

tion. This, however, is only the *argumentum ad hominem*, which is not the style of argument that should be used in discussing a question of such grave importance as this. It should be considered solely upon its merits; and being so considered, I hope the amendment I had the honor to propose will be adopted, and that such recommendations will be made to Government as will enable them to secure for us a Treaty fair, liberal and comprehensive in its provisions.

Mr. J. M. TROUT (Toronto)—I find myself placed in a somewhat peculiar position. When, this morning, I rose to move the resolution now before you, it was simply with the intention of affirming our approval of the general principle of Reciprocity; and I did hope that this Board, in harmony with its own history, and in order to avoid any liability to misconception from any source, would have passed that resolution unanimously. I cannot see what possible harm that could have done. If you look at the resolution, you will find that it merely affirms the desirability of reciprocity with the United States, and that this Board takes an interest in the proceedings now pending for the obtaining of a Treaty. It does not approve of these proceedings in any shape or form. Is there any reason why this Board should divide upon the general principle of Reciprocity as enunciated in my resolution? My own opinion is that the Board should first affirm the general principle, and then we could naturally pass on to the consideration of objections to this Treaty, and specify them in the form of resolutions. But what is the issue now presented to us? You are asked to vote against the general principle of Reciprocity.—(No, no.) My resolution affirms nothing but that general principle, and you are going to vote against it.—(No, no; only to amend it!) Then our action has no meaning at all. How do you reconcile that with your past utterances? The only consistent course for this Board to take, is to affirm that we are in favor of Reciprocity and intend to support it whenever it is fairly and squarely presented to us. That is one matter, and the objections to this draft Treaty are quite another matter. We ought to remember that we are only a section of the community; that the agricultural part of the population outnumber us ten to one, and can if they like, pass the Treaty in spite of us. We ought to be consistent as commercial men, and to reaffirm in unmistakable terms our approval of Reciprocity.

This closed the debate on the part of the Delegates; and an invitation was again extended to the representatives of the National Board of Trade of the United States to address the Dominion Board before the vote was taken.

Mr. B. F. NOURSE (Boston)—Mr. President and Gentlemen: As has been said by the Chairman of our delegation, the provisions of this Treaty which you have been discussing here to-day, have not been considered by our National Board of Trade, nor by our local Boards. I could not therefore, under these circumstances, enter into a discussion of its merits,—feeling that if I should do so I would transgress the line of duty marked

out for me. on some p comments; my remark general se at all,—t considerate ing. In t that is inst well as for kindly feeli have occur and in the: the fact that the Treaty Wool-Growe ground agai festo in whic the Treaty v here to-day same clause gentleman fr agricultural former Treat For several; When the co out their us Europe, I sh American gr both. On th rency was te had swept aw have not yet of meats and look to the fu duction in the those which h we underwent interests. B our currency iron and steel the world. J We have had flow comes it consider, in d the past five or or six years.