

"That the Harbour Engineer be instructed to furnish the Commissioners with an official report of the progress of the work of construction to the close of navigation;" this motion, however, did not meet with the approval of the other members of the Trust, seven, for some reason that I cannot understand, voting against it, the mover and seconder being the only ones in its favor. Under the terms of contract as specified in Section 8, without this official report I do not see that any pressure can be brought on the Syndicate to obtain what appears to me to be very important information, as to what progress will be made with the works of construction during next season. At the time the arrangements were completed with the Syndicate (January 1900), it was expected that the elevator and warehouses on Canal Basin site would have been finished in time for the opening of navigation in 1901.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES CRATHERN,

Board of Trade Harbour Commissioner.

PILOTAGE SYSTEM.

Consideration of the bill amending the Pilotage Act introduced into Parliament last Session led your Council to adopt the following memorial objecting to its provisions, which memorial was presented on the 3rd March to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Public Works and other members of the Cabinet, by a deputation from this Board consisting of Messrs. Robert Mackay, President, Thos. Harling and Alex. McFee:—

THE MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE.

To the Honourable Sir L. H. Davies, K. C. M. G., Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

THE MEMORIAL OF THE COUNCIL OF THE MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,—

That having considered Bill No. II. "An Act to amend the Pilotage Act," it begs to represent that it objects to said bill for the following reasons:—

That the court it provides is objectionable and unnecessary; objectionable because the interests of shippers and marine underwriters might not be properly represented thereon; unnecessary because the government can at once establish a Vice-Admiralty Court in Montreal, where charges against pilots could be properly dealt with, which court is greatly to be preferred to the pilotage court proposed in the said bill;

That the proposed formation of an Admiralty District, as provided in clause 8 of said bill, would leave the proposed Pilotage Court intact with the exception of the President of that Court whose place would be taken by the Judge, and that, as before stated, such Pilotage Court is considered objectionable and unnecessary. Moreover, the permanent appointment of nautical assessors is inadvisable, the selection of experts suitable for a particular case being preferable, and the appointment of such experts should be in the hands of the Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court;

That, in place of the Pilotage Court proposed in said Bill, the Council desires that the Vice-Admiralty Court as it now exists in Quebec should be established in Montreal, and that all shipping cases and charges against pilots should be tried before it, the Judge thereof having the right to appoint the necessary expert assistants, so that he would select such as were suited to the particular case before the Court; for instance, it might be advisable to call in a different expert for a collision than for a grounding case;