

tion of Treaty arrangements with Canada has been used by politicians for their own advancement.

It will therefore be perceived that whilst in the Detroit Convention the Chicago and Western Delegates went either indifferent or unprepared, those from New York State, made up of politicians and merchants, had been well educated in the school of opposition.

On behalf of the latter, it was argued that no Treaty should be made with unfriendly people, and hints were thrown out that annexation of Canada to the United States must follow the abrogation of the Treaty.

I found also that the merchants of New York State urged on the Chicago Delegates that even if the Treaty were a benefit to the West, the injury it inflicted on their best customers was of greater moment than the value it was to them.

But it must be understood that whilst I do not consider the proceedings of this Convention, as representing national views, are important, yet their value can scarcely be estimated as having had the effect of directing the public attention to the great importance of the question in the Western States.

I visited the Board of Trade several times and saw the merchants in the city. It was one general topic of discussion at that time, and although I was by no means surprised to find a bitterness against Canada very general, I certainly was surprised to hear the abrogation of the Treaty defended on the ground that it was disadvantageous to the West.

No. 8.

Sir F. Bruce to Earl Russell.—(Received November 20.)

My Lord.

Washington, November 6, 1865.

ON seeing the inclosed notification in the newspapers, I thought it advisable to ask Mr. Seward whether it was merely an administrative measure called for by the approaching expiration of the Reciprocity Treaty, or was intended to be a declaration of the Government against the renewal of the Treaty.

Mr. Seward stated that he was glad I had asked him the question in order that the import of the notification might not be misapprehended. He said that the question of the Treaty remained exactly as it was, and that the notification was not based on any action of the Cabinet, but was issued by the Secretary of the Treasury as an administrative act which could not be legally deferred.

I have, &c.

(Signed) **FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.**

Inclosure in No. 8.

Circular to Collectors of Customs and others.

Treasury Department, October 20, 1865.

I HAVE received information from the Secretary of State that official notice was delivered by our Minister at London, on the 17th of March, 1865, at 2 o'clock p.m., to the British Government, of the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty between the United States of America and Her Britannic Majesty, concluded the 5th of June, 1854, in conformity with the provisions of the said Treaty, and of the joint Resolution of Congress, approved January 18, 1865.

You are hereby instructed that the operation of the Treaty will cease on the expiration of twelve months from the time at which the notice was given.

(Signed) **HUGH McCULLOCH,**
Secretary of the Treasury.