

"Government the necessity for the speedy completion of the work of deepening the Canals to fourteen feet on the St. Lawrence Channel between the Great Lakes and the Sea."

The manner of dealing with the motion was so peculiar as to deserve more than a passing reference. The Committee on Resolutions on the afternoon of the last day of the Convention brought in their first report recommending a platform, a permanent organization on Deep Water Ways, and certain resolutions which were considered to be in harmony with the scope of the Convention, and announced that all other resolutions not so recommended were ruled out as not within the call of the Convention. Immediately after this announcement a member introduced a motion, part of which was similar to your motion. The Chairman ruled this motion in order; the further point of order was, however, taken that it had not been referred to the Committee on Resolutions. It was for this reason ruled out of order.

I then inquired after your motion stating that it was in terms which the Chairman had just ruled as within the scope of the Convention, and that it had been duly referred to the Resolution Committee. The Chairman of the Committee stated that the motion of the Board of Trade had been ruled out of order by the Committee as not within the call of the Convention.

It now became my duty to point out that the Chairman of the Convention, who had discharged his duties with marked ability, had declared your motion a proper one, while the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions had declared it an improper one, and that I would therefore request these gentlemen to adjust their opinions after which I would decide what course to take.

Mr. Suydam, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, in open Convention requested me to come to the Committee, and stated that the motion could be so worded as to meet the views of all parties. This proposal I at once accepted, and in order to feel sure that the views of the Council of the Board of Trade were properly represented and guarded, I requested Mr. J. Herbert Mason to accompany me. He consented and we appeared before the Committee in the evening and stated your views as we understood them, to the Committee. A member of the Committee drew up a resolution which both Mr. Mason and myself accepted as satisfactory, and which we assumed to be satisfactory to the Committee.

The Committee some time afterwards entered the Convention and reported other business, but made no mention of your motion. What made it more apparent that the omission had been deliberate was that the motion was twice enquired for by other members of the Convention without any response from the Committee. I felt that my duty had been discharged and decided to make no further call for the motion. By this time I was persuaded that the Convention had been captured in the interests of the west, and that the Committee had determined to ignore the opinions of the Toronto Board of Trade. It was clear to me that the delegates from the Western States did not consider that 14 feet down the St. Lawrence would be sufficient improvement on the present route through United States territory to warrant them in recommending such a change, and had determined, without reasonable consideration for Canadian interests, not to support anything less than 21 feet.

The Convention closed without the matter having been again referred to by the Committee, notwithstanding such a course was a violation of the compact made with me on the floor of the Convention. I would therefore recommend that the Board of Trade place on record its disapproval of the methods adopted by the Convention and of the decision of the Committee on Resolutions in ruling out of order, as not within the