

No. 445.

Lord Tenterden to Sir H. Holland.

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 14, 1874.

I AM directed by the Earl of Derby to transmit to you, to be laid before the Earl of Carnarvon, a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Washington, upon the subject of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty.*

I am, &c.
(Signed) TENTERDEN.

No. 446.

Lord Tenterden to Sir H. Holland.

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 20, 1874.

I AM directed by the Earl of Derby to transmit to you, to be laid before the Earl of Carnarvon, for his perusal, despatches, as marked in the margin,† upon the subject of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty.

I am, &c.
(Signed) TENTERDEN.

No. 447.

Mr. Watson to the Earl of Derby.—(Received August 24.)

(No. 54.)

My Lord,

Newport, August 8, 1874.

I HAVE the honour to inclose, for your Lordship's perusal, an interesting article (the only one I can obtain) from the "New York Commercial Advertiser" on the Reciprocity Treaty.

This article exhibits such a reciprocal dissatisfaction with the provisions of the Treaty as seems to me to establish their equity and suitableness, and the journal in question believes that the Treaty will pass the Senate.

I have, &c.
(Signed) R. G. WATSON.

Inclosure in No. 447.

Extract from the "New York Commercial Advertiser," Monday, August 3, 1874.

THE RECIPROCITY TREATY.—The necessity, or at least the desirability of a Reciprocity Treaty with the Dominion of Canada, has been pretty generally felt, both in this country and in the Dominion, ever since the late existing one was abrogated. There is, in fact, hardly room for objection to this, and it was universally anticipated that the consideration of the subject on the part of the appointees of both negotiants would result in a conclusion which should be advantageous to both parties to the Convention, and at least agreeable to one of these. It is, therefore, matter for speculation, if not for deprecation, that the draft of the Reciprocity Treaty finally agreed upon, should not only not meet with the views of either of the proposed contracting parties—so far as an informal expression of public opinion should be considered—but is actually opposed virulently by large numbers of business men, and by important commercial and business organizations in both countries. Throughout the United States, the comments upon the proposed Treaty have been generally unfavourable, by the press and by those representative bodies of merchants and manufacturers which have considered it. But the objections made here, though strenuous and pronounced, have not, as a rule, taken the shape of that extreme disagreement with the proposed stipulations which is generally current in Canada. There the press and the public have displayed a degree of vigour in their opposition to the entire framework of the Treaty, as well as to its specific stipulations, and such a decided animosity to the Canadian participation in its construction, as to be almost amusing to us more quiet lookers-on. While, probably, much of this excess of feeling is

* No. 443.

† Nos. 436, 437, 438, and 439.