Government. The hon. gentleman from Halifax will not deny the *Chronicle* as the hon. member from Ottawa has repudiated the *Globe*.

Hon. Mr. POWER—All the early Governments after Confederation were Conservative Governments. The present Government of New Brunswick is recognized as a coalition Government.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—But the *Chronicle* says that the New Brunswick Government is Liberal.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—Coming back to what was called discrimination against the United States on the canals, I was surprised to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition qualify the action of the Government in this matter as unworthy of British statesmen. Now, I do not agree with him in this, and I believe I can show him that the statesmen of the United States do not agree with him either. I say that there never has been any discrimination against United States vessels navigating the St. Lawrence canals.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That is correct. I agree with the hon. gentleman: it was ports I said.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—What is the privilege granted by the treaty? The privilege is not one granted to a territory, or to a special state: it is a privilege granted to the flag carried by the vessels.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The citizens—the people.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—No, it is granted to the vessel, and I say that an American vessel fulfilling the conditions imposed on a Canadian vessel, gets exactly the same rebate that our own vessels get.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The vessels do.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—The citizens also get the same advantage, because the vessel must be owned by an American citizen. An American vessel loaded on its way to Montreal with grain for export gets the rebate. A Canadian vessel bound on the same course loaded with grain for export gets the rebate. The two parties are equal in this regard. Any Canadian vessel loaded with grain and landing it short of Montreal, for the purpose of consumption in the country, does not get the rebate, and why should an American vessel, doing what a Canadian vessel cannot do, get a rebate? That is exactly the position. The hon. gentleman wishes us to grant an American vessel a privilege that a Canadian vessel is denied. Now, if these were my own opinions merely, I would not expect the House to lay much stress upon them, but this has been the interpretation and construction put upon the treaty by the United States themselves in all their statements for eight years. Let me recall the date when this wheat rebate was first established by an Order in Council. It was on the 26th August, 1884, and on the 4th July, 1885, that this rebate was granted, and never was there a protest or a complaint of undue treatment or unfair interpretation or illegal interpretation of the treaty during all that time. Now, would the hon. gentleman affirm that Mr. Bayard and Mr. Blaine were so obtuse, so unskilful, so unmindful of United States interest that they would not have immediately protested against this state of things which lasted for eight years? and yet it was only last September that they gave any shape at all to a protest.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that vessels carrying grain, either American or Canadian, where they tranship at Ogdensburgh, but intending the grain to go to Europe, would get a rebate?

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—Certainly not, and the reason is plain. How could the hon. gentleman expect us to follow grain through American territory to ascertain whether it is exported or not? Would they grant us the privilege of entering their custom-houses and examining their officials to see whether the grain was exported or not? We granted them the privilege of coming to our ports, if they chose, and we could not give them a