

many millions on building a Sault canal on our side. I think that the sensible course for two neighbours was to abide firmly and liberally by the treaty of Washington, and enlarge it from time to time as no doubt friendly relations would enable us to do. We pass through the Sault Canal on the United States side a very small fraction, not quite three per cent of the whole traffic. So it was a comparatively small amount. Our vessels passed through that canal not as American vessels pass through the Welland Canal paying a toll—they passed through the Sault Canal paying nothing. Our vessels came through in their turn; they never were put to any disadvantage. I have passed and re-passed many a time myself up and down this canal, and I know whereof I speak. The American officials took all the trouble, supplied the lights, and rendered assistance in every possible way, and not a farthing was ever charged, and remember the Sault Canal was not among the canals that were mentioned in the Treaty of Washington. The United States had not at that time acquired the Sault Canal; it was the private property of the state of Michigan. The United States some years afterwards acquired the canal and spent large sums on it and threw it open to Canada, as it was their duty to do, but it is something in our days for a nation to do its duty. So we continue to enjoy it and I think that it was wholly unnecessary expense that we should go to in connection with the new canal. It amounted to a menace to the United States; it was tantamount to saying that we should be independent of them, that we did not propose to be dependent on them. I say neither the United States nor Canada can take that position; I say they are both in a degree dependent on each other. They occupy contiguous territory for 4,000 miles, and we have in common, water ways of great extent, very much more than is the case in any other countries in the world, and it is our interest, as well as our duty, to preserve amicable relations. They are people akin to us in race, language and laws. Do you for a moment believe that if the administration of these matters had been in the hands of British statesmen that this condition of affairs would have arisen? Would they have allowed this petty collision to occur on a comparatively insignificant matter? The heads of this Government did not choose to come down from their high pedestal, and acknowledge that they were

in the wrong, when over and over again we were told by the United States, "cease your discrimination; abide by what you assured us you would do when you met us at Washington last, or we shall impose a tax on your grain and cargoes going through the Sault Canal." What was our position? We took the high and mighty course; we snapped our fingers at them and said "you may do as you please, we will be independent; we can afford to pay the tax to the United States Government," and therefore we occupy this ridiculous position, that we paid thirty or forty thousand dollars from September last to the close of the season to swell the treasury at Washington, simply because our pride would not allow us to admit that we had made a gross error. In the interpretation of treaties, it is the duty of all high-minded, honourable people to be liberal, and if we followed the course pursued by British statesmen, we would have admitted that we were wrong; we would have apologized and occupied a much stronger position to-day than we now hold. I have no doubt the Government will remove the discrimination before this season begins. They do not propose to go on, I trust, in the foolish course of continuing to pay tribute to the United States treasury when it is wholly unnecessary. All they have to do is to say: "We will go back to the treaty and abide by it." I would have spoken last year, but had hoped from day to day—we know that the Order in Council hung fire for considerable time—that the Canadian Government would have acquiesced in the very proper suggestion from Washington that they were transgressing an article of the treaty and requesting them to withdraw the Order in Council under which the discriminating tolls were enforced; but it is all of a piece with the mode of carrying on the government in this country—it is carried on for individuals and not for the masses. The hon. gentleman who introduced these resolutions pointed to the millionaires on the other side of the line. Have we made no millionaires in the last fifteen years? Has not the disparity between wealth and poverty been more marked in the last ten years than in any former period in the history of this country? I say it has. It would be a matter of indelicacy to name individuals who have grown rich on the subsidies that the people of the country have been obliged, under Act of Parliament, to pay to the favoured few. Million-