

wise discriminates against the citizens of the United States in the use of said Welland canal, in violation of the provisions of article 27 of the treaty of Washington concluded May 8, 1871; and

Whereas said Welland canal is connected with the navigation of the Great Lakes, and I am satisfied that the passage through it of cargoes in transit to ports of the United States made difficult and burdensome by said discriminating system of rebate and otherwise and is reciprocally unjust and unreasonable:

Now, therefore, I, Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power to that end conferred upon me by said Act of Congress approved July 26, 1892, do hereby direct that from September 1, 1892, until further notice a toll of 20 cents per ton be levied, collected and paid on all freight of whatever kind or description passing through the St. Mary's Falls canal in transit to any port of the Dominion of Canada, whether carried in vessels of the United States or of other nations; and to that extent I do hereby suspend from and after said date the right of free passage through said St. Mary's Falls canal of any and all cargoes or portions of cargoes in transit to Canadian ports.

From this action of the American government with respect to a discrimination or what was regarded as discrimination on American vessels passing through the Welland canal, one can learn how the term 'equality' was construed in 1892, just twenty years ago. President Cleveland declared that the rebate of 18 cents per ton on Canadian freight was unfair treatment, 'showed a narrow and ungenerous commercial spirit,' 'was to fulfil a promise with the shadow of performance,' and recommended that the action of the Canadian government should be 'measured by exactly the same rule of discrimination.'

President Harrison said, February 23rd, 1892:

'The matter of canal tolls of treaty rights were flagrantly disregarded.' And again in a message of June 20th, 1892, he said: 'It is wholly evasive to say that there is no discrimination between Canadian and American vessels;' and again in his proclamation of August 18th, 1892, he said:

The passage of cargoes through the Welland canal in transit to ports in the United States is made difficult and burdensome by said discriminating system of rebate and otherwise, and is reciprocally unjust and unreasonable.

In closing this speech, already too long, I may be allowed to summarize as

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS.

briefly as possible the position of Canada with regard to the action of Congress at its last session.

1. We accept the interpretation of Congress of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with regard to our foreign trade, as it places our foreign trade on the same basis as the foreign trade of the United States and of 'all nations.'

2. It is not necessary for our purpose that we should dispute the right of the United States to allow its own coastwise shipping the free use of the Panama canal, provided a similar privilege is extended to the coastwise shipping in Canada. We insist that there shall be no 'discrimination,' and that the terms 'entire equality' shall apply to our shipping whether or not the United States imposes tolls on its own coastwise shipping or permits such shipping or permits such shipping the free use of the canal.

3. In every treaty affecting the canal since the first treaty of 1846 with New Granada down to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, the avowed policy of all parties to such treaties was that the canal should be open on terms of equality to all nations, and that this view was strengthened by lapse of time is shown in the definite and comprehensive terms of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty to that end.

4. That every President of the United States, from President Polk to President Roosevelt, in their written messages to Congress, confirmed this view in terms even more comprehensive than the restricted language of the treaties concerned.

5. That in the diplomatic correspondence of several Secretaries of State, no indication whatever was given that the United States, as a party to the treaties, claimed to itself any preference or right to which all nations affected by the treaty would not be equally entitled.

6. That the action of the United States with regard to the alleged discrimination of Canada in the use of the Welland canal by American shipping shows how strictly the Washington treaty was construed where American interests were involved, and that the example of Canada in that case encourages the hope that the United States will remove all discrimination against Canada's coastwise shipping.