

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The correspondence came under my own observation many years ago, when I had to do with these questions, and that was my idea. The estimates of the cost are, for the United States portion of the work of surveying the line, \$1,500,000; for our portion of the work according to General Cameron, something over a million dollars. That would be a total of at least two and a half millions spent in defining a comparatively short line. It may be that the country is worth such a great expenditure. I have no doubt it has its value, but between two sensible neighbours, the best way to settle the matter would be to fix an absolute boundary, irrespective of the height of land. I am glad to hear that a friendly conference has taken place between delegates from this Government and delegates from Newfoundland, and I sincerely hope that all causes of difficulty between the two colonies will cease. I think we ought to deal rather tenderly with Newfoundland. It is a weak and a poor sister, and Canada can afford to be generous. I did not myself approve of the policy which was adopted two years ago in reference to that colony. I need not now discuss that question; it is perhaps not germane to the matter at present under debate, and therefore I will not further allude to it, but I cannot certainly join in the hope expressed by the hon. the seconder of these resolutions, that we may round off confederation by bringing in Newfoundland. I think the confederation is already rounded off sufficiently, leaving Newfoundland out, and it would be better for both Newfoundland and Canada that the former should remain outside of the union. It is not easy to govern a country where circumstances are so dissimilar to ours as they are in Newfoundland. I think they could take much better care of themselves while remaining a separate colony than by joining the Canadian Confederation. We are asked to concur in His Excellency's regret that the Government of the United States were unable to accept the suggestions made by the Government of Canada on the subject of the canal tolls, and that the President should have thought it necessary to impose exceptional tolls. I take issue with the hon. mover of the resolution in the observations he made upon this subject. I think that anybody dispassionately looking at this subject, would have said from the beginning that the Government of Canada were entirely in the wrong. I should have said so last

year, when the papers were moved for; but I felt then that if I did so, I should be accused of playing into the hands of the United States. That is the line taken to seal the mouths of gentlemen who desire to give their advice to the Government and to express their judgment on the various international questions which arise from time to time between the two countries. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the use of the canals by the two countries has its origin in the Treaty of Washington. Under the twenty-seventh article of that treaty we were to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence and other canals on terms of equality with our own people. That was what we agreed to do—that they should enjoy these canals on terms of equality. We did give them that privilege for some years, but unfortunately political influences were at work to secure some advantages for the people of Kingston, and an Order in Council was passed giving Kingston the advantage of transshipping grain to Montreal, and the grain transhipped at Montreal got a rebate of eighteen cents per ton. On all cargoes of grain coming from the west of Canada there was a charge of twenty cents per ton, and a rebate of eighteen cents was granted to vessels loading at Montreal. It is quite true that there was no discrimination against vessels, but there was discrimination against the people of the United States. We discriminated against Ogdensburgh, and in discriminating against Ogdensburgh we discriminated against the people of Ogdensburgh, and in my judgment Canada failed to observe the conditions of that portion of the Treaty of Washington relating to this question. Now, I think that in regard to treaties we ought to follow the example of the motherland. England has been exceedingly sensitive on this question of treaties with foreign powers. Wherever there was a doubt, unless in matter of very grave importance, the desire and disposition has been rather to give the case away than make a *casus belli* of it—to have no friction with a foreign country in any small or unimportant matter. Yet here we find that Canada, in order to favour a few traders, possibly not more than a dozen persons, imposed a discriminating tariff against the people of United States of eighteen cents on every ton of grain going through the canals. Our attention is called to it and what do we do? In the presence of