

everywhere endeavor to carry into effect. The official enunciation of this doctrine on behalf of the great oriental empire was an event of scarcely less importance than the departure of Columbus on his voyage of discovery to this continent. Certainly the Canadians were met in this spirit when the treaty was negotiated. If instead of this friendly policy the United States had adopted towards them the illiberal course urged by the Canadian minister upon his own country, when he said, "We must keep our own trade within and over its own channels as much as possible," we should never have conceded to her free access to our markets for all she has to sell, and left open for taxation nearly all we sell to her for her own use and consumption, or permitted the free return of products or freight to this side without payment of duty, after having passed over Canadian railroads.

The first formidable opposition, stimulated by the popular sentiment against the treaty, arose from the frequent and short-sighted renunciation, in avowal and practice, of the principle of reciprocity by the Canadians. Not only did the Canadian minister commit this error in his public utterances, but, as has been already stated, he endeavored to counteract the natural effects of the treaty by laws discriminating against us.

Higher duties were placed upon our manufactures. Laws were passed to prevent our merchants from selling to Canadians merchandise imported from other countries, and to force business to the Canadian railroads and canals; and legislative enactments were passed, interfering with the natural course of trade, and depriving our people of its just benefits. The grievance was by no means theoretical. Under the tariffs and regulations adopted by Canada the trade of our inland cities with her was destroyed, manufacturers broke up their establishments and removed to the province, and the trade of our Atlantic cities with Canada in imported goods was transferred to Montreal.

The belief, originating in these reasons and held by Congress, that the spirit and substance of the treaty of Washington had been disregarded by the legislators of Canada, led to its termination and the refusal to authorize any negotiations for its renewal. Nor have the Canadians, in proposals submitted to Congress in 1863, or at any other time, ever offered to make such additions to the free list as would fairly carry out a system of just exchange.

CONCLUSIONS.

A treaty, if thoroughly reciprocal, would include all the products of labor on both sides, or at least provide for a fair and equal exchange of them. The party selling the productions of agriculture and the forest should remove all laws preventing the sale of manufactures on the part of the other, and under the present condition of our revenue laws competition between the people of the United States and Canada can only be on equal terms when duties equal to those directly or indirectly exacted by our government from our own citizens are levied on importations the product of Canada. The same principle evidently applies to the competition of the cheaply built and untaxed railroads of Canada with those of our own country, which, through the tariffs and various methods of internal taxation, contribute largely to the revenue of the United States.

In the clear light of past experience our commercial advantages would be fairly estimated in fixing the basis for renewal of reciprocal trade. Nor could the well known fact be overlooked, that since the termination