



1-17-1913

Panama Canal Tolls: Instruction of the Secretary of State of January 17, 1913, to the American Charge D'Affaires at London, and the British Notes of July 8, 1912, and November 14, 1912, to Which it Replies

Philander C. Knox

A. Mitchell Innes

Edward Grey

William Howard Taft

James Bryce

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/fmhw_speeches

 Part of the [Diplomatic History Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

[Click here to let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Recommended Citation

Knox, Philander C.; Innes, A. Mitchell; Grey, Edward; Taft, William Howard; and Bryce, James, "Panama Canal Tolls: Instruction of the Secretary of State of January 17, 1913, to the American Charge D'Affaires at London, and the British Notes of July 8, 1912, and November 14, 1912, to Which it Replies" (1913). *Notes, Speeches, Articles, and Addresses*. 12. https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/fmhw_speeches/12

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Assistant Secretary of State (1909-1913) at Digital Commons @ Ursinus College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Notes, Speeches, Articles, and Addresses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Ursinus College. For more information, please contact aprock@ursinus.edu.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

INSTRUCTION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF JANUARY
17, 1913, TO THE AMERICAN CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES
AT LONDON, AND THE BRITISH NOTES OF
JULY 8, 1912, AND NOVEMBER 14,
1912, TO WHICH IT REPLIES

The Secretary of State to Chargé d'Affaires Laughlin.

No. 1833.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 17, 1913.

IRWIN B. LAUGHLIN, Esquire,
American Chargé d'Affaires, London, England.

SIR: I enclose a copy of an instruction from Sir Edward Grey to His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, dated November 14, 1912, a copy of which was handed to me by the Ambassador on the 9th ultimo, in which certain provisions in the Panama Canal Act of August 24th last are discussed in their relation to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of November 18, 1901; and I also enclose a copy of the note addressed to me on July 8, 1912, by Mr. A. Mitchell Innes, His Britannic Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, stating the objections which his Government entertained to the legislation relating to the Panama Canal, which was then under discussion in Congress. A copy of the President's proclamation of November 13, 1912, fixing the canal tolls, is also enclosed.

Sir Edward Grey's communication, after setting forth the several grounds upon which the British Government believe the provisions of the Act are inconsistent with the stipulations of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, states the readiness of his Government "to submit the question to arbitration if the Government of the United States would prefer to take this course" rather than "to take such steps as would remove the objections to the Act which His Majesty's Government have stated." It, therefore, becomes necessary for this Government to examine these objections in order to ascertain exactly in what respects this Act is regarded by the British Government as inconsistent with the provisions of that treaty, and also to explain the views of this Government upon the questions thus presented, and to consider the advisability at this time of submitting any of these questions to arbitration.

It may be stated at the outset that this Government does not agree with the interpretation placed by Sir Edward Grey upon the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, or upon the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, but for reasons which will appear hereinbelow it is not deemed necessary at present to amplify or reiterate the views of this Government upon the meaning of those treaties.

In Sir Edward Grey's communication, after explaining in detail the views taken by his Government as to the proper interpretation

of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, "so as to indicate the limitations which" His Majesty's Government "consider it imposes upon the freedom of action of the United States," he proceeds to indicate the points in which the Canal Act infringes what he holds to be Great Britain's treaty rights.

It is obvious from the whole tenor of Sir Edward Grey's communication that in writing it he could not have taken cognizance of the President's proclamation fixing the canal tolls. Indeed, a comparison of the dates of the proclamation and the note, which are dated respectively November 13th and November 14th last, shows that the proclamation could hardly have been received in London in time for consideration in the note. Throughout his discussion of the subject, Sir Edward Grey deals chiefly with the possibilities of what the President might do under the Act, which in itself does not prescribe the tolls, but merely authorizes the President to do so; and nowhere does the note indicate that Sir Edward Grey was aware of what the President actually had done in issuing this proclamation. The proclamation, therefore, has entirely changed the situation which is discussed by Sir Edward Grey, and the diplomatic discussion, which his note now makes inevitable, must rest upon the bases as they exist at present, and not upon the hypothesis formed by the British Government at the time this note was written.

Sir Edward Grey presents the question of conflict between the Act and the treaty in the following language:

It remains to consider whether the Panama Canal Act, in its present form, conflicts with the treaty rights to which His Majesty's Government maintain they are entitled.

Under section 5 of the Act the President is given, within certain defined limits, the right to fix the tolls, but no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States, and the tolls, when based upon net registered tonnage for ships of commerce, are not to exceed 1 dollar 25 c. per net registered ton, nor be less, *other than for vessels of the United States and its citizens*, than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the Canal. There is also an exception for the exemptions granted by article 19 of the Convention with Panama of 1903.

The effect of these provisions is that vessels engaged in the coastwise trade will contribute nothing to the upkeep of the Canal. Similarly vessels belonging to the Government of the Republic of Panama will, in pursuance of the treaty of 1903, contribute nothing to the upkeep of the Canal. Again, in the cases where tolls are levied, the tolls in the case of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens may be fixed at a lower rate than in the case of foreign ships, and may be less than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the Canal.

These provisions (1) clearly conflict with the rule embodied in the principle established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships, and (2) would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

From this it appears that three objections are made to the provisions of the Act; first, that no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States; second, that a discretion appears to be given to the President to discriminate in fixing tolls in favor of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens as against foreign ships; and third, that an exemption has been given to the vessels of the Republic of Panama under Article 19 of the Convention with Panama of 1903.

Considered in the reverse order of their statement, the third objection, coming at this time, is a great and complete surprise to this Government. The exemption under that article applies only to the government vessels of Panama, and was part of the agreement with Panama under which the canal was built. The Convention containing the exemption was ratified in 1904, and since then to the present time no claim has been made by Great Britain that it conflicted with British rights. The United States has always asserted the principle that the status of the countries immediately concerned by reason of their political relation to the territory in which the canal was to be constructed was different from that of all other countries. The Hay-Herran Treaty with Colombia of 1903 also provided that the war vessels of that country were to be given free passage. It has always been supposed by this Government that Great Britain recognized the propriety of the exemptions made in both of those treaties. It is not believed, therefore, that the British Government intend to be understood as proposing arbitration upon the question of whether or not this provision of the Act, which in accordance with our treaty with Panama exempts from tolls the government vessels of Panama, is in conflict with the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

Considering the second objection based upon the discretion thought to be conferred upon the President to discriminate in favor of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens, it is sufficient, in view of the fact that the President's proclamation fixing the tolls was silent on the subject, to quote the language used by the President in the memorandum attached to the Act at the time of signature, in which he says—

It is not, therefore, necessary to discuss the policy of such discrimination until the question may arise in the exercise of the President's discretion.

On this point no question has as yet arisen which, in the words of the existing arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, "it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy," and until then any suggestion of arbitration may well be regarded as premature.

It is not believed, however, that in the objection now under consideration Great Britain intends to question the right of the United States to exempt from the payment of tolls its vessels of war and other vessels engaged in the service of this Government. Great Britain does not challenge the right of the United States to protect the canal. United States vessels of war and those employed in government service are a part of our protective system. By the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty we assume the sole responsibility for its neutralization. It is inconceivable that this Government should be required to pay canal tolls for the vessels used for protecting the canal, which we alone must protect. The movement of United States vessels in executing governmental policies of protection are not susceptible of explanation or differentiation. The United States could not be called upon to explain what relation the movement of a particular vessel through the canal has to its protection. The British objection, therefore, is understood as having no relation to the use of the canal by vessels in the service of the United States Government.

Regarding the first objection, the question presented by Sir Edward Grey arises solely upon the exemption in the Canal Act of vessels engaged in our coastwise trade.

On this point Sir Edward Grey says that "His Majesty's Government do not question the right of the United States to grant subsidies to United States shipping generally, or to any particular branches of that shipping," and it is admitted in his note that the exemption of certain classes of ships would be "a form of subsidy" to those vessels; but it appears from the note that His Majesty's Government would regard that form of subsidy as objectionable under the treaty if the effect of such subsidy would be "to impose upon British or other foreign shipping an unfair share of the burden of the upkeep of the Canal, or to create a discrimination in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise to prejudice rights secured to British shipping by this Treaty."

It is not contended by Great Britain that equality of treatment has any reference to British participation in the coastwise trade of the United States, which, in accordance with general usage, is reserved to American ships. The objection is only to such exemption of that trade from toll payments as may adversely affect British rights to equal treatment in the payment of tolls, or to just and equitable

tolls. It will be helpful here to recall that we are now only engaged in considering (quoting from Sir Edward Grey's note) "whether the Panama Canal Act in its present form conflicts with the treaty rights to which His Majesty's Government maintain they are entitled," concerning which he concludes:

These provisions (1) clearly conflict with the rule embodied in the principle established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships, and (2) *would enable* tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

On the first of these points the objection of the British Government to the exemption of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States is stated as follows:

* * * the exemption will, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be a violation of the equal treatment secured by the treaty, as it will put the "coastwise trade" in a preferential position as regards other shipping. Coastwise trade cannot be circumscribed so completely that benefits conferred upon it will not affect vessels engaged in the foreign trade. To take an example, if cargo intended for an United States port beyond the Canal, either from east or west, and shipped on board a foreign ship could be sent to its destination more cheaply, through the operation of proposed exemption, by being landed at an United States port before reaching the Canal, and then sent on as coastwise trade, shippers would benefit by adopting this course in preference to sending the goods direct to their destination through the Canal on board the foreign ship.

This objection must be read in connection with the views expressed by the British Government while this Act was pending in Congress, which were stated in the note of July 8, 1912, on the subject from Mr. Innes as follows:

As to the proposal that exemption shall be given to vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, a more difficult question arises. If the trade should be so regulated as to make it certain that only bona-fide coastwise traffic which is reserved for United States vessels would be benefited by this exemption, it may be that no objection could be taken.

This statement may fairly be taken as an admission that this Government may exempt its vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from the payment of tolls, provided such exemption be restricted to bona fide coastwise traffic. As to this it is sufficient to say that obviously the United States is not to be denied the power to remit tolls to its own coastwise trade because of a suspicion or possibility

that the regulations yet to be framed may not restrict this exemption to bona fide coastwise traffic.

The answer to this objection, therefore, apart from any question of treaty interpretation, is that it rests on conjecture as to what may happen rather than upon proved facts, and does not present a question requiring submission to arbitration as it has not as yet passed beyond the stage where it can be profitably dealt with by diplomatic discussion. It will be remembered that only questions which it may not be possible to settle by diplomacy are required by our arbitration treaty to be referred to arbitration.

On this same point Sir Edward Grey urges another objection to the exemption of coastwise vessels as follows:

Again, although certain privileges are granted to vessels engaged in an exclusively coastwise trade, His Majesty's Government are given to understand that there is nothing in the laws of the United States which prevents any United States ship from combining foreign commerce with coastwise trade, and consequently from entering into direct competition with foreign vessels while remaining "prima facie" entitled to the privilege of free passage through the Canal. Moreover any restriction which may be deemed to be now applicable might at any time be removed by legislation or even perhaps by mere changes in the regulations.

This objection also raises a question which, apart from treaty interpretation, depends upon future conditions and facts not yet ascertained, and for the same reasons as are above stated its submission to arbitration at this time would be premature.

The second point of Sir Edward Grey's objection to the exemption of vessels engaged in coastwise trade remains to be considered. On this point he says that the provisions of the Act "*would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.*"

It will be observed that this statement evidently was framed without knowledge of the fact that the President's proclamation fixing the tolls had issued. It is not claimed in the note that the tolls actually fixed are not "just and equitable" or even that all vessels passing through the canal were not taken into account in fixing the amount of the tolls, but only that either or both contingencies are possible.

If the British contention is correct that the true construction of the treaty requires all traffic to be reckoned in fixing just and equitable tolls, it requires at least an allegation that the tolls as fixed are not just and equitable and that all traffic has not been reckoned in fixing them before the United States can be called upon

to prove that this course was not followed, even assuming that the burden of proof would rest with the United States in any event, which is open to question. This Government welcomes the opportunity, however, of informing the British Government that the tolls fixed in the President's proclamation are based upon the computations set forth in the report of Professor Emory R. Johnson, a copy of which is forwarded herewith for delivery to Sir Edward Grey, and that the tolls which would be paid by American coastwise vessels, but for the exemption contained in the Act, were computed in determining the rate fixed by the President.

By reference to page 208 of Professor Johnson's report, it will be seen that the estimated net tonnage of shipping using the canal in 1915 is as follows:

Coast to coast American shipping.....	1,000,000 tons
American shipping carrying foreign commerce of the United States.....	720,000 tons
Foreign shipping carrying commerce of the United States and foreign countries.....	8,780,000 tons

It was on this estimate that tolls fixed in the President's proclamation were based.

Sir Edward Grey says, "This rule [1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty] also provides that the tolls should be 'just and equitable.'" The purpose of these words, he adds, "was to limit the tolls to the amount representing the fair value of the services rendered, i. e., to the interest on the capital expended and the cost of the operation and maintenance of the Canal." If, as a matter of fact, the tolls now fixed (of which he seems unaware) do not exceed this requirement, and as heretofore pointed out there is no claim that they do, it is not apparent under Sir Edward Grey's contention how Great Britain could be receiving unjust and inequitable treatment if the United States favors its coastwise vessels by not collecting their share of the tolls necessary to meet the requirement. There is a very clear distinction between an omission to "take into account" the coastwise tolls in order to determine a just and equitable rate, which is as far as this objection goes, and the remission of such tolls, or their collection coupled with their repayment in the form of a subsidy.

The exemption of the coastwise trade from tolls, or the refunding of tolls collected from the coastwise trade, is merely a subsidy granted by the United States to that trade, and the loss resulting from not collecting, or from refunding those tolls, will fall solely upon the United States. In the same way the loss will fall on the United States if the tolls fixed by the President's proclamation on

all vessels represent less than the fair value of the service rendered, which must necessarily be the case for many years; and the United States will, therefore, be in the position of subsidizing or aiding not merely its own coastwise vessels, but foreign vessels as well.

Apart from the particular objections above considered, it is not understood that Sir Edward Grey questions the right of the United States to subsidize either its coastwise or its foreign shipping, inasmuch as he says that His Majesty's Government do not find "either in the letter or in the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty any surrender by either of the contracting Powers of the right to encourage its shipping or its commerce by such subsidies as it may deem expedient."

To summarize the whole matter: The British objections are, in the first place, about the Canal Act only; but the Canal Act does not fix the tolls. They ignore the President's proclamation fixing the tolls which puts at rest practically all of the supposititious injustice and inequality which Sir Edward Grey thinks might follow the administration of the Act, and concerning which he expresses so many and grave fears. Moreover, the gravamen of the complaint is not that the Canal Act will actually injure in its operation British shipping or destroy rights claimed for such shipping under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, but that such injury or destruction may possibly be the effect thereof; and further, and more particularly, Sir Edward Grey complains that the action of Congress in enacting the legislation under discussion foreshadows that Congress or the President may hereafter take some action which might be injurious to British shipping and destructive of its rights under the treaty. Concerning this possible future injury, it is only necessary to say that in the absence of an allegation of actual or certainly impending injury, there appears nothing upon which to base a sound complaint. Concerning the infringement of rights claimed by Great Britain, it may be remarked that it would, of course, be idle to contend that Congress has not the power, or that the President properly authorized by Congress, may not have the power to violate the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, in its aspect as a rule of municipal law. Obviously, however, the fact that Congress has the power to do something contrary to the welfare of British shipping or that Congress has put or may put into the hands of the President the power to do something which may be contrary to the interests possessed by British shipping affords no just ground for complaint. It is the improper exercise of a power and not its possession which alone can give rise to an international cause of action; or to put it in terms of municipal law, it is not the possession of the power to trespass upon another's property which gives a right of action in trespass,

but only the actual exercise of that power in committing the act of trespass itself.

When, and if, complaint is made by Great Britain that the effect of the Act and the proclamation together will be to subject British vessels as a matter of fact to inequality of treatment, or to unjust and inequitable tolls in conflict with the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, the question will then be raised as to whether the United States is bound by that treaty both to take into account and to collect tolls from American vessels, and also whether under the obligations of that treaty British vessels are entitled to equality of treatment in all respects with the vessels of the United States. Until these objections rest upon something more substantial than mere possibility, it is not believed that they should be submitted to arbitration. The existence of an arbitration treaty does not create a right of action; it merely provides a means of settlement to be resorted to only when other resources of diplomacy have failed. It is not now deemed necessary, therefore, to enter upon a discussion of the views entertained by Congress and by the President as to the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty in relation to questions of fact which have not yet arisen, but may possibly arise in the future in connection with the administration of the Act under consideration.

It is recognized by this Government that the situation developed by the present discussion may require an examination by Great Britain into the facts above set forth as to the basis upon which the tolls fixed by the President's proclamation have been computed, and also into the regulations and restrictions circumscribing the coastwise trade of the United States, as well as into other facts bearing upon the situation, with the view of determining whether or not, as a matter of fact, under present conditions there is any ground for claiming that the Act and proclamation actually subject British vessels to inequality of treatment, or to unjust and inequitable tolls.

If it should be found as a result of such an examination on the part of Great Britain that a difference of opinion exists between the two Governments on any of the important questions of fact involved in this discussion, then a situation will have arisen, which, in the opinion of this Government, could with advantage be dealt with by referring the controversy to a Commission of Inquiry for examination and report, in the manner provided for in the unratified arbitration treaty of August 3, 1911, between the United States and Great Britain.

The necessity for inquiring into questions of fact in their relation to controversies under diplomatic discussion was contemplated by both Parties in negotiating that treaty, which provides for the institution, as occasion arises, of a Joint High Commission of

Inquiry, to which, upon the request of either Party, might be referred for impartial and conscientious investigation any controversy between them, the Commission being authorized upon such reference "to examine into and report upon the particular questions or matters referred to it, for the purpose of facilitating the solution of disputes by elucidating the facts, and to define the issues presented by such questions, and also to include in its report such recommendations and conclusions as may be appropriate."

This proposal might be carried out, should occasion arise for adopting it, either under a special agreement, or under the unratified arbitration treaty above mentioned, if Great Britain is prepared to join in ratifying that treaty, which the United States is prepared to do.

You will take an early opportunity to read this despatch to Sir Edward Grey; and if he should so desire, you will leave a copy of it with him.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

P. C. KNOX.

[Inclosure 1.]

Chargé d'Affaires Innes to the Secretary of State.

BRITISH EMBASSY
KINEO, MAINE.

July 8, 1912.

SIR,

The attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to the various proposals that have from time to time been made for the purpose of relieving American shipping from the burden of the tolls to be levied on vessels passing through the Panama Canal, and these proposals together with the arguments that have been used to support them have been carefully considered with a view to the bearing on them of the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain of November 18th 1901.

The proposals may be summed up as follows:—

- (1). To exempt all American shipping from the tolls,
- (2). To refund to all American ships the tolls which they may have paid,
- (3). To exempt American ships engaged in the coastwise trade,
- (4). To repay the tolls to American ships engaged in the coastwise trade.

The proposal to exempt all American shipping from the payment of the tolls, would, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, involve an infraction of the treaty, nor is there, in their opinion any difference in principle between charging tolls only to refund them and remitting tolls altogether. The result is the same in either case, and the adoption of the alternative method of refunding the tolls in preference to that of remitting them, while perhaps complying with the letter of the treaty, would still contravene its spirit.

It has been argued that a refund of the tolls would merely be equivalent to a subsidy and that there is nothing in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which limits the right of the United States to subsidise its shipping. It is true that there is nothing in that treaty to prevent the United States from subsidising its shipping and if it granted a subsidy His Majesty's Government could not be in a position to complain. But there is a great distinction between a general subsidy, either to shipping at large or to shipping engaged in any given trade, and a subsidy calculated particularly with reference to

the amount of user of the Canal by the subsidised lines or vessels. If such a subsidy were granted it would not, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be in accordance with the obligations of the Treaty.

As to the proposal that exemption shall be given to vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, a more difficult question arises. If the trade should be so regulated as to make it certain that only bona-fide coastwise traffic which is reserved for United States vessels would be benefited by this exemption, it may be that no objection could be taken. But it appears to my government that it would be impossible to frame regulations which would prevent the exemption from resulting, in fact, in a preference to United States shipping and consequently in an infraction of the Treaty.

I have the honor to be,

With the highest consideration,

Sir,

Your most obedient, humble Servant,

A. MITCHELL INNES.

[Inclosure 2.]

*The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain to
Ambassador Bryce.*

[Handed to the Secretary of State by the British Ambassador December 9, 1912.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 14, 1912.*

SIR,

Your Excellency will remember that on the 8th July, 1912, Mr. Mitchell Innes communicated to the Secretary of State the objections which His Majesty's Government entertained to the legislation relating to the Panama Canal, which was then under discussion in Congress, and that on the 27th August, after the passing of the Panama Canal Act and the issue of the President's memorandum on signing it, he informed Mr. Knox that when His Majesty's Government had had time to consider fully the Act and the memorandum a further communication would be made to him.

Since that date the text of the Act and the memorandum of the President have received attentive consideration at the hands of His Majesty's Government. A careful study of the President's memorandum has convinced me that he has not fully appreciated the British point of view, and has misunderstood Mr. Mitchell Innes' note of the 8th July. The President argues upon the assumption that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to place upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty an interpretation which would prevent the United States from granting subsidies to their own shipping passing through the Canal, and which would place them at a disadvantage as compared with other nations. This is not the case; His Majesty's Government regard equality of all nations as the fundamental principle underlying the treaty of 1901 in the same way that it was the basis of the Suez Canal Convention of 1888, and they do not seek to deprive the United States of any liberty which is open either to themselves or to any other nation; nor do they find either in the letter or in the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty any surrender by either of the contracting Powers of the right to encourage its shipping or its commerce by such subsidies as it may deem expedient.

The terms of the President's memorandum render it essential that I should explain in some detail the view which His Majesty's Government take as to what is the proper interpretation of the

treaty, so as to indicate the limitations which they consider it imposes upon the freedom of action of the United States, and the points in which the Panama Canal Act, as enacted, infringes what His Majesty's Government hold to be their treaty rights.

The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty does not stand alone; it was the corollary of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850. The earlier treaty was, no doubt, superseded by it, but its general principle, as embodied in article 8, was not to be impaired. The object of the later treaty is clearly shown by its preamble; it was "to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by whatever route may be deemed expedient, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the general principle of neutralisation established in article 8 of that convention." It was upon that footing, and upon that footing alone, that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was superseded.

Under that treaty both parties had agreed not to obtain any exclusive control over the contemplated ship canal, but the importance of the great project was fully recognised, and therefore the construction of the canal by others was to be encouraged, and the canal when completed was to enjoy a special measure of protection on the part of both the contracting parties.

Under article 8 the two Powers declared their desire, in entering into the Convention, not only to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, and therefore agreed to extend their protection to any practicable trans-isthmian communication, either by canal or railway, and either at Tehuantepec or Panama, provided that those who constructed it should impose no other charges or conditions of traffic than the two Governments should consider just and equitable, and that the canal or railway, "being open to the subjects and citizens of Great Britain and the United States on equal terms, should also be open to the subjects of any other State which was willing to join in the guarantee of joint protection."

So long as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was in force, therefore, the position was that both parties to it had given up their power of independent action, because neither was at liberty itself to construct the Canal and thereby obtain the exclusive control which such construction would confer. It is also clear that if the Canal had been constructed while the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was in force, it would have been open, in accordance with article 8, to British and United States ships on equal terms, and equally clear, therefore, that the tolls leviable on such ships would have been identical.

The purpose of the United States in negotiating the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was to recover their freedom of action, and obtain the right, which they had surrendered, to construct the Canal themselves; this is expressed in the preamble to the treaty, but the complete liberty of action consequential upon such construction was to be limited by the maintenance of the general principle embodied in article 8 of the earlier treaty. That principle, as shown above, was one of equal treatment for both British and United States ships, and a study of the language of article 8 shows that the word "neutralisation", in the preamble of the later treaty, is not there confined to belligerent operations, but refers to the system of equal rights for which article 8 provides.

If the wording of the article is examined, it will be seen that there is no mention of belligerent action in it at all. Joint protection and equal treatment are the only matters alluded to, and it is to one, or both, of these that neutralisation must refer. Such joint protection has always been understood by His Majesty's Government to be one of the results of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of which the United States was most anxious to get rid, and they can scarcely therefore believe that it was such joint protection that the United States were willing to keep alive, and to which they referred in the preamble of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. It certainly was not the intention of His Majesty's Government that any responsibility for the protection of the Canal should attach to them in the future. Neutralisation must therefore refer to the system of equal rights.

It thus appears from the preamble that the intention of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was that the United States was to recover the right to construct the trans-isthmian canal upon the terms that, when constructed, the canal was to be open to British and United States ships on equal terms.

The situation created was in fact identical with that resulting from the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between Great Britain and the United States, which provided as follows:—

"The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall for ever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation, and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

"It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting

boundary waters and now existing, or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory, and may charge tolls for the use thereof; but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties, and they * * * shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof."

A similar provision, though more restricted in its scope, appears in article 27 of the Treaty of Washington, 1871, and Your Excellency will no doubt remember how strenuously the United States protested, as a violation of equal rights, against a system which Canada had introduced of a rebate of a large portion of the tolls on certain freight on the Welland Canal, provided that such freight was taken as far as Montreal, and how in the face of that protest the system was abandoned.

The principle of equality is repeated in article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, which provides that the United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralisation of the Canal, certain rules, substantially as embodied in the Suez Canal Convention. The first of these rules is that the Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing the rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation.

The word "neutralisation" is no doubt used in article 3 in the same sense as in the preamble, and implies subjection to the system of equal rights. The effect of the first rule is therefore to establish the provision, foreshadowed by the preamble and consequent on the maintenance of the principle of article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, that the Canal is to be open to British and United States vessels on terms of entire equality. It also embodies a promise on the part of the United States that the ships of all nations which observe the rules will be admitted to similar privileges.

The President in his memorandum treats the words "all nations" as excluding the United States. He argues that, as the United States is constructing the Canal at its own cost on territory ceded to it, it has, unless it has restricted itself, an absolute right of ownership and control, including the right to allow its own commerce the use of the Canal upon such terms as it sees fit, and that the only question is whether it has by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty deprived itself of the exercise of the right to pass its own commerce free or remit tolls collected for the use of the Canal. He argues that article 3 of the treaty is nothing more than a declaration of policy by the United States that the Canal shall be neutral and all

nations treated alike and no discrimination made against any one of them observing the rules adopted by the United States. "In other words, it was a conditional favoured-nation treatment, the measure of which, in the absence of express stipulations to that effect, is not what the country gives to its own nationals, but the treatment it extends to other nations."

For the reasons they have given above His Majesty's Government believe this statement of the case to be wholly at variance with the real position. They consider that by the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty the United States had surrendered the right to construct the Canal, and that by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty they recovered that right upon the footing that the Canal should be open to British and United States vessels upon terms of equal treatment.

The case cannot be put more clearly than it was put by Mr. Hay himself, who, as Secretary of State, negotiated the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, in the full account of the negotiations which he sent to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (see Senate Document No. 746, 61st Congress, 3rd session):—

"These rules are adopted in the treaty with Great Britain as a consideration for getting rid of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty."

If the rules set out in the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty secure to Great Britain no more than most-favoured-nation treatment, the value of the consideration given for superseding the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is not apparent to His Majesty's Government. Nor is it easy to see in what way the principle of article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which provides for equal treatment of British and United States ships, has been maintained.

I notice that in the course of the debate in the Senate on the Panama Canal Bill the argument was used by one of the speakers that the third, fourth, and fifth rules embodied in article 3 of the treaty show that the words "all nations" cannot include the United States, because, if the United States were at war, it is impossible to believe that it could be intended to be debarred by the treaty from using its own territory for revictualling its war-ships or landing troops.

The same point may strike others who read nothing but the text of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty itself, and I think it is therefore worth while that I should briefly show that this argument is not well founded.

The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 aimed at carrying out the principle of the neutralisation of the Panama Canal by subjecting it to the same régime as the Suez Canal. Rules 3, 4, and 5 of article 3

of the treaty are taken almost textually from articles 4, 5, and 6 of the Suez Canal Convention of 1888. At the date of the signature of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty the territory, on which the Isthmian Canal was to be constructed, did not belong to the United States, consequently there was no need to insert in the draft treaty provisions corresponding to those in articles 10 and 13 of the Suez Canal Convention, which preserve the sovereign rights of Turkey and of Egypt, and stipulate that articles 4 and 5 shall not affect the right of Turkey, as the local sovereign, and of Egypt, within the measure of her autonomy, to take such measures as may be necessary for securing the defence of Egypt and the maintenance of public order, and, in the case of Turkey, the defence of her possessions on the Red Sea.

Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the Canal, His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection.

For these reasons, His Majesty's Government maintain that the words "all nations" in rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty include the United States, and that, in consequence, British vessels using the Canal are entitled to equal treatment with those of the United States, and that the same tolls are chargeable on each.

This rule also provides that the tolls should be "just and equitable." The purpose of these words was to limit the tolls to the amount representing the fair value of the services rendered, i. e., to the interest on the capital expended and the cost of the operation and maintenance of the Canal. Unless the whole volume of shipping which passes through the Canal, and which all benefits equally by its services, is taken into account, there are no means of determining whether the tolls chargeable upon a vessel represent that vessel's fair proportion of the current expenditure properly chargeable against the Canal, that is to say, interest on the capital expended in construction, and the cost of operation and maintenance. If any classes of vessels are exempted from tolls in such a way that no receipts from such ships are taken into account in the income of the Canal, there is no guarantee that the vessels upon which tolls are being levied are not being made to bear more than their fair share of the upkeep. Apart altogether, therefore, from the provision in rule 1 about equality of treatment for all nations, the stipulation that the tolls shall be just and equitable, when rightly understood, entitles His Majesty's Government to demand, on behalf of British shipping, that all vessels passing through the Canal, whatever their flag or their character, shall be taken into account in fixing the amount of the tolls.

The result is that any system by which particular vessels or classes of vessels were exempted from the payment of tolls would not comply with the stipulations of the treaty that the Canal should be open on terms of entire equality, and that the charges should be just and equitable.

The President, in his memorandum, argues that if there is no difference, as stated in Mr. Mitchell Innes' note of the 8th July, between charging tolls only to refund them and remitting tolls altogether, the effect is to prevent the United States from aiding its own commerce in the way that all other nations may freely do. This is not so. His Majesty's Government have no desire to place upon the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty an interpretation which would impose upon the United States any restriction from which other nations are free, or reserve to such other nation any privilege which is denied to the United States. Equal treatment, as specified in the treaty, is all they claim.

His Majesty's Government do not question the right of the United States to grant subsidies to United States shipping generally, or to any particular branches of that shipping, but it does not follow therefore that the United States may not be debarred by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty from granting a subsidy to certain shipping in a particular way, if the effect of the method chosen for granting such subsidy would be to impose upon British or other foreign shipping an unfair share of the burden of the upkeep of the Canal, or to create a discrimination in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise to prejudice rights secured to British shipping by this Treaty.

If the United States exempt certain classes of ships from the payment of tolls the result would be a form of subsidy to those vessels which His Majesty's Government consider the United States are debarred by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty from making.

It remains to consider whether the Panama Canal Act, in its present form, conflicts with the treaty rights to which His Majesty's Government maintain they are entitled.

Under section 5 of the Act the President is given, within certain defined limits, the right to fix the tolls, but no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States, and the tolls, when based upon net registered tonnage for ships of commerce, are not to exceed 1 dollar 25 c. per net registered ton, nor be less, *other than for vessels of the United States and its citizens*, than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the Canal. There is also an exception for the exemptions granted by article 19 of the Convention with Panama of 1903.

The effect of these provisions is that vessels engaged in the coastwise trade will contribute nothing to the upkeep of the Canal. Similarly vessels belonging to the Government of the Republic of Panama will, in pursuance of the treaty of 1903, contribute nothing to the upkeep of the Canal. Again, in the cases where tolls are levied, the tolls in the case of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens may be fixed at a lower rate than in the case of foreign ships, and may be less than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the Canal.

These provisions (1) clearly conflict with the rule embodied in the principle established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships, and (2) would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

It has been argued that as the coastwise trade of the United States is confined by law to United States vessels, the exemption of vessels engaged in it from the payment of tolls cannot injure the interests of foreign nations. It is clear, however, that the interests of foreign nations will be seriously injured in two material respects.

In the first place, the exemption will result in the cost of the working of the Canal being borne wholly by foreign-going vessels, and on such vessels, therefore, will fall the whole burden of raising the revenue necessary to cover the cost of working and maintaining the Canal. The possibility, therefore, of fixing the toll on such vessels at a lower figure than 1 dol. 25 c. per ton, or of reducing the rate below that figure at some future time, will be considerably lessened by the exemption.

In the second place, the exemption will, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be a violation of the equal treatment secured by the treaty, as it will put the "coastwise trade" in a preferential position as regards other shipping. Coastwise trade cannot be circumscribed so completely that benefits conferred upon it will not affect vessels engaged in the foreign trade. To take an example, if cargo intended for an United States port beyond the Canal, either from east or west, and shipped on board a foreign ship could be sent to its destination more cheaply, through the operation of the proposed exemption, by being landed at an United States port before reaching the Canal, and then sent on as coastwise trade, shippers would benefit by adopting this course in preference to sending the goods direct to their destination through the Canal on board the foreign ship.

Again, although certain privileges are granted to vessels engaged in an exclusively coastwise trade, His Majesty's Govern-

ment are given to understand that there is nothing in the laws of the United States which prevents any United States ship from combining foreign commerce with coastwise trade, and consequently from entering into direct competition with foreign vessels while remaining "prima facie" entitled to the privilege of free passage through the Canal. Moreover any restriction which may be deemed to be now applicable might at any time be removed by legislation or even perhaps by mere changes in the regulations.

In these and in other ways foreign shipping would be seriously handicapped, and any adverse result would fall more severely on British shipping than on that of any other nationality.

The volume of British shipping which will use the Canal will in all probability be very large. Its opening will shorten by many thousands of miles the waterways between England and other portions of the British Empire, and if on the one hand it is important to the United States to encourage its mercantile marine and establish competition between coastwise traffic and transcontinental railways, it is equally important to Great Britain to secure to its shipping that just and impartial treatment to which it is entitled by treaty, and in return for a promise of which it surrendered the rights which it held under the earlier convention.

There are other provisions of the Panama Canal Act to which the attention of His Majesty's Government has been directed. These are contained in section 11, part of which enacts that a railway company, subject to the Inter-State Commerce Act 1887, is prohibited from having any interest in vessels operated through the Canal with which such railways may compete, and another part provides that a vessel permitted to engage in the coastwise or foreign trade of the United States is not allowed to use the Canal if its owner is guilty of violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

His Majesty's Government do not read this section of the Act as applying to, or affecting, British ships, and they therefore do not feel justified in making any observations upon it. They assume that it applies only to vessels flying the flag of the United States, and that it is aimed at practices which concern only the internal trade of the United States. If this view is mistaken and the provisions are intended to apply under any circumstances to British ships, they must reserve their right to examine the matter further and to raise such contentions as may seem justified.

His Majesty's Government feel no doubt as to the correctness of their interpretation of the treaties of 1850 and 1901, and as to the validity of the rights they claim under them for British shipping; nor does there seem to them to be any room for doubt that the pro-

visions of the Panama Canal Act as to tolls conflict with the rights secured to their shipping by the treaty. But they recognise that many persons of note in the United States, whose opinions are entitled to great weight, hold that the provisions of the Act do not infringe the conventional obligations by which the United States is bound, and under these circumstances they desire to state their perfect readiness to submit the question to arbitration if the Government of the United States would prefer to take this course. A reference to arbitration would be rendered unnecessary if the Government of the United States should be prepared to take such steps as would remove the objections to the Act which His Majesty's Government have stated.

Knowing as I do full well the interest which this great undertaking has aroused in the New World and the emotion with which its opening is looked forward to by United States citizens, I wish to add before closing this despatch that it is only with great reluctance that His Majesty's Government have felt bound to raise objection on the ground of treaty rights to the provisions of the Act. Animated by an earnest desire to avoid points which might in any way prove embarrassing to the United States, His Majesty's Government have confined their objections within the narrowest possible limits, and have recognised in the fullest manner the right of the United States to control the Canal. They feel convinced that they may look with confidence to the Government of the United States to ensure that in promoting the interests of United States shipping, nothing will be done to impair the safeguards guaranteed to British shipping by treaty.

Your Excellency will read this despatch to the Secretary of State and will leave with him a copy.

I am, &c.,

E. GREY.

[Inclosure 3.]

[PANAMA CANAL TOLL RATES.]

By the President of the United States of America.

A Proclamation.

I, WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Act of Congress, approved August twenty-fourth, nineteen hundred and twelve, to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone, do hereby prescribe and proclaim the following rates of toll to be paid by vessels using the Panama Canal:

1. On merchant vessels carrying passengers or cargo one dollar and twenty cents (\$1.20) per net vessel ton—each one hundred (100) cubic feet—of actual earning capacity.
2. On vessels in ballast without passengers or cargo forty (40) percent less than the rate of tolls for vessels with passengers or cargo.
3. Upon naval vessels, other than transports, colliers, hospital ships and supply ships, fifty (50) cents per displacement ton.
4. Upon army and navy transports, colliers, hospital ships and supply ships one dollar and twenty cents (\$1.20) per net ton, the vessels to be measured by the same rules as are employed in determining the net tonnage of merchant vessels.

The Secretary of War will prepare and prescribe such rules for the measurement of vessels and such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry this proclamation into full force and effect.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this thirteenth day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twelve and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.]

WM H TAFT

By the President:

P C KNOX

Secretary of State.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State.

BRITISH EMBASSY
WASHINGTON

February 27, 1913.

SIR:

His Majesty's Government are unable before the Administration leaves office to reply fully to the arguments contained in Your despatch of the 17th ultimo to the United States Charge d'Affaires at London regarding the difference of opinion that has arisen between our two Governments as to the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, but they desire me in the meantime to offer the following observations with regard to the argument that no case has yet arisen calling for any submission to arbitration of the points in difference between His Majesty's Government and that of the United States on the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, because no actual injury has as yet resulted to any British interest and all that has been done so far is to pass an Act of Congress under which action held by His Majesty's Government to be prejudicial to British interests might be taken.

From this view His Majesty's Government feel bound to express their dissent. They conceive that international law or usage does not support the doctrine that the passing of a statute in contravention of a treaty right affords no ground of complaint for the infraction of that right, and that the nation which holds that its treaty rights have been so infringed or brought into question by a denial that they exist, must, before protesting and seeking a means of determining the point at issue, wait until some further action violating those rights in a concrete instance has been taken, which in the present instance would, according to your argument, seem to mean, until tolls have been actually levied upon British vessels from which vessels owned by citizens of the United States have been exempted.

The terms of the Proclamation issued by the President fixing the Canal tolls, and the particular method which your note sets forth as having been adopted by him, in his discretion, on a given occasion for determining on what basis they should be fixed do not appear to His Majesty's Government to affect the general issue as to the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty which they have raised. In their view the Act of Congress, when it declared that no tolls should be

levied on ships engaged in the coasting trade of the United States and when, in further directing the President to fix those tolls within certain limits, it distinguished between vessels of the citizens of the United States and other vessels, was in itself and apart from any action which may be taken under it, inconsistent with the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty for equality of treatment between the vessels of all nations. The exemption referred to appears to His Majesty's Government to conflict with the express words of Rule 1 of Article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and the Act gave the President no power to modify or discontinue the exemption.

In their opinion the mere conferring by Congress of power to fix lower tolls on United States ships than on British ships amounts to a denial of the right of British shipping to equality of treatment, and is therefore inconsistent with the treaty irrespective of the particular way in which such power has been so far actually exercised.

In stating thus briefly their view of the compatibility of the Act of Congress with their Treaty rights His Majesty's Government hold that the difference which exists between the two Governments is clearly one which falls within the meaning of Article I of the Arbitration Treaty of 1908.

As respects the suggestion contained in the last paragraph but one of your note under reply His Majesty's Government conceive that Article I of the Treaty of 1908 so clearly meets the case that has now arisen that it is sufficient to put its provisions in force in whatever manner the two governments may find the most convenient. It is unnecessary to repeat that a reference to arbitration would be rendered superfluous if steps were taken by the United States Government to remove the objection entertained by His Majesty's Government to the Act.

His Majesty's Government have not desired me to argue in this Note that the view they take of the main issue—the proper interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty—is the correct view, but only that a case for the determination of that issue has already arisen and now exists. They conceive that the interest of both countries requires that issue to be settled promptly before the opening of the Canal, and by means which will leave no ground for regret or complaint. The avoidance of possible friction has been one of the main objects of those methods of arbitration of which the United States has been for so long a foremost and consistent advocate. His Majesty's Government think it more in accordance with the General Arbitration Treaty that the settlement desired should precede rather than follow the doing of any acts, which could raise questions of actual damage suffered; and better also that when vessels begin to pass through the great waterway in whose construction all the world

has been interested there should be left subsisting no cause of difference which could prevent any other nation from joining without reserve in the satisfaction the people of the United States will feel at the completion of a work of such grandeur and utility.

I have the honour to be,

With the highest consideration,

Sir,

Your most obedient,
humble servant,

JAMES BRYCE.