

the conclusions arrived at; therefore, while the protocols substantially contain the result of the negotiations ended in the Treaty, they must not be looked upon as chronological details of facts and incidents as they occurred. I say so, because the protocol which relates more especially to the Fisheries would lead one to suppose that at the first meeting, and without previous discussion, the British Commissioners stated "that they were prepared to discuss the question of the Fisheries, either in detail or generally, so as either to enter into an examination of the respective rights of the two countries under the Treaty of 1818, and the general law of nations, or to approach at once the settlement of the question on a comprehensive basis." Now the fact is, that it was found by the British Commissioners when they arrived at Washington, and had an opportunity of ascertaining the feeling that prevailed at that time, not only among the United States Commissioners, but among the public men of the United States whom they met there, and from their communications with other sources of information, that the feeling was universal that all questions should be settled beyond the possibility of dispute in the future, and more especially that if by any possibility a solution of the difficulties respecting the Fisheries could be arrived at, or a satisfactory arrangement be made by which the Fishery question could be placed in abeyance as in 1854, it would be to the advantage of both nations. It must be remembered that the Commission sat in 1871, that the exclusion of American fishermen from our waters was enforced and kept up during the whole of 1870, and that great and loud, though I believe unfounded, complaints had been made that American fishing vessels had been illegally seized although they had not trespassed upon our waters. Persons interested had been using every effort to arouse and stimulate the minds of the people of the United States against Canada and the Canadian authorities, and it was felt and expressed that it would be a great bar to the chance of the Treaty being accepted by the United States, if one of the causes of irritation which had been occurring a few months before should be allowed to remain unsettled; collisions would occur between American fishermen claiming certain rights, and Canadians resisting those claims, and thereby unfriendly feeling would be aroused and all the good which might be effected by the Treaty would be destroyed, by quarrels between man and man engaged on the fishing grounds. This feeling prevailed, and I as a Canadian knowing that the people of Canada desired, and had always expressed a wish to enter into the most cordial reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States, so stated to the British Commissioners, and they had no hesitation, on being invited to do so, in stating that they would desire by all means to remove every cause of dissention respecting these fisheries by the restoration of the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. An attempt was made in

1865 by the hon. member for Sherbrooke [Sir A. T. Galt] and Mr Howland on behalf of Canada, to renew that Treaty, but failed, because the circumstances of the United States in 1865 were very different from what they were in 1854, and it appeared out of the question and impossible for the United States to agree to a Treaty with exactly the same provisions and of exactly the same nature as that of 1854. So the British Commissioners, believing that a treaty similar in detail to that of 1854 could not be obtained, urged that one conceived in the same spirit but adapted to the altered circumstances of the two countries should be adopted, and this view was strongly pressed upon the Joint Commission. This will appear from the protocol referring to this branch of the Treaty. It will also appear from the protocol that the United States Commissioners stated that the Reciprocity Treaty was out of the question, that it could not be accepted without being submitted to both branches of Congress, and that there was not the slightest possibility of Congress passing such an Act, and that the agreement by the two Governments to a treaty, including provisions similar in spirit to the Treaty of 1854, would only ensure the rejection of the Treaty by the Senate, and therefore that some other solution must be found. I believe that the United States Commissioners were candid and were accurate in their view of the situation. I believe that had the Treaty contained all the provisions, or the essential provisions of the Treaty of 1854, they would have insured its rejection by the Senate. When I speak of the conferences that were held on the fisheries I would state, for the information of those members of the House who may be unacquainted with the usage in such matters, that the Commissioners did not act at the discussions individually. The conference was composed of two units the British Commission and the United States Commission. If a question arose in conference on which either of the two parties, the British or American branch desired to consult together, they retired, and on their return expressed their views as a whole without reference to the individual opinions of the Commissioners. As an individual member of the British Commission, and behalf of Canada when it was found that we could not obtain a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, I urged upon my English colleagues that the Canadians should be allowed to retain the exclusive enjoyment of the inshore Fisheries, and that means should be used to arrive in some way or other at a settlement of the disputed questions in relation to the fisheries, so as to settle the headland question and the other one relating to trading in our ports by American fishermen, and I would have been well satisfied acting on behalf of the Canadian Government if that course had been adopted by the Imperial Government, but Her Majesty's Government felt, and so instructed her Commissioners; and it was so felt by the United States Commissioners, that