

supply to the fisheries, and in forcing them thus to take the supplies from the provinces; but, for the reasons above stated, it is not desired to acquire such an advantage at the expense of the fisheries.

4thly.—That the exemption was introduced in accordance with the policy of all the Canada Trade Acts, which contain the same exemption in favour of the fisheries.

5thly.—That the geographical position of the fisheries is such as to prevent it from being the interest of persons disposed to defraud the revenue to import, by sea, wheat from a foreign country, and to send it illicitly into Canada, there to acquire the character of wheat or flour of Canadian growth, or of the same articles which had paid the duty.

6thly.—That wheat or flour introduced by sea for the use of fisheries not on the sea-coast, would not bear the expense of transportation to the interior for the purpose of avoiding the duty.

7thly.—As to the danger of wheat being introduced by sea at the fisheries on the coast, which may there be converted into flour, and thereby acquire the character of colonial produce or manufacture, the Committee would observe, that the country on the coast not being wheat growing, any importation or manufacture of wheat for exportation would immediately be observed by the officers of the Customs, and the traders in the article, on importing what evidently was not for the use of the fisheries, or on attempting to export it to England, would be liable to have the property seized, and would be subject to the pains and penalties of the British Trade Act, re-enacted by the Bill in question.

And, lastly, as the exemption was introduced into the Bill in favour of British interests, any act removing or lessening the duty on wheat and flour imported from Canada may contain any precautionary enactments regulating the details of importations for the use of the fisheries, which may be devised by the Commissioners of Customs, and which would effectually prevent the fraud of which his Lordship apprehends the probability.

—No. 5.—

(No. 43.)

COPY of a DESPATCH from the Right honourable Sir Charles Bagot, G.C.B., to Lord Stanley.

Government House, Kingston,
20 March 1843.

My Lord,

WITH reference to your Lordship's Despatch of the 2d March, No. 330, relative to the petition addressed to the Queen by the Board of Trade at Quebec upon the subject of the Wheat Duty Bill, passed by the Provincial Legislature in its last session, I deem it expedient, although I am confident that Her Majesty's Government will allow no unnecessary delay to occur in determining upon the course which they will adopt with regard to this measure, to transmit to your Lordship a copy of a communication from the same body, pointing out the importance of an early decision upon this matter with reference to the trade of the approaching season.

I have, &c.

(signed) Charles Bagot.

No. 5.
Despatch from the
Right hon. Sir
Charles Bagot to
Lord Stanley,
20 March 1843.

Enclosure in No. 5.

Office of the Council of the Quebec Board of Trade,
Quebec, March 4, 1843.

Sir,

I AM requested by the Council of the Quebec Board of Trade respectfully to inquire if any information has yet been received regarding the fate of a Bill passed in the last session of our Provincial Legislature, imposing a duty of 3s. per quarter on wheat imported into the British Possessions in North America from the United States, and which was reserved by his Excellency the Governor-general for Her Majesty's pleasure thereon. When the aforesaid Bill was passed by the Legislature, it seemed to be generally understood that it was the intention of the Imperial Government to permit the importation of wheat from Canada into Great Britain at merely a nominal duty; and as the season of business is now approaching, it is of great importance to the inhabitants of the province generally that they should receive authentic information on these questions with the least possible delay.

Encl. in No. 5.

I have, &c.

(signed) W. Walker, Chairman.