

the Government of Canada has always held the most liberal views as to the considerations that might be included in a treaty with the United States. The negotiation of 1870 was soon followed by the High Joint Commission, nominally for the adjustment of our fishery disputes, but in reality for the settlement of the Alabama embroglio. We all know what was the cost to Canada of that negotiation. The fisheries of the St. Lawrence went from us for twelve years. The navigation of the St. Lawrence was presented to the United States in perpetuity. The use of our canals was ceded to them for twelve years. And to show exactly the position to which the relations of the two countries were then reduced, it will not be deemed unfitting that I should read a few short extracts from the official protocols of the High Joint Commissioners. And first as to our invaluable sea-coast fisheries:—

The question of the fisheries was discussed at the Conference of the 6th March, 1871, when the British Commissioners stated that "they considered that the Reciprocity Treaty of the 5th June, 1854, should be restored in principle. The American Commissioners declined to assent to a renewal of the former Reciprocity Treaty." They said:

"That that Treaty had proved unsatisfactory to the people of the United States, and consequently had been terminated by notice from the Government of the United States, in pursuance of its provisions. Its renewal was not in their interest, and would not be in accordance with the sentiments of their people."

At conferences held on the 7th, 20th, 22nd, and 25th of March, the American Commissioners stated:

"That if the value of the inshore fisheries could be ascertained, the United States might prefer to purchase, for a sum of money, the right to enjoy in perpetuity the use of these inshore fisheries in common with British fishermen, and mentioned \$1,000,000 as the sum they were prepared to offer. The British Commissioners replied that this offer was, they thought, wholly inadequate, and that no arrangement would be acceptable of which the admission into the United States, free of duty, of fish the produce of the British fisheries did not form a part; adding that any arrangement for the acquisition by purchase of the inshore fisheries in perpetuity was open to grave objection."

"During these discussions the British Commissioners contended that these inshore fisheries were of great value, and that the most satisfactory arrangement for their use would be a reciprocal tariff arrangement and reciprocity in the coasting trade. The American Commissioners replied that their value was over-estimated: that the United States desired to secure their enjoyment not for their commercial or intrinsic value, but for the purpose of removing a source of irritation,

and that they could hold out no hope that the Congress of the United States would give its consent to such a tariff arrangement as was proposed, or to any extended plan of reciprocal free admission of the products of the two countries. But that inasmuch as one branch of Congress had recently more than once expressed itself in favor of the abolition of duties on coal and salt, they would propose that coal, salt, and fish be reciprocally admitted free, and that

they would further propose that lumber be admitted free from duty, from and after the 1st of July, 1874." The British Commissioners, on the 17th of April, stated that this offer was regarded as inadequate; that Her Majesty's Government considered that free lumber should be granted at once, and that the proposed tariff concessions should be supplemented by a money payment. The American Commissioners then stated that they withdrew the proposal which they had previously made of the reciprocal free admission of coal, salt, and fish, and of lumber, after July 1st, 1874."

They expressed their willingness to "concede free fish and fish oil as an equivalent for the use of the inshore fisheries, and to make the arrangement for a term of years: that they were of opinion that free fish and fish oil would be more than an equivalent for those fisheries; but that they were also willing to agree to a reference to determine that question and the amount of any money payment that might be found necessary to complete an equivalent." The British Commissioners on 18th April, accepted this proposal, and articles XVIII to XXV there inent were agreed to.

"The British Commissioners proposed to take into consideration the question of opening the coasting trade of the lakes reciprocally to each party, which was declined."

"The British Commissioners proposed to take into consideration the reciprocal registration of vessels as between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, which was declined."

"At the Conference on the 23rd March, the American Commissioners stated that:— 'Unless the Welland Canal should be enlarged so as to accommodate the present course of trade, they should not be disposed to make any concessions, &c.'"

At the Conference on the 27th March the proposed enlargement of the Canadian canals was further discussed. It was stated on the part of the British Commissioners that the Canadian Government were now considering the expediency of enlarging the capacity of the canals on the River St. Lawrence, and had already provided for the enlargement of the Welland Canal, which would be undertaken without delay."

Hon. gentlemen would see by these extracts from the official records of the High Joint Commissioners how very humble a position in the eyes of the Commissioners Canada held as a negotiator with the United States for reciprocal commercial advantages, and to show the effect of the concessions made by that Commission, I will now read from a speech made by Sir A. T. Galt, in the Canadian House of Com-