

minion Board of Trade, objections which the hon. gentleman had answered more or less. Those objections, however, seemed more grave to him (the speaker) than they had appeared to the hon. mover of the Address. He thought probably that the answer which he gave to the first objection, as to the reduction of scale duties, was sufficient, and rendered that objection of less importance. The second objection urged by the Board of Trade touched on the gradual reduction of the duties. The average duty laid on goods going from Canada to the United States was, he believed, 25 per cent., while the duty paid by products of the United States coming here was $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. He did not think, on the whole, that the objection to the gradual reduction of these rates was a very serious one, but there was another objection of a more serious character, which did not seem to have been sufficiently understood, nor did it seem to have been sufficiently impressed on the mind of the hon. gentleman; he referred to the construction of the Gaugnawaga Canal. In the first place, it was very unwise to have stipulated that the work should be finished by 1880; we ought only to have been bound to have completed the canal in as short a time as possible. Grave objection had been taken to the fixing of the period of the Pacific Railway. It was decided at the time that it was a very unwise proceeding, but there at all events we were dealing with ourselves. It was one part of the country dealing with another. The representatives of that one province in our Legislature were quite willing to listen to any reasonable excuses that might be advanced; but in this case it was different. Here we were binding ourselves to do something in 1880, which we might find ourselves unable to perform within the time specified. If it were not done within the period specified, he supposed the conditions would fall to the ground. The fact of the possibility of the treaty being nullified by failure in the conditions was enough to deter manufacturers in Canada from speculating as they otherwise would. He did not think that this objection had been sufficiently answered by his hon. friend. He said

it was necessary to fix some period and therefore he fixed this; but even then it would have been wiser and safer not to have made that a condition of the treaty, to have named a longer period or the earliest possible day. The other objection was that it was not coupled with a stipulation on the part of the United States that they would continue it to the Hudson river. They promised to recommend it to the State of New York legislature, which was a very uncertain method of procedure. A recommendation of a similar nature had been made to the same legislature on the occasion of a former treaty, but which had never been carried out, and he did not see why in the present instance the hon. gentleman could have expected better success. As to the permission to go through the canal in that State he believed they might have done that before, but that was a matter of much less importance than would be the continuation of this canal from White Fall to the waters of the Hudson. It was quite equal in importance to the construction of that portion of it which lay in Canada, and why the hon. gentleman should have proposed to bind Canada to construct one portion of the canal in a certain period and not bound the Americans to construct theirs as well, he was at a loss to understand. The only explanation that he could see lay in assuming, what was just possible, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would pardon him for saying so, that he did display some over-eagerness for the obtaining of the treaty. No obligation to commence our work should have been undertaken until our suggestion had been first responded to by the others. In answer to this objection the hon. gentleman replied that the canal itself was a most important one, and irrespective of its being carried out as a part of the treaty, was of itself so valuable that we might venture to undertake its construction for ourselves. He apprehended, however, that this country would not undertake the construction of this canal simply as a local work, and certainly not on the scale mentioned, as a twelve feet canal. If the country undertook the construction of this canal at all, it would be with the intention of having