

If a British vessel came through the Welland Canal with a cargo of grain and took it to Montreal for the purpose of export, a rebate of 18 cents per ton was paid. If a United States vessel came in the same way, it was treated in exactly the same manner and received the same rebate. If a British vessel, after passing through the Welland Canal with its cargo, transhipped it at Kingston or any other Canadian port for export at Montreal, a rebate was granted as before. If a citizen of the United States treated his cargo in the same manner he received the same rebate. If a Canadian vessel discharged its cargo short of Montreal, without transshipment thereto, it paid the full toll of 20 cents; and a United States vessel transshipping its cargo in the same way also paid the full toll of 20 cents. If a British vessel brought its cargo to a United States port, east of the Welland Canal and transhipped it to Montreal for export, it received no rebate, but paid full toll; and a United States vessel treating its cargo in the same way paid the same full toll. Local Canadian cargoes shipped from ports east of the Welland Canal, for Montreal, paid full toll on the St. Lawrence Canals; United States cargoes shipped from points east of the Welland Canal to Montreal, paid the same tolls. So that in all respects the same treatment was given in the Canadian canals to United States citizens as to subjects of Her Majesty. The regulations that were passed and adopted by the Government apply with the same force to all vessels. We admitted in our negotiations with Mr. Blaine, that it was a discrimination against a route; and if it were not so, what would be our position, or what does the hon. gentleman desire that this Government should do, or what would he do if he were in power? If his views were adopted, an American vessel which passes through the Welland Canal, and proceeds to Ogdensburgh and tranships, she would receive 18 cents rebate on each ton of her cargo; but if a Canadian vessel passed through the Welland Canal and proceeded to Prescott, a Canadian port, opposite Ogdensburgh, and unloaded her cargo of wheat, the ultimate destination of which might be Ottawa via the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway, for the mills there, for consumption in Canada, she would pay the full amount of 20 cents per ton; so that there would be an actual discrimination against every consumer in Canada of 18 cents per ton on the bread-

stuffs brought through the Canadian canals, and discharged in the manner I have described. That is the policy that the hon. gentleman would like to have inaugurated in this country. It is quite equal to the course they pursued in 1878, when the operation of their tariff, and their whole policy, brought the country to the verge of bankruptcy and ruin. I have stated the position fully which we hold in reference to the canal question. The hon. gentleman said that probably we would continue it next year. I have no doubt that he reads the newspapers and probably has seen the despatch which was published and sent to the United States, stating that while we hold to the right as Canadians to legislate upon this question, in the lines that I have indicated we have done, we do not propose to continue it after this year, providing that they would not impose a tax on vessels passing through the Sault Canal. However, they did not accept that as sufficient. On the contrary they said that we promised them during the negotiation last February to remove that tax; and here, again, I think the public men of Canada have just cause to complain of the action of those who are opposed to them politically. Whenever the question of veracity arises between American diplomats or statesmen and ours, or whether it be an American newspaper, it matters not how high or low it may stand in public opinion, they always give the preference to the American version of the affair, and intimate, as the hon. gentleman did yesterday, that the statements made by Sir John Thompson, Mr. Foster and myself were not correct, but that the version given by Mr. Blaine and Gen. Foster was the correct one, and that we had not told the exact truth in the matter. Fortunately, a despatch which was received from General Foster, now Secretary of State of United States, not ten days ago, sustains the statements which we made on our return to Canada, after our interviews. This despatch verified every word we uttered in reference to our mission. What we told them in our negotiations was, that we would, upon our return to Canada, consider the question fully, with a view to removing, if it were found to be contrary to the treaty stipulations, any misconception that might have arisen upon this question. That is what we stated when we returned. The version given by Mr. Blaine and Mr. Foster was, that we had promised to remove the discrimi-