

been considering will not permit Canadian manufacturers of American patented articles to enter the market of the United States; but surely it is not a fair objection to the Treaty that it would put a stop to the wrongful use of another man's ingenuity and skill? Where is the commercial morality in an objection of that kind? I might just as well object to the law in Great Britain which prevents me from selling American re-prints of British works in that country. I shall only further refer to a remark of my friend, Hon. Mr. Howland. He spoke of the generosity of Great Britain in repealing the navigation laws. Generosity is not the word to apply to that transaction, or indeed any transaction between nations. I have no doubt that the statesmen of that day acted with a sincere desire to serve the highest interests committed to their charge; and it was because the statesmen of Great Britain saw that it was for the benefit of the whole British people that they conceded the repeal of the navigation laws. They were perfectly willing to subordinate, and even to destroy if necessary, some small interests for the good of the whole country. What was the result? The freights on deals and timber from St. John to Liverpool were reduced one half. Who gained by that reduction? The trans-Atlantic consumers, and in part, perhaps, the producers here. It was not a loss to the British people as a whole, but a saving to them; and if American ships carried the freight for one-half of what the British ship-owners had carried it, the British people saved so much by the use of American bottoms. I am only speaking of the general principle underlying this matter, and it stands out in bold contrast to much that I have heard to-day. I could imagine from many things I have heard here that I was back to the days of the old corn-laws in England, or to those of Henry Clay in my own country,—when our high protective tariff prevailed—a system contrary to what is regarded as true political economy in these days, and which our war and its consequences compelled us unfortunately for a time to maintain. But we consider it an evil although we do retain it. You seem to adopt it as a principle upon which you are to construct your system of intercourse with your neighbors. We do not complain of that. It does not lie in our mouths to complain of the adoption of our policy; but much of the argument built upon it in this discussion carries me back to my boyish days. For the interest of my country, for the interest of her shipping, I would be very glad to see navigation between our Atlantic and Pacific ports thrown open to the shipping of the world; and I think the gain to our own people would be so great, so immediate, and so decided, that it might almost tend to throw open all our ports upon the Atlantic. Besides that, the generous rivalry that would arise would give a stimulus to our ship-building, and would make our mercantile marine larger and more efficient than before. This is the best kind of stimulant—better than any forced, hot-house protection! (Hear, hear). No Chinese walls in these days, if we can do away with them! (Hear, hear).

Mr. J. AUSTIN STEVENS (New York)—Mr. President and Gentlemen: I represent a body and a community which are wholly commer-

cial. We the highest and even which it I felt all day rel as it s Canada, to principles (sylvania an are not my represent th the Canada have oftene delegates wi and resist u the two co secured the (Cheers.) from the do our country known to you in regard to baskets, one In this count unless you r soon find it q agricultural shows that th shaping the long; but be associates, to to us, and for when you com in this respect

Mr. R. assure you with you,— the delegates and to meet l pleasure. I gratification a tended to us together, it wil your kindness. these comparis countries,—ha-