

ty, however, I do not that this Board will high will so vitally n sure we will leave from a commercial

a city that calls itself y a fine agricultural of reciprocity. The our manufacturers. y branch of industry, d state of American would get our gold ted currency. The uarantee how it will special manner with ad mowing machines nufacturers of these though the duty were n of the patent laws. lieve that either the commodate our craft ttawa, and surely in down the Hudson to t American ports on ould be prepared to l not enter into any erests, as the treaty

more than I do at nada and the United rests involved, or the ves the calmest deli- tical feelings. We siness. In order to ould be felt by busi- se, "to be just, liber- see that this Treaty peak on the question om the western part tter acquainted with uestion of revenue, m told on very good revenue, under this t I allude more par- ublic. The United

States have enjoyed, since 1851, a boon of very great magnitude, granted by the Imperial Government,—I mean the repeal of the Navigation Laws. Under the operation of that Act, we find American ships competing with Canadian ships all over the world. If you go to Bombay, you find American ships competing with British ships in carrying merchandize to Liverpool. If you go to Calcutta, you find the same thing. If you go to Australia, you find American ships loading for London; and to come nearer home, I suppose there is no port in the British Empire where competition with American ships has been found so severe as in this city of St. John. I can remember the trade of St. John before the repeal of the navigation laws; and the result of that repeal has been to reduce freights to Great Britain about one half. But supposing I send a ship to New York, and want to go from there to California, I am not allowed to carry a ton of freight, because from New York to San Francisco is considered coasting trade. Or if I have a ship in Baltimore or Philadelphia, and want to send her to New York, I am obliged to pay for stones to ballast her, because I am not permitted to carry freight. Now, I ask, is that reciprocity? Americans can take freight from London to Australia, but we cannot carry any from New York to San Francisco. Then there is another feature of this Treaty to which we in Quebec are strongly opposed, and that is the part relating to Canals. We think it unwise for our government to pledge this country to deepen our Canals and the River St. Lawrence to 12 feet within a limited time, and at a cost practically unknown. There are many engineers in Canada who doubt even the possibility of accomplishing that work; and who will say what the cost of the attempt will be? Suppose that at the end of five years we have failed to carry out this provision of the treaty,—in what position would this country find itself? You can easily see that it might lead to complications of the most disastrous character—even to war itself, for all we know. Then, as to the Caughnawaga canal, we believe that this work interests Americans far more than ourselves, and that it should be undertaken by a private company, assisted perhaps by the United States Government. To throw upon this country the burden, not only of enlarging our own canals, but also of building the Caughnawaga canal, is a proposition to which we in Quebec are entirely opposed. With regard to the lumber trade, I for one am of opinion that it is no matter to us in Canada whether the United States admit lumber free, or charge five or fifty per cent. duty. My policy would be, instead of opening up new markets for our lumber, to preserve our forests. I think the less timber we cut, within certain limits, the more profitable our forests will be. We have been wasteful in our use of them in the past; and it would now be better to preserve them, rather than seek for new markets. The Americans must, to a very great extent, have our lumber, and the duty they impose on it they themselves have to pay. I admit that the registration of Canadian ships is a boon, and I am the more particularly gratified at this feature of the Treaty, as it evinces a very considerable advance in public opinion in the United States. I was one of the delegates to the Detroit Convention in 1865; and when I proposed there,