

PROCEEDINGS

3
/

AT THE

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE

HELD AT OTTAWA,

ON 19th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd JANUARY, 1875.

MONTREAL :

GAZETTE PRINTING HOUSE, NEARLY OPPOSITE THE POST OFFICE.

1875

OFFICE-BEARERS OF THE DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE,
FOR 1875.

President :

C. H. FAIRWEATHER, Esq., ST. JOHN, N.B.

Vice-Presidents :

ADAM BROWN, Esq., HAMILTON, ONT.
ANDREW ROBERTSON, Esq., MONTREAL, Q.
ROBERT MARSHALL, Esq., KING'S CO., ST. JOHN, N.B.
HON. W. J. STAIRS, HALIFAX, N.S.
HON. G. W. HOWLAN, CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.

Executive Council.

HENRY FRY, Esq., QUEBEC, Q.
W. H. HOWLAND, Esq., TORONTO, ONT.
WM. DARLING, Esq., MONTREAL, Q.
WM. PENNOCK, Esq., OTTAWA, ONT.
J. A. HARDING, Esq., ST. JOHN, N.B.
JOHN McLENNAN, Esq., MONTREAL, Q.
A. JOSEPH, Esq., QUEBEC, Q.
HENRY CUNNINGHAM, Esq., KINGSTON, ONT.

Treasurer :

C. H. GOULD, Esq., MONTREAL.

Secretary :

WILLIAM J. PATTERSON, MONTREAL.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

It affords me a great deal of satisfaction to be able to present the Report of Proceedings at Fifth Annual Meeting of the DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE, so much sooner than heretofore after the adjournment. It seemed expedient that arrangements should be made for prompt publication; and, very effectively seconded by my Assistant, Mr. W. J. B. Patterson, and by Mr. S. Hutchinson, of whose services as Reporter I have availed myself,—I am now able to distribute at this early date, copies as has been customary to the Members of the Dominion Parliament.

I believe the Board scarcely needs to be assured, that no labor nor care has been spared, while the Report was passing more rapidly than usual through the press; and it is hoped that the Representatives will recognize in it a fair transcript of what took place during the several sessions.

WM. J. PATTERSON,

Secretary.

MONTREAL, 18th February, 1875.

LIST OF BOARDS AND DELEGATES.

<i>Place.</i>	<i>Organization.</i>	<i>No. of Members.</i>	<i>Names of Delegates.</i>
Belleville, Ont.....	Board of Trade.....	15	Hon. Robert Read.
Brantford, Ont.....	Do	40	{ George Wilkes.
Galt, Ont.....	Do	30	{ Robert Henry.
Halifax, N.S.....	Chamber of Commerce.....	100	{ Thomas Cowan.
			{ Hon. W. J. Stairs.
			{ Robert Boak, Jr.
			{ Adam Brown.
			{ Adam Hope.
Hamilton, Ont.....	Board of Trade.....	160	{ W. F. Findlay.
			{ James Wylie.
			{ Henry Cunningham.
Kingston, Ont.....	Do	67	{ W. R. Mingaye.
			{ Robert Marshall.
King's County, N.B.....	Do	87	{ F. M. Sproul.
Levis, Que	Do	60	{ James Domville, M.P.*
			{ I. N. Belleau.
			{ E. W. Sewell.
London, Ont	Do	69	{ Isaac Waterman.
			{ F. Rowland.
			{ Wm. Darling.
			{ Thomas Cramp.
			{ Andrew Robertson.
Montreal, Que.....	Do	480	{ George A. Drummond.
			{ Thos. White, Jr.
			{ John McLennan.
			{ H. Shorey.
			{ James McDougall.
			{ R. T. Routh.
Do	Corn Exchange.....	280	{ Louis Tourville.
			{ G. M. Millar.
			{ James Magor.
			{ Hon. James Skead.
Ottawa, Ont	Board of Trade.....	150	{ Wm. Pennock.
			{ Francis Clemow.
			{ Ed. McGillivray.
Port Hope, Ont.....	Do	40	{ Wm. Craig.
			{ Joseph G. King.
			{ Henry Fry.
Quebec, Que.....	Do	170	{ A. Joseph.
			{ A. Woods.
			{ Joseph Shehyn.
Stratford, Ont.....	Do	22	{ P. R. Jarvis.
Strathroy, Ont.....	Do	45	{ Chas. Grist.
			{ B. H. Rothwell.*
St. Catherines, Ont.....	Do	45	{ Dr. L. S. Oille.
			{ Silvester Neelon.*
			{ Wm. Elder.
St. John, N.B.....	Do	164	{ C. H. Fairweather.*
			{ R. S. DeVeber.*
			{ J. A. Harding.
St. Johns, Que	Do	40	{ James McPherson.
			{ Alex. Defresne.
			{ Wm. Elliott.
Toronto, Ont.....	Do	150	{ John Mori-on.
			{ Jno. Gillespie.
			{ Patrick Hughes.
Do	Corn Exchange.....	70	{ W. H. Howland.
			{ James Young.*
Windsor, Ont.....	Board of Trade.....	43	{ James Dougall.
			{ G. W. Girdiestone.*

NOTE.—Names marked (*) indicate absence of delegates.

St
=
—
I. I
II. N
III.
IV.
—
V.
VI.
—
VII. E
VIII.
IX. I
I
T
X. T
XI. I
XII.

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION *at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, to be held in Ottawa, on Tuesday, 19th January, 1875, and following days.*

I.—Special Reports, &c.

<i>Subjects.</i>	<i>Board or Chamber Proposing.</i>	<i>Recommendations and Resolutions.</i>
I. DRAFT RECIPROCITY TREATY.		Report of the Special Committee appointed at Semi-Annual Meeting held in St. John, N.B.
II. DELEGATION TO NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.		Report of Chairman of Delegation to Autumn Meeting of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom.
III. INSURANCE POLICIES.		Report of Special Committee on Uniformity of conditions in Insurance Policies.
IV. PAST PRESIDENTS.	EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.	That the past Presidents of the Dominion Board of Trade be, and they hereby are, constituted <i>ex-officio</i> Members of the Executive Council, with the privilege of seats at all General Meetings of the Board, and right to participate in transaction of business.

II. Special Commercial Requirements.

V. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.	EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.	That the question of constituting a Department of Commerce in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, to be presided over by a Cabinet Minister, be urged upon the attention of the Dominion Government.
VI. TRIBUNALS OF COMMERCE.	EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.	That the question of establishing Tribunals of Commerce, or Arbitration Courts, be brought under the special notice of the Hon. Minister of Justice, with a view to the introduction of a measure during the next Session of the Dominion Parliament, to provide for the summary settlement of commercial disputes and differences.

III. Questions Relating to Internal Commerce.

VII. PREFERENCE OF ENTRY IN CANALS.	KINGSTON (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That representations be made to the Government, asking for the revocation of Order in Council of date September, 1873, giving preference of entry into Canadian Canals to Propellers over Barges and Sailing Craft, —such preference being detrimental to the Inland Shipping interest at large.
VIII. MONTREAL HARBOUR CHARGES.	TORONTO (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	The improvement of the Tariff of charges made by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.
IX. MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS OBSTRUCTING TRADE.	QUEBEC (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That the trade of the Dominion is obstructed and injured by the special local taxation levied under the several Municipal and City Corporation Acts now in force.
X. TELEGRAPH MONOPOLIES.	HAMILTON (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	The rights of Telegraph Companies to construct their lines along existing Railways.
XI. EXCESSIVE RATES OF EXPRESS COMPANIES.	OTTAWA (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	A paper regarding the exorbitant charges made by Express Companies, and recommending that the Express business of the Dominion should be in the hands of the Government, and under the management of the Post Office Department.
XII. GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.	KINGS COUNTY (N.B.) BOARD OF TRADE.	A paper on the practical results of Government owning and running Railroads in New Brunswick.

IV. Reciprocal Trade Relations.

<i>Subjects.</i>	<i>Board or Chamber Proposing.</i>	<i>Recommendations and Resolutions.</i>
XIII. RECIPROCITY TREATY.	LEVIS (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	The proposed Reciprocity Treaty between Canada and the United States.

V. Insolvency Legislation.

XIV. INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.	EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.	That a Special Committee of Members be appointed for the purpose of conferring with the Hon. Minister of Justice upon the subject of amending and continuing the Insolvent Act of 1869.
XV. EXTRADITION OF DEBTORS.	TORONTO (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	The extension of the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Canada, so as to include the extradition of fraudulent debtors.

VI.—Inspection.

XVI. APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTORS.	TORONTO (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That this Board memorialize Parliament in favor of so amending the General Inspection Law, as that the appointment of Inspectors for the various kinds of Produce shall be made by the Councils of the Boards of Trade, as was the case prior to the change in the Law made in 1873.
XVII. INSPECTION OF FISH.	LEVIS (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That this Board should petition the Federal Government, on the necessity of establishing a thorough system for the General Inspection of Fish.

VII.—Transportation—Average Adjusters, &c.

XVIII. RIGHTS AND LIABILITIES OF COMMON CARRIERS.	MONTREAL (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That the Executive Council be, and hereby is, instructed to petition Parliament in favor of the passage of an Act to clearly define the respective rights and liabilities of Common Carriers by land and water, as well as delivery of Goods by vessels arriving in Ports of the Dominion.
XIX. AVERAGE ADJUSTERS.	MONTREAL (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That the Executive Council of the Dominion Board of Trade be, and is hereby, instructed to procure the enactment by the Parliament of the Dominion, of a law for the establishment and regulation of the Office of Average Adjusters at the principal Ports in Canada.
XX. INQUIRY INTO MARINE DISASTERS.	QUEBEC (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That in the opinion of this Board a public inquiry should take place immediately after all shipwrecks or serious accidents in Canadian Waters, and that the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be called to this important matter, by the Executive Council.

VIII.—Insurance, Stamp Duties, &c.

<i>Subjects.</i>	<i>Board or Chamber Proposing.</i>	<i>Recommendations and Resolutions.</i>
XXI. INSURANCE INSPECTORS.	LEVIS (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	On the advisability of the nomination of Insurance Inspectors by the Government.
XXII. UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS IN INSURANCE POLICIES.	TORONTO (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That a memorial be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, in favor of the Government procuring the enactment of a law to provide for uniformity of conditions in Fire Insurance Policies.
XXIII. STAMP DUTIES.	HALIFAX (N.S.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.	That the law requiring Stamps to be affixed to Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange, is vexatious in its principle, partial in its operation, and the burden it entails hinders the adjustment and settlement of balances, especially in the rural districts, demoralizing in the ease with which it can be evaded, and the difficulties and impossibilities in many instances of fulfilling its provisions; while the revenue it yields is so small, as to be of but little practical value to the Finances of the Dominion; and that in the opinion of this Chamber the law should be repealed at the earliest practicable day.
XXIV. DISALLOWED BILLS OF EXCHANGE.	QUEBEC (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That with the improved modes of communication now existing, it has become unjust and inexpedient to subject disallowed Bills of Exchange, to the damages allowed by the Articles 2,336 and 2,337 of the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec.

IX.—Excise, &c.

XXV. DUTIES ON NATIVE TOBACCO.	LEVIS (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	The abolition of the duties on Tobacco, the product of Canada.
XXVI. DUTIES ON SHIPPING MATERIALS.	LEVIS (Q.) BOARD OF TRADE.	The abolition of the duties on Shipping Materials.
XXVII. WEIGHT VS. GAUGING OF LIQUIDS.	KINGSTON (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	<i>Whereas</i> the sale of liquids by gauging, as practiced, is highly unsatisfactory, and in different part of the country represents different quantities; Therefore be it <i>Resolved</i> :— That this Board memorialize the Government, to enact such legislation as will compel the adoption of the uniform standard throughout the Dominion; and that in the opinion of the Board, sales by weight would be preferable.
XXVIII. THE IRON INTEREST.	OTTAWA (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	A paper on the development of the mineral wealth of the Dominion—with a special reference to the Iron Mines of the Ottawa Valley.

X.—Canal Enlargement.

XXIX. ENLARGEMENT OF WELLAND CANAL.	ST. CATHERINES (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That in the opinion of this Board the question of the depth of the enlarged Welland Canal should be reconsidered, and that provision should be made for the passage of the largest class of vessels used on the upper Lakes, by increasing the proposed depth to fourteen (14) feet at least on the mitre sills of the Locks.
XXX. DEEPENING OF WELLAND CANAL.	WINDSOR (ONT.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That this Board is of opinion that the Welland Canal should be deepened to at least 14 feet on the mitre sills, and 15 feet on the level, instead of 10 feet as contemplated at present.

Unclassed Notices of Subjects.

<i>Subjects.</i>	<i>Board or Chamber Proposing.</i>	<i>Recommendations and Resolutions.</i>
XXXI. WRECKS IN CANADIAN WATERS.	EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.	How may the difficulties and dangers of the St. Lawrence and Lake Navigation be lessened?
XXXII. THE BAY VERTE CANAL.	ST. JOHN (N.B.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That this Board would urge upon the Government the desirableness of having the Bay Verte Canal constructed at as early a period as possible, inasmuch as this Board looks upon the Canal as a most important Dominion work, eminently in the interest of Inter-Provincial and International Trade.
XXXIII. DECK LOADS.	ST. JOHN (N.B.) BOARD OF TRADE.	That the Government be urged to repeal the law affecting the carrying of Deck Loads, so far as relates to the Atlantic and West India Trade from the Province of New Brunswick.
XXXIV. TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS.	TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE.	Commercial Travellers' Associations, and charges for Licences to Commercial Travellers made in certain Cities.
XXXV. CUSTOMS REGULATIONS.	MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE.	That the attention of the Government be called to the system of the Examination of Goods at the various Ports of the Dominion, and recommend that the same be made as nearly uniform as possible; also, That the rate charged for the Examination of Goods after the duty is paid, should either be discontinued, or, that the same rate should be exacted at every Port of Entry in the Dominion. Further, that additional Appraisers should be appointed at such of the large Ports as require them in the exigencies of business; and that only such persons should be selected for these positions, as are competent from long experience in the branches of trade to which they are appointed Appraisers.

WM. J. PATTERSON,
Secretary.

MONTREAL, 6th January, 1875.

open
Aft
read

MAI

Semi
confi

Rep

To ti

Meet
that
Parli
tution
full r
ance
script
to ea
ber o
Memo
Gene
them

PROCEEDINGS.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE ROOM,
OTTAWA, *January 19, 1875.*

THE Fifth Annual Meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade was opened at noon, the President, W. H. HOWLAND, Esq., in the Chair. After calling the meeting to order, he announced the first order to be the reading of the minutes.

Hon. ROBERT READ (Belleville), moved, seconded by Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (King's Co., N.B.),

"That the Minutes of Annual Meeting held in Ottawa, in February, 1874, and of Semi-Annual Meeting held in St. John, N.B., in July, 1874, be taken as read and confirmed."

Motion carried.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The SECRETARY, Mr. WM. J. PATTERSON, then read the Annual Report of the Executive Council, as follows :

To the REPRESENTATIVES constituting the

DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE:—

The EXECUTIVE COUNCIL have pleasure in presenting to the Fifth Annual Meeting, a brief summary of proceedings since the session held here in February, 1874,—that month being necessarily chosen, it will be remembered, an account of the General Parliamentary Elections occurring during the week in which, according to the Constitution, it had been requisite to assemble. No time was lost in preparing and printing a full report of the proceedings of the Annual Meeting,—the more than ordinary importance of the topics considered, warranting an extended, and in most cases *verbatim* transcript of the discussions. The requisite number of copies was immediately forwarded to each affiliated Board,—one copy being sent, as on all former occasions, to each member of the House of Commons and of the Senate.

As soon as possible after the adjournment in February, the various Petitions, Memorials, Resolutions, &c., ordered to be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, and to Parliament, were transmitted, and acknowledgments of them received. They included the following:—

Memorials.—On Canadian Shipping and Mr. Plimsoll's Bill.

The Excise Duty on Petroleum.
 The Gauging of Liquids.
 Appointment of Average Adjusters.
 Free Postal delivery in cities and towns.

Resolutions.—Relating to Canal Enlargement.

Railway Tariffs.
 Obstructions to Navigation.
 Revision of the Customs Tariff on the Canal at Sault Ste. Marie.
 Customs Regulations.
 The Cental System.
 The Fishery Commission.
 Suits against Government.
 Telegraphic Communication with Prince Edward Island.
 The Cultivation of Trade with the West Indies.

Reports.— On the Insolvency Act of 1869.

Inland Navigation.
 The General Inspection Law.

ACTION OF GOVERNMENT ON IMPORTANT QUESTIONS.

Free Postal Delivery.—It will be noticed, on examining the Official Programme, that some of the questions above referred to will again come before the Board for consideration. It is gratifying, however, to state that one of the important subjects upon which an unanimous opinion has again and again been pronounced, is now effectually removed from the arena of discussion,—viz., free postal delivery in cities and towns. The Executive Council are convinced that the action of the Government in this matter will be hailed with satisfaction, not alone by the organizations forming the Dominion Board of Trade, but by every merchant and business man in Canada; and it is hoped that, as soon as practicable, the advantages of the system will be extended to every city and town.

Reciprocal Reduction in Postage Rates.—A welcome feature in connection with recent changes in postal arrangements, is the reduction of rates on letters, newspapers, &c., between Canada and the United States. Some amelioration as regards newspaper, magazine and periodical postage, took effect on the 1st instant; but additional arrangements are in contemplation, to come into force at an early day. On and after the 1st proximo, the single letter rate between any place in the United States and any place in Canada, and *vice versa*, will be three cents, prepayment obligatory, with free delivery in the respective countries. An international Money Order exchange with the United States will also be carried into effect as soon as practicable.

West India Trade.—The desirability of procuring increased facilities for direct trade with the British and foreign West Indies, has been strongly expressed by this Board, and the publication of an advertisement by the Post Office Department, calling for tenders for the conveyance of mails between Canada and the West Indies, is a matter of satisfaction. The steamers must be first-class, of a tonnage not less than 1200 tons, and have a speed of at least nine knots an hour. The tenders asked for are for a monthly or fortnightly service,—any contract made, to take effect on 1st June, 1875.

CANAL ENLARGEMENT.—BAY VERTE CANAL.

During the month of March, a circular—to which very general circulation had, it is believed, been given,—was received from the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, as follows:—

The question of the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals being now under consideration, it has been deemed advisable to invite Boards of Trade, Shipowners, Forwarders, and persons directly interested, to give information and state their views on the following points:—

1st. What is the cost of transporting grain per bushel direct from Ports on the Upper Lakes to Montreal, by sailing vessels of from 300 to 500 tons burden; and by Propellers of a like carrying capacity; also the cost per bushel in each case, and difference in time, if the grain is transhipped at Kingston, and delivered at Montreal by barges?

2nd. What would be the probable cost of transportation of grain per bushel from Ports on the Upper Lakes to Montreal direct by sailing vessels of 1,000 tons burden, and by Propellers of a like capacity; also the cost per bushel in each case, and difference in time likely to be occupied, if the grain be transhipped at Kingston, and delivered at Montreal by barges?

3rd. The Welland Canal being now in progress of enlargement to a bottom width of 100 feet, and a depth of 13 feet, or least sectional area 1638 feet, locks 270 feet long between the gates, and 45 feet wide, with a depth of 12 feet water on the sills; would the interests of Commerce, in your opinion, warrant an expenditure of *Ten Millions of Dollars*, or more, in making the Canals between Prescott and Montreal of like dimensions?

At a special meeting, your Council considered the communication, and transmitted the following replies:

QUERIES ONE AND TWO.

The Executive Council of the Dominion Board of Trade, are of opinion, that the varied information on the subjects of these two questions, given in the Report of the Canal Commission (see pp. 103-229) renders it unnecessary to enter upon any calculations to reproduce answers to these questions.

QUERY THREE.

The Executive Council beg most respectfully to draw attention to the circumstance that the Canal Commission, above referred to,—having given attention to the opinions of experienced Engineers,—recommended uniform dimensions for the Welland, St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals, viz., 270 x 45 x 12 feet. The estimates for the necessary enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals amounted to \$3,150,000, and for the Lachine Canal \$1,350,000—making an aggregate of \$4,500,000. The Circular Letter now under consideration, however, strongly implies, if it does not positively assert, that the enlargement of the St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals would cost “ten millions of dollars or more.” It is, therefore, most respectfully recommended that the data upon which the latter statement is made be published, for the information of those interested in Canal enlargement.

The Executive Council are decidedly of opinion, that *uniformity of dimensions* in the Welland, St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals, is of paramount importance,—that the *depth of water* (especially in the Welland Canal) should be equal to passing the largest vessels navigating Lake Michigan,—and that if consistent with the financial possibilities of the Dominion Government, the improvement and enlargement of the Welland, St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals should be prosecuted simultaneously.

It appears further to the Executive Council that it is of immensely greater importance to establish a true principle for *adequate* enlargement of the Canal system of the Dominion, and then prosecute the works as rapidly as the financial situation will admit of,—than to question about a hypothetical expenditure which, so far possibly as can be known by most of those to whom the circular-letter has been addressed,—and in the absence of any information differing in character from that afforded by the Canal Commission,—may or may not be confirmed by engineering details.

Certified a true copy,

(Signed,)

WM. J. PATTERSON, *Secretary.*

MONTREAL, 20th March, 1874.

Canal Enlargement.—The general question of canal enlargement seems to be settled by the action of the Government. The contracts for the Welland, with the exception of a single section, have been let, the basis of enlargement being locks 270 × 45 × 12 feet, and the work is said to be progressing favorably. It will be seen from the Official Programme, however, that notice is given by the St. Catherines Board of Trade, suggesting that the question of *depth* on the enlarged Welland should be reconsidered, and that provision should be made for the passage of the largest class of vessels used on the upper Lakes, by increasing the proposed depth to fourteen (14) feet at least, on the mitre sills of the locks.

It is understood that the work of enlarging the St. Lawrence Canals will be pushed forward as rapidly as possible.

The Bay Verte Canal.—An advertisement has been inserted in several newspapers, informing intending contractors that tenders would probably be called for about the month of January, for the work of constructing the Bay Verte Canal. Meanwhile they could examine a lithographic map, as the work of preparing plans, specifications, &c., is being proceeded with preparatory to the calling for tenders.

INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR COASTING TRADE.

Reciprocal arrangements for participating in the coasting trade of Canada have been entered into as undermentioned. Orders in Council were issued by the Dominion Government, indicating that Canadian ships were allowed the coasting trade of certain European countries, as follows:—To vessels of Italy, 13th August, 1873; Germany, 14th May, 1874; the Netherlands, 9th September, 1874; Norway and Sweden, 5th November, 1874. By Order in Council, dated 11th April, 1874, the Government of Brazil allows, for the present, all foreign vessels to carry national and foreign goods between any ports of that Empire where a Custom House exists.

CANADIAN TONNAGE AND MR. PLIMSOLL'S BILL.

Before leaving Ottawa at the close of the Annual Meeting, your Council, in accordance with a resolution passed during the second day's proceedings, considered the draft of a Memorial for submission to the Government, which was subsequently adopted, and forwarded, as follows:—

*To His Excellency Earl Dufferin, Governor-General of the Dominion of Canada, in Council.
The Memorial of the Dominion Board of Trade:*

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That the tonnage owned and registered in the Dominion of Canada, in proportion to her population, exceeds that of any other country in the world:

That Canada now ranks *fourth*, if not *third*, as regards gross amount of tonnage, and that the building of vessels as well in the vicinity of our great inland waters as in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, is one of the prominent and most profitable of the industries of this country:

That prior to the Confederation of the Provinces in 1867, our large-sized vessels were, as a rule, built under contracts for parties in England and elsewhere, and that when they once passed out of the builders' hands, our interest in them ceased:

That the practice of building vessels for sale, has been almost wholly abandoned, and that now ship-builders, being joined by Canadian capitalists, build their vessels, whether for inland, coastwise, or deep-sea voyages, and own them and reap the advantage or loss in the business, as the case may be; our ships are now found on every sea in the commercial world—carrying valuable East India and other cargoes, delivering the same in the best of order, and in a condition as satisfactory as by first-class iron freight vessels:

That the Bill introduced some time ago by Mr. PLIMSOLL in reference to shipping—and more recently the appointment by Her Majesty's Government of a Royal Commission to enquire into and report upon the matter,—has caused the marked attention of people of all maritime countries to be given to questions concerning the character, condition and loading of ships; and the feeling in the United Kingdom is so wide spread that Parliament will in all probability legislate in the matter :

That the people and Parliament of England, however desirous of doing ample justice to her loyal subjects in the Dominion, cannot be supposed to know thoroughly how much one of the great Departments of Canadian industries may be injured by attempting to legislate for us in this matter :

That the people and Parliament of Canada will join heartily with our mother country in doing all that humanity demands for the preservation of life at sea, or that a judicious precaution requires; as instanced when, at the last session of Parliament, *an Act was passed limiting deck loads to a reasonable quantity*, and also another intituled "*An Act relating to shipping, and for the Registration, Inspection and Classification thereof*;" but they strongly object that so noble a purpose may, from want of a knowledge of the true position which our shipping now occupies, be made a plea for detrimental interference with our ships which contribute so largely to our importance and wealth :

Your Memorialists THEREFORE HUMBLY PRAY, THAT YOUR EXCELLENCY in Council may, in view of the fact that legislation will be proposed in the Parliament of Great Britain, consequent upon the report of the Royal Commission recently held in London, adopt such measures as the Government, in its wisdom, may deem necessary to prevent such legislation from prejudicially affecting the tonnage of the Dominion of Canada.

And, as in duty bound, your Memorialists, &c.

In name, and on behalf of the Dominion Board of Trade,

(Signed) W. H. HOWLAND, *President.*

(Signed,) WM. J. PATTERSON, *Secretary.*

MONTREAL, 12th March, 1874.

INACCURACY OF OFFICIAL STATISTICS.

Attention was drawn to the remarks of the President in his opening address at the Fourth Annual Meeting, relative to the inaccuracy of Statistics of Imports and Exports, as published by Government, as well as to the delay and incorrectness in the Monthly Bank Statements; and a letter was addressed to the Hon. Minister of Finance, as follows :

OFFICE DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE,

MONTREAL, March 30, 1874.

HON. R. J. CARTWRIGHT,
Minister of Finance,

OTTAWA.

SIR,

I am directed by the President and Council of the Dominion Board of Trade, to solicit your early attention to the circumstance, that a very large difference has uniformly, for a number of years, appeared to exist between the official totals representing the import and export trade of the country. They have reason to believe that much, if not all, of that apparent discrepancy may arise from imperfect returns, or from want of returns, especially of shipments by Railway Companies. Indeed, the President and Council have some evidence at present before them, tending to show that much of the Commerce on Railways (especially *through* traffic) is carried on without the Government's having any definite knowledge of its variety and quantity. They believe especially that a great deal of *through* traffic in bond, on United States account, passes unchecked or unregistered, (so far as the interests of Government are concerned) and unmolested by Customs or other official charges; while the traffic in bond passing through the United States from one part of Canada to another is onerously and vexatiously hampered and impeded.

I am also to bring to your notice the following extract from a recently published Blue Book, issued by the British Government, in which the Agricultural Department of our Government is unfavorably referred to :—

“ The tables that follow those for Great Britain, contain all the recent agricultural statistics that have reached this Department for the several Colonies. Statistics relating to the agriculture of British India, especially of Bengal, would have been read with much interest at the present time ; but, unfortunately, complete returns of this description have not yet been obtained for any of the Provinces of our Indian Empire. There is almost a blank in the Colonial tables for that important Colony, the Dominion of Canada, for which the most recent Statistics received only relate to the production of Corn in 1868.”

I am further to draw your attention to the circumstance, that the Statistics of your Department (particularly the Monthly Bank Statement) have been adversely commented upon in the newspaper press, as regards the almost constant delay in their publication,—while their accuracy has been impugned.

With reference to the foregoing statements (which had their special consideration,) I am, on behalf of the President and Council of this Board, to express the hope that you will concur with them in thinking that,—in the interest of the trade and commerce of the Dominion,—it is essential that the official returns should be full and reliable :—that the Statistics of the Agriculture of Canada should be carefully compiled, and published annually as in Great Britain and in the United States,—particularly that the odium of the reference in the foregoing extract ought to be promptly removed :—also that the Bank Statements, as well as Insurance Returns, should not only be most carefully compiled, but promptly communicated to the mercantile public.

In view of the foregoing particulars, the President and Council desire me most respectfully to suggest that you will be pleased to institute a thorough inquiry into them for the purpose of providing such remedy as may be needful,—and especially that you will, whenever necessary, apply such remedy as in your judgment will meet the several requirements, and if requisite invoke the interposition of the Executive Council of the Government.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

(Signed) WM. J. PATTERSON, *Secretary.*

An acknowledgement of the foregoing communication was received from the Secretary of the Finance Minister, as follows :—

“ I am directed by the Minister of Finance to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of yesterday's date, and to inform you that several of the subjects referred to are now receiving the consideration of the Government.”

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

The Insolvent Law, which has so repeatedly engaged the attention of your Executive Council, was more thoroughly dealt with at the last Annual Meeting than had been previously attempted, inasmuch as a large committee, representing nearly all sections of the country, gave the subject their earnest attention, and drew up a report setting forth the amendments and recommendations deemed necessary. This report was subsequently presented to the Honorable the Minister of Justice, and also to the Governor-General in Council ; it was published in full in the proceedings of the Annual Meeting, and doubtless reached every member of the affiliated organizations.

During the then ensuing session of Parliament, a new Insolvency Bill was laid before the House, by the Hon. Minister of Justice. The report of the Special Committee of this Board on Insolvency, who afterwards considered the proposed Bill and presented their views thereon at the St. John meeting in July, indicated how far the recommendations of this body had influenced legislation. [For Committee's Report, see the published St. John, N. B., proceedings, pp 52—54.]

It will now be for the Board to determine what further action should be taken in the interest of the commerce and trade of the Dominion,—in view of this most important subject being brought before Parliament during the approaching session.

SUMMER MEETING AT ST. JOHN, N.B.—RECIPROCITY TREATY, &C.

Acting upon the invitation from the St. John Board of Trade, formally accepted at Ottawa, your Council, early in the Summer, commenced preparations for the special session, which they decided should be held in St. John, on the 16th day of July. At that meeting there were 48 delegates present, representing 20 different cities and towns,—while the following gentlemen attended from the National Board of Trade of the United States:—

Portland : T. C. Hersey, Esq., Chairman.
Cincinnati : W. W. Taylor, Esq.
New York : John Austin Stevens, Jr., Esq.
Boston : B. F. Nourse, Esq.
Milwaukee : W. E. Smith, Esq.
Detroit : R. Hawley, Esq.
Buffalo : E. P. Dorr, Esq.

A full report of this important gathering was published soon after adjournment, and extensively circulated, so that any statement of the business done there, seems needless in the present report.

That the draft Reciprocity Treaty formed the principal subject of discussion, is generally known,—and the following resolution was adopted as the result:—

1st—"That this Board reiterates its frequently expressed opinion in favour of a Treaty of Reciprocity between the United States and Canada.

2nd—"That while the document known as the new Reciprocity Treaty contains many desirable provisions, particularly those which relate to the exchange of natural productions between the United States and Canada, and the reciprocal extension of maritime privileges, it is, notwithstanding, defective in the privileges secured for Canada, which are not nearly so valuable as those conceded to the United States; and that this Board, by means of a proper Committee, or otherwise, do take steps to represent to the Government of Canada those aspects of the treaty in which it is unfair to Canada, or might operate prejudicially to Canadian interests."

A Committee was accordingly appointed by the President of this Board, consisting of Messrs. :—

Hugh McLennan,	Montreal, Que., <i>Convener.</i>
Wm. Darling,	"
Thos. White, Jr.,	"
A. Joseph,	Quebec, Que.
Henry Fry,	"
Wm. Harty,	Kingston, Ont.
Jno. Gillespie,	Toronto, Ont.
J. M. Trout,	"
Adam Brown,	Hamilton, Ont.
Jno. Stuart,	"
Hon. James Skead,	Ottawa, Ont.
Sylvester Neelon,	St. Catherines, Ont.
Chas. H. Fairweather,	St. John, N.B.
Hon. T. R. Jones,	"
Cathcart Thomson,	Halifax, N.S.
Robert Boak, Jr.,	"
Wm. J. B. Patterson,	Montreal, <i>Secretary of Committee.</i>

After very carefully examining and considering the proposed Treaty in the light of the discussion by the Board, a report was prepared and forwarded to Government. The

Committee, however, deemed it proper and wise to withhold their report from publicity, until they had formally presented it at this (Fifth) General Meeting. It will be called for in the early order of business.

LIGHT DUES.

At the Summer meeting, a resolution was also passed, with respect to the tax on shipping for the support of lights on the coasts of Great Britain, as follows:—

“That the Executive Council do present a respectful remonstrance to the Imperial Government, through His Excellency the Governor General, against the continued taxation of Canadian Ships in Britain for the support of lights and buoys, showing that all lights and buoys throughout the Dominion are supported solely by Dominion funds, and are free to ships of all nations.”

A memorial was subsequently prepared, and despatched to the Honorable the Secretary of State, for transmission to Her Majesty the Queen. The following is the text:—

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

The Humble Memorial of the Executive Council of the Dominion Board of Trade,

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:—

That your Memorialists represent about 30 Boards of Trade and other Commercial organizations in various parts of the Dominion of Canada.

That said Dominion owns, at present, over one million tons of shipping, the greater portion of which is engaged in trading to Great Britain and different parts of Europe.

That fully twelve hundred (1,200) miles of coast-line around the Dominion are lighted and buoyed at the sole expense of the Government of Canada, a full share of the cost of which is borne by Canadian Shipowners.

That these Lights and Buoys are absolutely *free* to all nations of the world.

That the cost of maintaining Lights and Buoys on the Coasts of the United States, France, Russia, Prussia and Spain, is borne by their respective Governments, and said Lights and Buoys are free to the ships of all nations.

That the tax levied upon Canadian Ships, in common with all other ships, when visiting Great Britain, is felt as a serious burthen, inasmuch as many of these Ships make three or four voyages per annum, and are compelled to pay “light dues” twice every voyage,—(unless in ballast); and especially is this so felt, as the cost of Canadian Lights and Buoys, (which are *free* to British Ships,) falls partly on the Shipowners of the Dominion, who are thus placed in an unfavorable position, as compared with British and other Shipowners.

That the “Light Dues” of Great Britain, as at present enforced, are full of anomalies,—one of which is, that Ships discharging at French and other Continental Ports, which have passed English lights, pay no dues; whilst, if they discharge at British Ports, the tax is enforced.

Wherefore: Your Memorialists humbly pray, that in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committees of the House of Commons which sat in 1845 and in 1860, the said tax may be abolished,—and that all expenses for the erection and maintenance of Light-Houses, Light-Ships, Buoys and Beacons, on the Coasts of the United Kingdom, be henceforth defrayed out of the public revenue.

And your Memorialists as in duty bound will ever pray.

Signed on behalf of the Executive Council
of the Dominion Board of Trade,
Montreal, 28th November, 1874.

(Signed,)

W. H. HOWLAND,

President

(Signed,)

WM. J. PATTERSON,

Secretary.

unde
Pilo
Min
Hon

call
the
John
deli
as f
“
“ di
“ pu

nur
acci
been
stat
Gen
its j
whic
to t
imp
appl

T
Wm

SIR,

you
Anr
pun
that
De
clav
to.
Fis
tak
the
imm

THE PILOTAGE ACT.

Mr. Henry Fry, of Quebec, having pointed out at the Semi-Annual Meeting, that under the 71st clause of the Pilotage Act of the Session of 1873, the punishment of Pilots is practically impossible, the annexed communication was forwarded to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:—

MONTREAL, *November 26, 1874.*

HON. A. J. SMITH,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
OTTAWA.

SIR,

I have the honor, by direction of the President and Executive Council, to call your attention to the accompanying copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at the Semi-Annual Meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, held in the City of St. John, New Brunswick, in July last, with reference to the trial and punishment of delinquent Pilots, under the Act recently passed, 36 Vict., Chap. 54. The resolution is as follows:—

“That the attention of the Honorable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be directed to the practical operation of the 71st clause of the Pilotage Act, by which the punishment of Pilots is taken out of the hands of the Local Pilot Authorities.”

The President and Council are informed that during the past season, a large number of collisions,—in one of which five lives were sacrificed,—as well as other accidents, have occurred in the Lower St. Lawrence, and that no inquiry of any sort has been instituted, nor have any of the Pilots been subjected to trial or punishment. This state of things has arisen in consequence of an opinion given by the late Attorney-General of the Province of Quebec, that the 71st clause deprives the Trinity House of its jurisdiction in such cases, and left Pilots to be punished by indictment,—a course which Shipmasters will not pursue or adopt. As the Act is a general one, and applies to the whole Dominion, I am directed to ask your immediate consideration of this important matter, inasmuch as the President and Council trust a proper remedy may be applied at the earliest possible time after the meeting of Parliament.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed,) WM. J. PATTERSON,
Secretary.

The following reply was received:—

OTTAWA, *December 7, 1874.*

WM. J. PATTERSON, Esq.
Secretary Dominion Board of Trade,
MONTREAL.

SIR,

I am requested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 26th ultimo, forwarding a copy of a resolution adopted at the Semi-Annual Meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, with reference to the trial and punishment of delinquent Pilots, under the Act 36 Vict., Cap. 54, and to inform you that previous to the receipt of your letter, the subject had engaged the attention of this Department, and the Department of Justice had been consulted as to whether the 71st clause of the Act had deprived the Trinity House of its jurisdiction in the cases referred to. In the opinion both of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the punishment of Pilots by suspension of their Certificates had not been taken away from the Pilotage Authorities mentioned in the Act. But I am to state that the subject is still under the consideration of this Department, and will receive immediate attention.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed,) WM. SMITH,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

GENERAL BILL TO ESTABLISH BOARDS OF TRADE.

During the Session of the Dominion Parliament, 1874, a Bill to provide for organizing Boards of Trade throughout Canada was assented to. The main object of it is to save the trouble and expense of procuring Special Acts of Incorporation,—especially to those places where the number of members in a purely commercial organization would be comparatively small. Your Council have reason to believe that the provisions of the Act have already been made available,—and expect to find many towns stimulated to the formation of Boards of Trade.

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES, GREAT BRITAIN, AND FRANCE.

Among the substantial results aimed at by your Executive Council, as well as by their predecessors in office, one was the bringing together representatives of the various commercial organizations which exist throughout Canada, and the consolidation, as far as was practicable, of commercial interests and influences. Another was the establishment of friendly relations between the merchants and business-men of the Dominion and those of other countries. The very pleasant intercourse of this Board, on various occasions, with the United States National Board of Trade, is doubtless fresh in the memory of those who have had the good fortune to be present at our general meetings, or to be on the several delegations which have met that Board at St. Louis, New York, or Chicago. We will all be most happy to have our United States friends here again.

The delegation appointed to attend the Autumn Meeting at Newcastle-on-Tyne, in September last, of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain, received an exceedingly cordial welcome, and their report will be presented among the early orders of business.

The Council of the Montreal Board of Trade have afforded the Executive Council the gratification of reporting the opening of correspondence with the "Comité Central des Chambres Syndicales" of France. Through the kindness of E. J. Barbeau, Esq., Assistant Receiver-General of the Dominion at Montreal, your Secretary has been placed in communication with that organization, and also with the "Commission de Géographié Commerciale." He has forwarded a number of documents, including sets of the Annual Report of this Board, and also of the Montreal Commercial Reports; and M. Farrenc of Paris will make the merchants of France acquainted with such particulars of the Foreign Trade of Canada as are likely to be of interest to his countrymen. He has already rendered valuable service to the foreign trade of the Dominion by his writings.

In one of his communications to Mr. Barbeau, Mr. Farrenc acknowledges the value and usefulness of the documents forwarded to Paris, and says—

"There is not the slightest doubt but that the international trade relations which we are endeavoring to establish between France and Canada will be achieved,—and that the movement which you are so disinterestedly assisting in, is destined to produce favorable results,—much more favorable than you can imagine. Already, our lumber trade of this year is double that of last year. I am preparing just now, a considerable work respecting our imports from, and exports to Canada, from which it will appear that England sells to France what she gets from you. We export at present 100,000,000 kilos of Sugar, of which a large quantity is shipped to England;—not only do we export our refined, but also our raw sugar, which, owing to the improvements in our machinery, we can sell at a lower price than you can buy either in Brazil or elsewhere,—I mean Beet-root Sugar, which is equal, if not superior, to Cane-Sugar. I wish you would communicate this fact to Mr. Patterson, and also with the large importers on the subject. It is certain if we can supply Canada direct with Sugar, and other merchandise, we will take Lumber in exchange, &c., &c."

with
marl
in C
Cans
now

open
be o
inter

orga
subn

orga
dispr
case
Prog
been
the
atter

able
Ann
inco
case,
and
consi
if Se
atter
opini
that

loss
a def
with
Art.
" me
" me
draw
on "
to C
distr

In a subsequent communication Mr. Farrenc says:—

“Your Woods are not the only articles which, I am sure, can be exported to France with profit. Your Meats, both dried and smoked, and your Fish, would command a market. The Petroleum for which you want purchasers,—seeing the low prices ruling in Canada,—would also meet a ready sale, as it is more and more coming into use. Canadian Cheese is already known, and appreciated for its excellence. All these, which now come to us from England, could be shipped to France direct.”

One of the points involved in these remarks of Mr. Farrenc, appears to be the opening of direct steamship communication with France,—while it is expected such will be opened up, ere long, with Germany also; and without doubt the trade and shipping interests of the Dominion will look forward hopefully to such a consummation.

It is expected that a special communication on the subject of an international organization of Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce, will by-and-by be submitted for consideration.

A WORD TO AFFILIATED BOARDS.

The Council regret that they have to give a kindly hint to many of the affiliated organizations, in that too much dilatoriness occurs in replying to official Circular-letters dispatched from the Secretary's office from time to time; particularly has this been the case with the Annual Circular requesting notices of subjects for insertion on the Official Programme to be sent in. By their neglecting to comply, the Secretary has sometimes been hindered from preparing the Programme for circulation in the time specified in the Constitution,—viz., within thirty days before each Annual Meeting. A little attention would obviate this difficulty, thus saving time and inconvenience.

THE TREASURER'S ACCOUNTS.

The Executive Council regret to inform you that the Treasurer reports a considerable deficit in revenue for the year just ended. It will be recollected that at the last Annual Meeting the Special Committee on Finance were of opinion that the probable income would fully meet the estimated expenditure; and such would have been the case, but for the extra outlay involved in the production of the enlarged Annual Report and in connection with the Semi-Annual session held in July. There is necessarily considerable expenditure connected directly and indirectly with general meetings; and if Semi-Annual Assemblies are continued, the question of expenditure will demand the attention of the Finance Committee. Were the Executive Council required to give an opinion, or make a recommendation as to Summer Meetings, it would be to the effect that no ordinary amount of expenditure ought to be an obstacle to holding them.

The Treasurer has to report *four* defaulting Boards during the year, resulting in a loss to the revenue of \$161.25, and making the aggregate fund less able to sustain such a deficit as that above referred to. With reference to Boards dropping out of connection without notice of any kind being given, the Council beg to call attention to Sec. 2 of Art. IX., of the Constitution, which says:—“Any constituent body may withdraw from membership in the Board, on submitting a formal request to that effect at an annual meeting, and on full payment of all dues.”

But for the deficit above mentioned, your Executive Council would have gladly drawn an order upon the Treasurer for the value of a quantity of copies of a pamphlet on “The Great Water Highways of the Dominion, together with Appendices relating to Commerce and Navigation,” published by your Secretary,—with the intention of distributing them among the Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain. It seems proper

that such information as it contains should be widely disseminated; and the matter is therefore brought under consideration.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Executive Council,—

(Signed,)

W. H. HOWLAND,

President.

OTTAWA, 18th January, 1875.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), moved, seconded by Mr. WILLIAM ELLIOTT (Toronto), "That the Annual Report of the Executive Council, just read, be received and adopted."

INACCURACY OF OFFICIAL STATISTICS.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec): Before the report is adopted, I am anxious to draw the special attention of the Board to that paragraph in the Report which refers to the inaccuracy of official statistics. At St. John, last summer, the Hon. Senator from Prince Edward Island (Mr. HOWLAN) stated, that if we entered into the arbitration on the subject of Fisheries compensation with the officials of the United States, we should find ourselves at great disadvantage, owing to the unreliability and incompleteness of our statistics; while, on the other hand, the Americans by their system of collecting statistics, would be prepared with an array of figures to shew the value of their Fisheries, which would quite astonish us. The importance to this country of having full and correct statistics upon all matters relating to our trade and industries, was too evident to require argument. For many years past it has been the practice to allow manifests of vessels' cargo to be made up by a junior clerk, and to him was left the task of placing a value upon the goods. This defect was to some extent remedied by the local Act, which compels merchants to make declarations of the goods being shipped, for the purpose of imposing a Harbour Tax; but I am told that in Upper Canada no statistics are obtained of exports by railway. If that is the case it is very deplorable, and may produce results which, at some future time, may very seriously affect this country. My object now is merely to call the attention of the Board to this matter; but at a later stage of the proceedings, I may perhaps be permitted to move a resolution on the subject. In the meantime I would be glad to hear any member of the Board who may have any information to offer with reference to this matter.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton): In Ontario this subject is receiving serious consideration. What Mr. FRY has stated is perfectly correct. We have no reliable statistics whatever respecting the movements of produce by railway. Recently, when applied to by the Secretary of this Board, the Hamilton Board of Trade had no means of ascertaining the volume of goods that passed out of the country. The Board I represent, and I believe the Toronto Board also, have taken up the matter; at any rate, so far as the Hamilton Board is concerned, we intend to organize some system by which the transport by way of Hamilton, over the Suspension Bridge, may be correctly ascertained. It is a matter of very great

impor
time,

incide
astray
A fev
estima
afterv
was fi
100,0
world
prove
that (C
world

shoul
get ne
side.
requir
some
But it
goods
canno
I thin
the G

Comm

importance to have correct trade statistics ; but in this, at the present time, we are sadly lacking.

Mr. FRY: I ought to mention, in connection with this subject, an incident which shews that even the Government official may sometimes be astray in his statistics under the system we now have for collecting them. A few months ago the Deputy Minister of Marine, in his report, stated he estimated the tonnage of the Dominion at 950,000 tons. A few weeks afterwards, when the subject had been discussed in various quarters, it was found that he had under-estimated our tonnage to the extent of some 100,000 tons. He said that Canada was only the seventh country in the world in respect to her tonnage of vessels. A further investigation proved that he was entirely wrong ; and there is now not a shade of doubt that Canada really holds the *third* place among the shipping nations of the world. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. ROBERT READ: I think this question of statistics is one that should engage our earnest attention. The only information we can really get now, of goods passing out of Canada by railway, is from the American side. All goods exported to the United States over \$100 in value, are required to be accompanied by a Consular Certificate ; by that means some account is kept on the other side, of goods exported from Canada. But it is always the interest of the exporter to place the value of the goods as low as possible, and therefore the statistics obtained in this way, cannot be said to fairly represent the value of the goods covered by them. I think this question ought to be brought under the earnest attention of the Government.

The motion to adopt the Council's Report was then carried.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT then nominated the following Standing and Special Committees :

FINANCE.

HENRY FRY, <i>Chairman</i>	QUEBEC.
WM. PENNOCK.....	OTTAWA.
ADAM BROWN.....	HAMILTON.
WM. ELLIOTT.....	TORONTO.

BY-LAWS.

ED. MCGILLIVRAY, <i>Chairman</i>	OTTAWA.
J. A. HARDING.....	ST. JOHN, N.B.
PATRICK HUGHES.....	TORONTO.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

THOS. WHITE, JR., <i>Chairman</i>	MONTREAL.
WM. ELDER.....	ST. JOHN, N.B.
JNO. GILLESPIE.....	TORONTO.
WM. J. STAIRS.....	HALIFAX, N.S.
JOSEPH SHEHYN.....	QUEBEC.
ROBT. MARSHALL.....	KING'S CO., N.B.

CREDENTIALS.

ADAM BROWN, *Chairman*.....HAMILTON.
 GEO. A. DRUMMOND.....MONTREAL.
 P. R. JARVIS.....STRATFORD.

INSOLVENCY.

ANDREW ROBERTSON, *Chairman*.....MONTREAL.
 WILLIAM DARLING.....Do.
 A. JOSEPH.....QUEBEC.
 FRANCIS CLEMOW.....OTTAWA.
 J. A. HARDING.....ST. JOHN, N.B.
 W. F. FINDLAY.....HAMILTON.

The PRESIDENT: Our usual course has been to adjourn at this stage, to allow the Committees on Credentials and Order of Business, to proceed to business, as we cannot very well make further progress until these Committees report.

REPORT ON RECIPROCITY TREATY.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR. (Montreal): Would it not be well that the Committee on the draft Reciprocity Treaty should at least present their report, so that it might be in the hands of members, and thus afford them an opportunity for considering it? Then the question as to the time that this report shall be considered by the Board, should be determined by the Committee on Order of Business.

Mr. PENNOCK concurred in the suggestion.

The SECRETARY read the following letter received from the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Reciprocity Treaty, explaining his unavoidable absence, and enclosing copy of their report:

MONTREAL, December 28, 1874.

WILLIAM J. PATTERSON, Esq.,

Secretary Dominion Board of Trade, Montreal.

SIR,—In compliance with the Resolution respecting the proposed draft Reciprocity Treaty, and which was passed at the summer-session of the Dominion Board of Trade, held at St. John, N.B., in July last, the undersigned, as Convener of the Special Committee required under said Resolution, caused a circular-letter to be prepared, on 22nd August, and sent to each member of the Committee, asking for a full expression of opinion relative to said draft Treaty.

At subsequent meetings, held early in October, at which written replies from each member were submitted, a Report, based on these various opinions, was prepared and dispatched to His Excellency the Governor General in Council. In the light of the instructions contained in the Resolution appointing the Committee, this Report set forth the provisions in the proposed Treaty which were considered objectionable, and if carried into effect, assumed to be disadvantageous to the interests of the Dominion.

I enclose a copy of the same, which, in my absence as Chairman of the Committee, you will, with permission, be pleased to read at the Annual Meeting to be held in Ottawa, next month.

I am, Sir,

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed,)

HUGH McLENNAN.

nicat

To th

May à

A

St. Jo

comm

betwe

adopt

"

Treaty

"

many

produc

mariti

Canad

that tl

sent to

Canad

A

Trade,

the dr

to pre

the ut

viz:—

In

submit

draft t

The report of the Committee, as alluded to in the foregoing communication, was then submitted as follows :

REPORT ON DRAFT RECIPROCITY TREATY.

To the Right Honorable SIR FREDERIC TEMPLE, EARL OF DUFFERIN, Viscount and Baron Clandeboye of Clandeboye in the County Down in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Baron Dufferin and Clandeboye, of Ballyleidy and Killeleagh, in the County Down, in the Peerage of Ireland, and a Baronet, Knight of the Most Illustrious Order of St. Patrick, and Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Governor General of Canada, in Council:—

May it please Your Excellency :

At the semi-annual meeting of the DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE, held in the city of St. John, N.B., in July last, at which were present representatives from twenty-two commercial organizations, the subject of the proposed draft Treaty of Reciprocity between Canada and the United States was discussed, and the following resolution was adopted :—

“1st—That this Board reiterates its frequently expressed opinion in favour of a Treaty of Reciprocity between the United States and Canada.

“2nd—That while the document known as the new Reciprocity Treaty contains many desirable provisions, particularly those which relate to the exchange of natural productions between the United States and Canada, and the reciprocal extension of maritime privileges, it is, notwithstanding, defective in the privileges secured for Canada, which are not nearly so valuable as those conceded to the United States; and that this Board, by means of a proper Committee, or otherwise, do take steps to represent to the Government of Canada those aspects of the Treaty in which it is unfair to Canada, or might operate prejudicially to Canadian interests.”

Acting upon the instructions thus given, the President of the Dominion Board of Trade, Mr. W. H. Howland, appointed the following gentlemen a committee to consider the draft Treaty in all its aspects, and in the light of the discussion by the Board; and to present to Your Excellency in Council, the points wherein they believe it to be of the utmost importance that the draft should be amended before its final ratification, viz:—

<i>Montreal, Q.</i>	HUGH McLENNAN, Convener.
“	WM. DARLING, Esq.
“	THOS. WHITE, Jr., Esq.
<i>Quebec, Q.</i>	A. JOSEPH, Esq.
“	HENRY FRY, Esq.
<i>Kingston, Ont.</i>	WILLIAM HARTY, Esq.
<i>Toronto, Ont.</i>	JOHN GILLESPIE, Esq.
“	J. M. TROUT, Esq.
<i>Hamilton, Ont.</i>	ADAM BROWN, Esq.
“	JOHN STUART, Esq.
<i>Ottawa, Ont.</i>	HON. JAMES SKEAD.
<i>St. Catharines, Ont.</i>	SYLVESTER NEELON, Esq.
<i>St. John, N.B.</i>	CHAS. H. FAIRWEATHER, Esq.
“	HON. T. R. JONES.
<i>Halifax, N.S.</i>	CATHCART THOMSON, Esq.
“	ROBERT BOAK, Jr., Esq.
<i>Secretary of Committee</i>	WM. J. B. PATTERSON, <i>Montreal.</i>

In accordance with the instructions thus given, the Committee beg respectfully to submit to Your Excellency in Council the following points in which they believe the draft treaty to require amendment :

1. The principle of gradual reduction of duties, preparatory to their entire abolition, upon articles mentioned in the several schedules, as provided by Article IV. of the draft, meets with the very general condemnation of the commercial community, as far as the Committee have been able to ascertain its opinions. It is felt that owing to the great inequality in the duties now levied, the reduction would be practically giving, during the early years of the Treaty, the right of import into Canada of American goods at almost nominal rates of duty, while Canadian goods going into the United States would continue to be subject to high protective duties. If the revenue requirements of the United States make it impossible that the duties should at once be abolished, it would be better, in the judgment of the Committee, to postpone altogether any reduction of duty upon such articles as might be selected for that purpose for a year after the ratification of the treaty, and that the United States should then consent to a reduction of their duties to the same rate as is levied in Canada, and allow the gradual reduction to commence from that point.

2. The limitation of time within which the enlargement of the St. Lawrence and Welland Canals, and the deepening of the channel of the river, and the construction of the Caughnawaga Canal, are to be completed, as provided by Articles V. and VI. of the draft, is strongly disapproved of by the commercial community. There can be no serious objection to the inclusion of an article binding the Dominion to enlarge the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals, and even, on conditions to be referred to hereafter, to construct the Caughnawaga Canal with all possible expedition, and to granting the use of them hereafter to the citizens of the United States upon terms of equality with the people of Canada. But the danger of this time clause is, that by raising doubts as to the continuance of the treaty, it will greatly paralyse trade generally, but especially those branches of industry to be affected by it. All experience shows that there is great difficulty in completing large public works within fixed limits of time. Upon this point the Committee would respectfully call the attention of Your Excellency to the Report of Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, on the subject of the enlargement of the Welland Canal. He says: "The carrying out of this extensive undertaking, would, under any circumstances, occupy from three to four years, a period not unlikely to be protracted by the scarcity of men accustomed to that class of labour, unless there may be a large influx of workmen from other countries." And again: "It is also important that in every case it should be placed in the hands of thoroughly competent contractors, and at such prices as will fairly represent its value. Unless some such course as this be followed, no one can give anything like a reliable opinion as to the time likely to be required to carry out the contemplated enlargement." The Committee would respectfully point out that if the enlargement of the Welland Canal alone, within the space of three or four years, is subject to such contingencies, the addition of the works of enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals, the deepening of the river stretches between those canals, and the construction of the Caughnawaga Canal, would greatly increase the difficulties referred to by Mr. Page, by still further absorbing the labour which is already insufficient for the one work, and by lessening the chances of securing those "thoroughly competent contractors," which, under the system of public tender, it is so difficult to select, the policy of the country requiring the granting of contracts to the lowest tender, provided the security is sufficient. No capitalist, it is feared by the Committee, would consent to invest capital in manufactures in Canada for export to the United States, under a treaty whose continuance after the time-limit had expired, was subject to such a contingency as this clause of the draft presents.

With reference to both these points, the Committee would respectfully submit to Your Excellency in Council, that the results of the early years of the treaty are matters of infinitely greater moment to Canada than to the United States. With our smaller population and more limited capital invested in the industrial enterprises of the country, any check, such as might result from the sliding scale of reduction in duties, and the doubts as to our ability to complete the canal improvements within the time-limit, would prove very disastrous. The treaty, if ratified, should be free from such contingencies, so that both countries would start upon an equal race with no contingency to interfere with the continuance of the arrangement for the full term named in it.

3. The ocean coasting trade should, in the opinion of the Committee, be conceded by the United States. United States ships have for over twenty years enjoyed a share of the great colonial and intercolonial trade of Great Britain, and in all those trades have competed, and do compete, with Canadian shipowners, while the United States refuse to grant similar privileges to our ships. In view of the large extension in point of time, of the privilege of fishing in Canadian waters granted to the citizens of the United States, by this proposed treaty, and the relinquishment by Canada of the claim to compensation, as provided by the Washington Treaty, the coasting trade ought to be obtained as really the only equivalent for these large concessions on the part of the Dominion.

If it be urged that the right of entering Canadian-built vessels to American registry is a return for these fishery privileges, the Committee would respectfully point out that the right to Americans to purchase Canadian ships, if they deem it to their advantage to do so, can hardly be regarded in the light of a valuable concession to the people of this Dominion,—while it is subject to this serious drawback: that in the absence of the right of coasting it presents to the Canadian shipowner a very strong inducement to transfer his vessel to American registry, and thus greatly interfere with the building up of that maritime power, by making the people of Canada shipowners as well as shipbuilders, which is so eminently the ambition of the people of the Dominion, and towards which they have already made so great advances.

4. The construction of the Caughnawaga Canal, as provided by article VI. of the draft treaty, should not, the Committee respectfully submit, be included among the works to be constructed by the people of Canada, until the State of New York shall, by formal agreement, have bound itself to enlarge the Whitehall Canal and improve the navigation of the Hudson River to a capacity equal to that of the proposed Caughnawaga Canal, and to grant to Canadian vessels navigating those waters the same privileges as are enjoyed by American vessels. The chief interest which the people of Canada have in the construction of the Caughnawaga Canal is, that it will afford a new outlet for the produce of the West to reach the seaboard at New York in competition with the Buffalo and Oswego routes, and that owing to its greater capacity, and consequent greater economy of transport, its construction would induce large shipments of western produce *via* the St. Lawrence route, subject to orders at Lachine,—its destination from that point being determined by the freights at Montreal and New York respectively, the rates at the former port being *plus* nine miles of inland navigation, and at the latter *plus* four hundred and sixty miles. But to realize this advantage it is clear that the navigation must be completed to an equal capacity from Lake Champlain to New York, and its use granted to Canadian vessels. The Committee, therefore, submit that the obligation to construct this canal, placed upon Canada by this proposed treaty, should only become operative when the State of New York has agreed to complete the navigation to the seaboard, and to grant its use to Canadians upon terms of equality with American citizens.

The Committee would submit to your Excellency in Council, that provision should be distinctly made in the treaty for the right of Canadian vessels to discharge cargo, wherever obtained, at any port on Lake Champlain, the canals, and the Hudson River, the cargo to be as free from Customs' forms and dues as if owned by an American citizen. Although the right of discharging cargo on Lake Champlain appears to be conceded by the second clause of Article VIII. of the treaty, which declares that the navigation of Lake Champlain "shall be free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants of Canada, subject to any laws or regulations of the United States, or of the States bordering thereon respectively, not inconsistent with such privileges of free navigation," when compared with Article VII. there is fair ground for doubting whether such is the intention. The latter clause gives to the inhabitants of Canada the right to "carry in their vessels cargo and passengers from one port of the United States on the great Lakes and River St. Lawrence to another port on the said lakes or river." Lake Champlain is not one of the "great lakes," and would therefore not be included in this limitation, and the question might hereafter arise whether the right of free navigation within the Lake itself, gave the right of coasting between ports "on the great lakes or River St. Lawrence" and ports on Lake Champlain, when such coasting is expressly limited to such great lakes or river.

5. It is not at all clear from the proposed treaty, whether the right of re-entry of Canadian or American goods respectively from one country to the other is intended to be conceded. Thus American produce or goods brought into Canada and stored, should be permitted to be re-shipped and entered free into the United States. The importance of this provision may be illustrated by reference to manufactured goods. One of the grievances of which the manufacturers in Canada have complained in the past, is the fact that Canada has frequently been made what is conventionally called "a slaughter market" for American manufactures. Under the proposed treaty it is not improbable that the same policy may be pursued. But if the goods thus sent into Canada, may be at once sent back into the United States, free of duty, although neither the growth nor manufacture of Canada, the facility for thus imposing an unfair and unequal competition upon Canadian manufacturers will be greatly lessened. Articles, therefore, which are included in the schedules, and which are the "growth, produce or manufacture," of either country, should pass freely between them, irrespective of whether the place of last shipment was the place of such growth, produce or manufacture or not.

6. Very great embarrassment is felt in relation to the schedules of manufactured goods owing to the want of clearness and definiteness in the description. For instance, in the article of cottons, the articles "cotton jeans unbleached," "cotton plaids," and "cottonades unbleached," are descriptions not generally understood by the trade in Canada. So in the article of woolen goods, the term "tweeds" is by no means such a term as would prevent embarrassment in the future in the commercial intercourse between the two countries under this treaty. The Committee submit the following statement on this subject, by a gentleman largely interested in this branch of the trade:—
"What is a Tweed? The distinctive name of this branch of manufacture arose solely from the fact of the goods being originally produced in several of the towns and villages on the banks of the River Tweed, in Scotland, and were designated Tweeds accordingly. These goods are now understood by the trade as Scotch Tweeds, as distinguished from those of West of England Tweeds or Yorkshire Tweeds. Canadian Tweeds, as understood here, embrace all the peculiarities of those named, and indeed extend to any description of goods manufactured in Canada of pure wool. But these again are subdivided, according to style of weave or finish, into imitations of Scotch or

“English Tweeds, Doeskins, Buckskins, Deerskins, Meltons, Etoffes, Friezes, &c.” The term, “woolen tweeds, plain or figured, milled, pressed or shorn,” would, as the Committee have ascertained, cover the objections, and there should be no difficulty in securing such verbal alteration of the treaty. Again, the term “boot and shoe making machines” is by no means sufficiently comprehensive. Sewing machines, for instance, are not included in the schedules, and yet sewing machines are very extensively used in the manufacture of boots and shoes. Are they, when intended for such use, to be admitted free under the general term “boot and shoe making machines?” The Committee submit that care should be taken, before the final ratification of the treaty, to remove all ambiguity of expression in relation to articles included in schedules, and that where, as in the case of boot and shoe making machines, there may be difference of opinion in the interpretation of the treaty, the actual articles intended to be included, should be specified by name.

7. The question has been raised whether goods manufactured in either country from raw material the growth or produce of a foreign country would be admitted under the treaty to pass free of duty. The Committee are aware that the terms “growth, produce or manufacture” seem at first sight sufficiently inclusive. But they submit to Your Excellency that certain articles of manufacture may be composed largely of articles of finished manufacture of a foreign country. As an instance, the articles of “carriages, carts, waggons or other wheeled vehicles” may be referred to. In carriages, the tires, axles, springs, fittings, and lamps, may all be of complete English manufacture. They are imported into Canada, and in the carriage in which they are used may constitute the larger part in money value. Would the carriage thus completed be considered, within the terms of the treaty, as manufactured in Canada, and as such entitled to free entry into the United States? In order to avoid any difficulty on such subjects in the commerce under the treaty, the Committee venture respectfully to suggest that a clause should be added, declaring that the place of produce or manufacture of material entering into the composition of manufactured goods mentioned in the treaty, shall not interfere with the free entry of such manufactured goods into either country.

8. In order to the fullest and freest commercial intercourse between the two countries, and for the avoidance of all embarrassments to the reciprocal trade, the Committee respectfully submit that, as to the natural productions of the two countries, the treaty should provide for the abolition of all Consular certificates and fees, making the interchange of such productions as unimpeded as it is between States of the Union or Provinces of the Dominion; and that as to manufactured goods, where the necessity for protecting the revenue in the United States from fraud by the entry of foreign goods as of Canadian manufacture, may render necessary some form of certificate, the precise form, and the charges on manufactured goods passing from one country to the other, should be determined by the treaty, so as to remove them from the caprice of Treasury Orders or Orders in Council. The Committee submit that it is quite possible by harassing exactions at the Custom houses, to greatly neutralize the mutual advantages which may necessarily be expected from a fair treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Canada, and that every precaution should be taken in the framing of the treaty itself to prevent such exactions.

The Committee need hardly remind Your Excellency in Council that the Dominion Board of Trade is earnestly in favour of the freest possible commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada, that can be afforded by a treaty of reciprocity, upon a broad, comprehensive and liberal basis. But looking at the question simply from a commercial

point of view, they regard it as of the greatest importance that in the framing of such a treaty, the concessions should be as nearly as possible equal, that neither party should be subjected to obligations, whose non-fulfilment presents the contingency of a premature abrogation of the treaty; and that the terms of the treaty in all respects should be so clear as to avoid the probabilities of embarrassment in the future, and a consequent estrangement of friendly feeling, where all should be characterized by mutual good will. The Committee, in fulfilment of the instructions of the Board, have submitted to Your Excellency the points wherein the draft of the proposed treaty is defective, and they trust that before its final ratification, amendments in the direction of these suggestions may be made in it.

Signed by authority of the members of the Committee.

(Signed,) HUGH McLENNAN

Chairman.

WM. J. B. PATTERSON,

Secretary.

MONTREAL, 14th November, 1874.

The Chairman of the Committee on Order of Business, requested that members desirous of submitting questions which did not appear on the official programme, should hand them at once to his Committee, in order that, on leave, places might be allotted to them.

On motion, the Board adjourned until 2:30 o'clock P.M.

[For facility of reference, the Secretary has deemed it expedient to repeat the text of the Draft Treaty here.]

PROPOSED RECIPROCITY TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES
AND CANADA.

Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, and the United States of America, being desirous of improving the commerce and navigation between their respective territories and people, and more especially between Her Majesty's possessions in North America and the United States, in such manner as to render the same reciprocally beneficial, have respectively named plenipotentiaries to confer and agree thereupon, that is to say :

* * * * *

A treaty for the reciprocal regulations of the commerce and trade between the United States and Canada, with provisions for the enlargement of the Canadian canals, and for their use by United States vessels on terms of equality with British vessels.

ARTICLE I. It is agreed by the high contracting parties that, in addition to the liberty secured to the United States fishermen by the convention between the United States and Great Britain, signed at London on the 20th day of October, 1818, of taking, curing, and drying fish on certain coasts of the British North American colonies therein defined, the inhabitants of the United States shall have in common with the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, the liberty, for the term of years mentioned in Article XIII of this treaty to take fish of every kind, except shell-fish, on the sea-coast and shores and in the bays, harbors, and creeks of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and of the several islands thereunto adjacent, without being restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the said coasts and shores and islands, and also upon the Magdalen Islands, for the purpose of drying

their nets and curing their fish, provided that in so doing they do not interfere with the rights of private property or with British fishermen in the peaceable use of any part of said coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose.

It is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea-fishery, and that the salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and mouths of rivers, are hereby reserved exclusively for British fishermen.

ART. II. It is agreed by the high contracting parties that British subjects shall have, in common with the citizens of the United States, the liberty, for the term of years mentioned in Article XIII of this treaty, to take fish of every kind, except shell-fish, on the eastern sea-coasts and shores of the United States, north of the thirty-ninth parallel of north latitude, and on the shores of the several islands thereunto adjacent, and in the bays, harbors and creeks of the said sea-coasts and shores of the United States and of the said Islands, without being restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the said coasts of the United States and of the islands aforesaid, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish; provided that in so doing they do not interfere with the rights of private property or with the fishermen of the United States in the peaceable use of any part of the said coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose.

It is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea-fishery, and that salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and mouths of rivers, are hereby reserved exclusively for fishermen of the United States.

ART. III. It is agreed that the places designated by the Commissioners appointed under the first article of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concluded at Washington on the 5th day of June, 1854, upon the coasts of Her Britannic Majesty's dominions and the United States, as places reserved from the common right of fishing under that treaty, shall be regarded as in like manner reserved from the common right of fishing under the preceding articles. In case any question should arise between the Governments of the United States and of Her Britannic Majesty as to the common right of fishing in places not thus designated as reserved, it is agreed that a Commission shall be appointed to designate such places, and shall be constituted in the same manner, and have the same powers, duties, and authority as the Commission appointed under the said first article of the treaty of the 5th of June, 1854.

ART. IV. It is agreed that the articles enumerated in the Schedules A, B, and C, hereunto annexed, being the growth, produce or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada or of the United States, shall, on their importation from the one country into the other, from the 1st day of July, 1875, to the 30th day of June, 1876, (both included) pay only two-thirds of the duties payable at the date of this treaty on the importations into such country of such articles respectively; and from the 1st day of July, 1876, to the 30th day of June, 1877, (both included,) shall pay only one-third of such duties; and on and after the 1st day of July, 1877, for the period of years mentioned in Article XIII of this treaty, shall be admitted free of duty into each country respectively.

For the term mentioned in Article XIII no other or higher duty shall be imposed in the United States upon other articles not enumerated in such schedules, the growth, produce, or manufacture of Canada, or in Canada upon such other articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, than are, respectively, imposed upon like articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of Great Britain or any other country.

SCHEDULE A.—Consisting of the following natural products: Animals of all kinds; ashes, pot, pearl, and soda; bark; bark extract, for tanning purposes; Bath bricks; bread-stuffs of all kinds; bricks for building, and fire-bricks; broom-corn; burr or grind-stones,

hewed, wrought or unwrought; butter; cheese; coal and coke; cotton-wool; cotton-waste; dye-stuffs; earths; clays; ochers; sand, ground or unground; eggs; fish of all kinds; fish, products of, and of all other creatures living in the water, except fish preserved in oil; fire-wood; flax, unmanufactured; flours and meals of all kinds; fruits, green or dried; furs, undressed; grain of all kinds; gypsum, ground, unground, or calcined; hay; hemp, unmanufactured; hides; horns; lard; lime; malt; manures; marble; stone; slate or granite, wrought or unwrought; meats, fresh, smoked or salted; ores of all kinds of metals; pelts; peas, whole or split; petroleum oil, crude or refined or benzole; pitch; plants; poultry of all kinds; rags of all kinds; rice; salt; seeds; shrubs; skins; straw; tails; tallow; tar; timber and lumber of all kinds, round, hewed and sawed, manufactured in whole or in part; tobacco, unmanufactured; tow, unmanufactured; trees; turpentine; vegetables; wool.

SCHEDULE B.—Consisting of the following agricultural implements: Axes; bag-holders; bee-hives; bone-crushers, or parts thereof; cultivators, or parts thereof; chaff-cutters, or parts thereof; corn-huskers, or parts thereof; cheese-vats; cheese factory heaters; cheese presses, or parts thereof; churns, or parts thereof; cattle-feed boilers and steamers, or parts thereof; ditchers, or parts thereof; field-rollers, or parts thereof; fanning mills, or parts thereof; feed choppers, or parts thereof; forks for hay and manure, hand or horse; grain drills, or parts thereof; grain broad-cast sowers, or parts thereof; grain crushers, or parts thereof; harrows; hoes, hand or horse; horse rakes; horse-power machines, or parts thereof; hay-tedders, or parts thereof; liquid manure carts, or parts thereof; manure-sowers, or parts thereof; mowers, or parts thereof; oil and oil-cake crushers, or parts thereof; plows, or parts thereof; root and seed planters, or parts thereof; root-cutters, pulpers and washers, or parts thereof; rakes; reapers, or parts thereof; reaper and mower combined, or parts thereof; spades; shovels; scythes; snaths; thrashing machines, or parts thereof.

SCHEDULE C.—Consisting of the following manufactures: Axles, of all kinds; boots and shoes of leather; boot and shoe making machines; buffalo robes, dressed and trimmed; cotton grain-bags; cotton denims; cotton jeans, unbleached; cotton drillings, unbleached; cotton tickings; cotton plaids; cottonades, unbleached; cabinet ware and furniture, or parts thereof; carriages, carts, wagons and other wheeled vehicles and sleighs, or parts thereof; fire-engines, or parts thereof; felt covering for boilers; gutta-percha belting and tubing; iron, bar, hoop, pig, puddled, rod, sheet or scrap; iron nails, spikes, bolts, tacks, brads, or sprigs; iron castings; India-rubber belting and tubing; locomotives for railways, or parts thereof; lead, sheet or pig; leather, sole or upper; leather, harness, and saddlery of; mill, or factory, or steamboat fixed engines and machines, or parts thereof; manufactures of marble, stone, slate, or granite; manufactures of wood solely or wood nailed, bound, hinged, or locked with metal materials; mangles, washing machines, wringing machines, and drying machines, or parts thereof; printing paper for newspapers; paper-making machines, or parts thereof; printing type, presses and folders, paper-cutters, ruling machines, page-numbering machines, and stereotyping and electrotyping apparatus, or parts thereof; refrigerators, or parts thereof; railroad cars, carriages, and trucks, or parts thereof; satinets of wool and cotton; steam-engines, or parts thereof; steel, wrought or cast, and steel plates and rails; tin tubes and piping; tweeds, of wool solely; water-wheel machines and apparatus, or parts thereof.

ART. V. It is agreed that the Canadian canals on the main route from Lake Erie to Montreal shall be enlarged forthwith at the expense of the Dominion of Canada, so as to admit the passage of vessels drawing 12 feet of water, and the locks on the said

canals shall be made of not less than 270 feet in length, 45 feet width, and not less than 12 feet depth on the miter-sill; and that the channel of the Saint Lawrence River shall be deepened in the several reaches between the canals, whenever the same may be necessary, so as to allow the free passage of vessels drawing 12 feet of water. And the work engaged to be done in this article shall be completed by the 1st of January, 1880.

ART. VI. It is agreed that the government of Canada shall construct, on or before the 1st day of January, 1880, a canal to connect the St. Lawrence River at some convenient point, at or near Caughnawaga, with Lake Champlain. The dimensions of said canal shall be such as to admit the passage of vessels drawing 12 feet of water, and the locks shall not be of less dimensions than those named in the preceding article. And the United States engage to urge upon the government of the State of New York to cause the existing canal from Whitehall, on Lake Champlain, to Albany, to be enlarged, and, if necessary, extended, or another canal or canals to be constructed of equal capacity with the proposed Caughnawaga Canal, as hereinbefore specified, and the navigation of the Hudson River to be improved, so as to admit the passage from Lake Champlain to the lower waters of the Hudson River of vessels drawing 12 feet of water.

ART. VII. Citizens of the United States may, during the term of years mentioned in Article XIII. of this treaty, carry in their vessels, cargo and passengers, from one Canadian port to another on the great lakes or River St. Lawrence. Reciprocally, inhabitants of Canada, subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, may, during the like period, carry in their vessels cargo and passengers from one port of the United States on the great lakes or River St. Lawrence to another on the said lakes or river. Citizens of the United States in their vessels, and inhabitants of Canada, subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, in their vessels, may, during the like term, carry cargo and passengers from any port of the United States or of Canada on the Red River, or the waters connecting therewith, to any other port on the said river, or waters connecting therewith.

ART. VIII. It is agreed that for the term of years mentioned in Art. XIII. of this treaty, the citizens of the United States shall enjoy the use of the Welland, the Saint Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion of Canada (including the proposed Caughnawaga Canal), on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada; and that, without interfering with the right of the Government of Canada to impose such tolls on the aforesaid Canadian canals respectively as it may think fit, the tolls shall be levied in relation to the number of the locks in each canal, without any drawback or discrimination, whatever the destination of the vessel, or whether one or more canal or canals, or part of a canal, be passed.

And it is also agreed that for the like term of years the inhabitants of Canada shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States; and that the navigation of Lake Champlain and of Lake Michigan shall be free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants of Canada, subject to any laws or regulations of the United States, or of the States bordering thereon, respectively, not inconsistent with such privileges of free navigation.

And the United States further engage to urge upon the governments of the States of New York and of Michigan to secure to the inhabitants of Canada the use of the Erie, the Whitehall, the Sault Ste. Marie Canals, and of any enlarged or extended or new canal or other improvement connecting Lake Champlain with the lower waters of the Hudson River which may be made, as contemplated in Article VI., on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.

And it is mutually agreed that full power shall be given and allowed to transship

cargo from vessels into canal-boats, and from canal-boats into vessels, at either terminus of every canal.

And, further, that if the use of the Erie and Whitehall, or other canal connecting Lake Champlain with the lower waters of the Hudson River, and of Sault Ste. Marie Canal be not granted to the inhabitants of Canada on terms of equality with the citizens of the United States, as contemplated in this article, then the use of the proposed Caughnawaga canal by citizens of the United States, as above contemplated, shall be suspended and cease until the use of the said canals in the United States shall be secured to the inhabitants of Canada, as above contemplated.

ART. IX. For the term of years mentioned in Article XIII. of this treaty, vessels of all kinds built in the United States may be purchased by inhabitants of Canada subjects of Great Britain, and registered in Canada as Canadian vessels; and, reciprocally, vessels of all kinds built in Canada may be purchased by citizens of the United States, and registered in the United States as United States vessels.

ART. X. A joint commission shall be established and maintained at joint expense during the operation of this treaty for advising the erection and proper regulation of all light-houses on the great lakes, common to both countries, necessary to the security of the shipping thereon.

ART. XI. A joint commission shall also be established at joint expense, and maintained during the continuance of the treaty, to promote the propagation of fish in the inland waters common to both countries, and to enforce the law enacted for the protection of the fish and fishing-grounds.

ART. XII. It is further agreed that the provisions and stipulations of this treaty shall extend to the colony of Newfoundland so far as they are applicable. But if the Imperial Parliament, the legislature of Newfoundland, or the Congress of the United States shall not embrace the colony of Newfoundland, in their laws enacted for carrying the foregoing articles into effect, then this article shall be of no effect; but the omission to make provision by law to give it effect by either of the legislative bodies aforesaid shall not in any way impair any other article of this treaty.

ART. XIII. This treaty shall take effect as soon as the laws required to carry it into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada on the one hand, and by the Congress of the United States on the other. If such legislative assent shall not have been given within——months from the date hereof, then this treaty shall be null and void. But such legislative assent having been given, this treaty shall remain in force for the period of twenty-one years from the date at which it shall come into operation, and, further, until the expiration of three years after either of the high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its wish to terminate the same, each of the high contracting parties being at liberty to give such notice to the other at the end of said period of twenty-one years, or at any time afterward.

ART. XIV. When the ratifications of this treaty shall have been exchanged, and the laws required to carry it into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada on the one hand, and by the Congress of the United States on the other, then Articles XXII, XXIII, XXIV and XXV, of the treaty of May 8, 1871, between Great Britain and the United States, shall become null and void.

ART. XV. This treaty shall be duly ratified by Her Britannic Majesty and by the President of the United States, and the ratifications shall be exchanged either at Washington or at London within——months from the date hereof, or earlier, if possible.

the

Ch

Wm

Cha
meeness
it w
mee
diffe

ral

Wm.

tende
of an
the p
accepof B
T
up in
N
34, fif
18, tw

AFTERNOON SESSION.

TUESDAY, *January 19, 1875.*

The Board resumed business at 2:30 o'clock, P.M., the President in the chair.

The SECRETARY read the following letter from the Secretary of the Charlottetown, P.E.I., Chamber of Commerce :—

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., *January 7, 1875.*

WM. J. PATTERSON, Esq.,
Secretary of Dominion Board of Trade,
MONTREAL.

DEAR SIR,—In accordance with your circular of December 11th, a meeting of this Chamber was held on 30th ult., to consider the appointment of delegates to attend the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade at Ottawa on 19th instant.

After some discussion, it was found impracticable to appoint delegates. The lateness of our shipping season (which has been exceptional) has so retarded business that it would be extremely difficult for merchants to leave here in time to be present at your meeting. Had it been later in the year we would have been in a position to have acted differently.

I remain,

Yours very truly,

P. S. MACGOWAN,
Secretary.

The SECRETARY also read the following communication from the General Manager of the Dominion Telegraph Company :—

TORONTO, *January 18, 1875.*

WM. J. PATTERSON, Esq.,
Secretary Dominion Board of Trade,
OTTAWA.

DEAR SIR,—I am desired by the President of the Dominion Telegraph Company to tender the members of the Board of Trade, while in session at Ottawa, free transmission of any messages they may desire to send of a social or domestic character, and I have the pleasure to enclose books for the purpose, with a hope that the members will kindly accept.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours respectfully,

I. D. PURKIS,
General Manager.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

MR. THOS. WHITE, JR., (Montreal), from the Committee on Order of Business, reported as follows :—

The Committee recommend that the subjects on the Official Programme be taken up in the following order, viz :—

Numbers on official programme : 2, first order ; 4, second ; 5, third ; 6, fourth ; 9 and 34, fifth ; 10, sixth ; 11, seventh ; 8, eighth ; 14, ninth ; 15, tenth ; 16 and 17, eleventh ; 18, twelfth ; 19, thirteenth ; 20 and 31, fourteenth ; 33, fifteenth ; 23, sixteenth ; 24,

seventeenth; 25, eighteenth; 26, nineteenth; 27, twenty; 28, twenty-one; 29, twenty-two; 30, twenty-three; 12, twenty-four; 7, twenty-five; 3, 21, and 22, twenty-six; 35 and 36, twenty-seven.

Two subjects, viz., 1st:

"Tonnage Dues, (known as the 'War Tax,') levied by the United States upon Canadian vessels;" and 2nd, "The subject of vessels being obliged to call at Duncan City to report, *en route* for Chicago," have been submitted by the Hamilton Board of Trade, which the Committee recommend shall be numbered respectively 28 and 29.

The Committee recommend that the consideration of the report of the Committee on the draft Treaty of Reciprocity be taken up as the first order of the day, on to-morrow, Wednesday, and that number thirteen of the official programme be considered in the same connection.

All of which is submitted.

(Signed,) THOS. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. ADAM BROWN, from the Committee on Credentials, reported thirty-three delegates in attendance, but as a number of additional members would arrive later on, they would report again.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask your attention while I make a few remarks in opening the Fifth Annual Session of this Board. I can assure you it is with very great pleasure that I notice, although our attendance to-day is small—a circumstance probably arising from the fact of the elections in Ontario having taken place yesterday, thereby preventing members interested in them from being present at our opening session—I notice with pleasure a great many old faces among the members present to-day. Many members who were present at our first annual meeting are still to the fore; and I think this a very strong indication of the usefulness of this Board, in that members who have once been with us, are willing to continue their connection with the Board and their presence here,—although they doubtless make some sacrifices in attending our meetings. I think I can also congratulate you upon the trade of the past year, although it has not been very profitable. In fact, in a majority of businesses, it has rather been the other way. Yet, at the same time, the business of the country is really sound, and the failures have been very much less in proportion than in former years. There is one circumstance which may add greatly to the present condition of trade, and that is the plentifulness of money, arising from two reasons. The first is, that the Lumber trade, one of the largest in the country, requires very much less money this year than formerly, owing to its present depressed condition; and the second is one which should receive your earnest consideration, viz., the Government deposits in the Banks. These amount at the present time to about eleven million dollars, which money has been nearly all voted for some particular object, and is liable to be withdrawn for such objects at any time. The

Ban
requ
of r
in a
have
a co
my
to be
be in
by n
insti
impr
Syst
one
both
Ther
be c
Char
Cana
may
but
they
stood
the
have
diffic
place
place
name
bond-
The r
have
purpo
Insur
report
to the
it was
condit
wheth
having
ture h
Compa
fied i
pointe
policie
latures
have d
panies

Banks holding these deposits have to pay interest on them, and therefore require to put the money to some use ; the result is that a large amount of money, liable to be withdrawn on very short notice, is being invested in actual business, and causing a considerable inflation in the country. We have to consider the fact, that the withdrawal of that money would produce a corresponding contraction, and very possibly a serious financial crisis. To my mind it is clear, that the funds of the Government should not be allowed to be diverted to the business of the country ; nor should the Government be invested with the power, which might be corruptly used, of being able, by means of these enormous deposits, to influence some of the most powerful institutions in the country, viz., the Banks. I think you would do well to impress upon the Government the necessity of adopting the Treasury System, by which these monies will not be used so as to inflate business at one time, and at another time by sudden withdrawal produce contraction, both of which may have very serious results upon the trade of the country. There is another matter affecting our financial situation which might also be considered by this Board, and that is, the character of the Railway Charters which are granted in this country. Every Railway Charter in Canada at the present time is practically non-forfeitable. A Company may get into arrears, and the bond-holders may appoint a receiver ; but they can have no share in the management of the road, unless they get legislation to that effect. This fact was never fairly understood in England until exposed a short time ago at a meeting of the Southern Railway Bond-holders, and from some correspondence I have seen, I am perfectly satisfied this power will lead to very serious difficulties. I think, moreover, the position in which the bond-holders are placed is an unreasonable one. I see no reason why they should not be placed in the same position as persons who lend money on mortgages,—namely, that on the failure of the company to fulfil their obligations, bond-holders might be prompted to take the road into their own hands. The result of the present restrictions upon bond-holders in the direction I have mentioned, will be to render it more difficult to procure money for the purpose of carrying out Railway enterprises in Canada. In regard to Insurance matters, the Committee which was appointed last summer, will report on the question of uniform policies. In this connection I may refer to the Act which was passed by the Ontario Legislature at last session. As it was introduced, it gave to the judges the power to declare whether any condition in an Insurance policy is reasonable or not, and consequently whether valid or not. This act will prevent the Insurance company from having any contract whatever ; and it is a question whether the Legislature have not carried their attempt to protect the public against Insurance Companies to the extent of persecution. However, the bill was modified in its passage, and provides that a commission shall be appointed to determine what conditions are reasonable in insurance policies. It seems to me to be objectionable for the Provincial Legislatures to legislate on this subject, because each Province may then have different laws. This would make it very difficult for Insurance Companies to carry on their operations, and perhaps result in what we cannot

afford at present,—the withdrawal of the English Companies. I think there can be no doubt, that if the Dominion Parliament would legislate on the subject of uniform policies, after the manner that is proposed in England, an arrangement acceptable to the Companies, and at the same time protecting the public, might be arrived at. As stated by Mr. Fry, our representations respecting the securing of commercial statistics have received no attention. It seems to be a very simple matter to require railway companies to make a return of all the freight they take out of the country; and I think you will be justified in again urging upon the Government the necessity of taking some steps in this direction. Another matter in which recommendation was made last year, and on which no action was taken, relates to steamboat navigation and the proper protection of life on our inland waters. I may refer to one case which shows how necessary it is that some better provision should be made in this matter. It has been stated to me as a fact, on the best authority, that the Royal Mail Line of steamers actually had no certificates last year! Whether these certificates were not issued, on account of the boats not having the proper appliances, or by reason of carelessness on the part of the officer whose duty it was to attend to the matter, I am not aware; but the fact that these boats were without certificates, is a serious matter to every one of us. I have also to say to you, that I think it is very desirable to repeat, if possible, the experiment we made last year, of a Semi-Annual Meeting. The result of it has been, I believe, extremely beneficial. We from Ontario had the pleasure of meeting our fellow-countrymen of the Maritime Provinces, learning more of the extent of their business and their resources, and of becoming socially acquainted with them; and the result has been in our Province at all events, the very best of feeling towards the Maritime Provinces. I think if the experiment was repeated in another section of the Dominion, it would have an equally good effect. In my judgment, nothing is more likely to bind the different sections of this country together, and make the confederation one grand whole, than for the business men of all sections to become thoroughly acquainted personally, and with the trade and industries carried on by each other. Another thing I may venture to press upon you is, that we, as merchants, should cultivate an *esprit de corps* among one another, such as exists in the professions. I think this Dominion Board is having a good effect in that way. Among the merchants who meet at this Board there is a certain amount of *esprit de corps*, and I think we have an evidence of that in the fact, that we have been able to discuss questions involving political considerations without political bias, and thus avoid a difficulty, which is frequently encountered in other assemblies. If we in returning from the meetings of this Board, were to endeavor to extend this desirable feeling in our respective localities, we would confer a benefit upon what I may call the mercantile profession, and eventually place it, in this respect, on the same footing as the learned ones. I do not know that I have anything more to add, except to say, that you have a very important list of subjects before you, and I am satisfied they will be discussed, as hitherto, with ability, good sense, and moderation. (Applause.)

deleg
of th
To the
A
Assoc
pleas
I
Carru
me), t
of Co
previc
conne
This v
from t
“
Canad
branch
praying
duties
Treaty
inter
and”—
A
S. S. I.
to the
to give
Domin
out th
Canada
Ye
the pro
Th
of Com
should
States c
“T
Treaty
Govern
Treaty
Great B
Kingdo
manufa
“T
negotia
referenc
will ser
different
An
Associat
afterwar

DELEGATION TO NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), presented the report of the delegation to the Autumn Meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom, as follows :

To the President and Council of the Dominion Board of Trade.

As convener of the delegation appointed by you to attend the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, in Newcastle, in September last, I have now the pleasure of presenting you with the following report :

Immediately on my arrival in England, communications were sent to Messrs. John Carruthers, of Kingston, and R. S. DeVeber, of St. John, (who had been associated with me), to meet at Newcastle prior to the day of the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce there. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Carruthers had returned to Canada previous to this date, and Mr. DeVeber, being on the Continent, through missing his connection, did not reach Newcastle until the first day's business had been transacted. This was to be regretted, as one of the earliest motions on their programme was one from the Chamber of Heckmondwicke, proposed by Mr. T. Firth, and was as follows :—

“ That, in the opinion of this Association, the proposed Reciprocity Treaty between Canada and the United States is, in its present form, prejudicial to some important branches of British industry. That a Memorial be presented to the Colonial Secretary praying that steps be taken to secure to British producers and manufacturers the same duties upon imports into Canada as may be granted to the United States by the said Treaty when carried into effect ; and that a committee be appointed to care for the interests of the Woollen Trade affected by the Treaty, consisting of the President and ”—

After two or three speakers had been heard on the resolution, the Chairman, S. S. Lloyd, Esq., requested your delegation to give any information which might tend to the elucidation of the subject. Your representative attempted, as briefly as possible, to give from memory a *resumé* of the debate which took place at the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade in St. John, N.B., in July last, and particularly pointed out that it was distinctly stated in the negotiations, that any articles “ *made free in Canada under agreement with any foreign country must be made free to Great Britain.*”

Your delegation at this time had, unfortunately, not been provided with a copy of the proceedings of your Board at St. John,—nor had they a copy of the Treaty.

The chief point raised in the discussion was, that they (the Associated Chambers of Commerce) wanted, that whatever Treaty was made with the United States, they should be charged the *same rate of duty or free of duty* as might be conceded to the United States or any other country. The following motion was ultimately carried :—

“ That inasmuch as the Government has announced the probability of a Reciprocity Treaty being made, representations by memorial and deputation be made to Her Majesty's Government, with the view of urging the necessity of stipulations being inserted in every Treaty of Commerce and Navigation made on behalf of any Colony or Dependency of Great Britain with foreign powers, that the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom be not subjected to any higher duties than those laid upon the produce and manufactures of such foreign country.

“ That a Committee of the Association be appointed to watch the progress of the negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States with reference to the Reciprocity Treaty between the latter and Canada, which Committee will serve as a medium of communication between Her Majesty's Government and the different Chambers of Commerce whose interests may be affected by that Treaty.”

Another meeting was held in Bradford, in October, of a considerable number of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, when the following memorial was adopted, and afterwards presented to Her Majesty's Ministers :—

The Memorial of the Bradford Chamber of Commerce sheweth: That Her Majesty, on closing the last session of Parliament, was graciously pleased to announce that negotiations had been undertaken for the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty formerly in force between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America, and that negotiations for that purpose would be resumed at an early date. That early date being probably December, when the American Senate usually reassembles, your memorialists consider it their duty to call the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government to the prejudicial effects which the Draft Treaty, if concluded as it was submitted to the Senate of the United States, would have upon the trade of the District whose interests are represented by this Chamber. That the 4th Article of the said Draft Treaty, and Schedule C, will require very considerable alteration, in order to prevent the anomaly of England stipulating for or consenting to differential duties in favor of foreign wool fabrics, to the prejudice of her own manufactures. That to avoid such a possibility your memorialists would respectfully suggest, that a clause be added to Article 4 providing that it be well understood that no lower duties shall be "imposed in Canada upon any article, the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States than are respectively imposed upon like articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United Kingdom." That with reference to Schedule C, attached to the said 4th Article, the words "Satinets of wool or cotton," and "Tweeds of wool solely," convey no positive meaning, and are liable to the most varied applications, and would, like all such conventional terms, create endless differences with the Customs, and become a serious impediment to trade. That as the abuses and difficulties which are the unavoidable consequence of an arbitrary nomenclature in a tariff, can only be obviated by a classification imposing duties upon woven fabrics according to the preponderance of materials which enter into their composition, your memorialists would propose that, on the renewal of the negotiations, the above mentioned words in Schedule C be struck out, and that they be replaced by the following: "Manufactures of wool, or wool combined with other materials." Your memorialists are well aware that the memorandum on the commercial relations of Canada with the United States (dated "Washington, April 27, 1874.") states "that any article made free in Canada under agreement with any foreign country must be made free to Great Britain." But as this memorandum, *even if it were binding*, refers only to articles made free of all duties, and Article 4 of the Draft Treaty provides for a temporary sliding-scale of duties, your memorialists trust that Her Majesty's Government will obviate the possibility of differential duties in favor of their produce being demanded by the United States, by the adoption of the suggested clause and the amendment of Schedule C. And further, to prevent all future ambiguities and misunderstandings, your memorialists beg humbly to suggest that in all similar negotiations in future, care be taken to guard against even the possibility of such a case arising as a colony or dependency of the Crown ever granting to any foreign Powers privileges or immunities which are not to be equally shared by all the subjects of Her Majesty.—Bradford, October 27, 1874.

To this (Bradford) meeting your representative was informally invited; but having, when in Bradford previously, fully discussed with Mr. Jacob Behrens the whole point, and with seeming tolerable accord, did not think it necessary to attend.

Your delegation extended, in your name, a cordial invitation to the President and members of the Associated Chambers to send a representative of their number to our next annual meeting,—or any future meeting they could find it convenient to attend.

Your delegation have to thank the President and Executive of the Associated Chambers for the cordiality and good feeling shown to them,—as well as to the Mayor of Newcastle (Addison Potter, Esq.,) whose guests they were during their residence there; also the President of the Newcastle and Gateshead Chamber of Commerce, Hugh Taylor, Esq., and the Secretary, B. Plummer, Esq., for the great attention and hospitality so kindly shown by them to your deputation.

The whole respectfully submitted.

(Signed,)

ANDREW ROBERTSON,

Chairman.

Cor
tiat
Par

the

of
the
ma
any

wh
Aut
it n

with
Rec
rep
and

FIN.

Robe
ated
deleg

mitte

"
consti
gener

tion,

whet
that
shoul

actua

[*Accompanying Documents*: Copy of report of meeting of the Associated Chamber of Commerce at Newcastle, September, 1874; copy correspondence relating to the negotiations for a Reciprocity Treaty between Canada and the United States, presented to Parliament, July, 1874.]

Mr. ROBT. MARSHALL (King's County, N.B.) moved, seconded by the Hon. ROBERT READ (Belleville):—

"That the Report be received, and placed on the Minutes of the Board."

Mr. JOHN MORISON (Toronto), said there seemed to be a good deal of debateable ground covered by that report, and he wished to ask whether the Board in accepting it would commit itself to any particular statement made therein. If the report were merely placed upon the minutes, without any endorsement from the Board, he would have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDENT explained that this was a report from the delegates who were appointed at the meeting in St. John last summer, to attend the Autumn Meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in England, and it merely contained a statement by the delegation of what had taken place.

Mr. ROBERTSON said the chief point he was asked to speak upon was with regard to the differential duties in connection with the proposed Reciprocity Treaty, and he had given his views on that subject. The report he had presented was merely a statement of what had been done, and of course did not bind the Board in any way.

The motion to adopt the Report was then carried.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR., then moved, seconded by Mr. W. F. FINDLAY (Hamilton), as follows:—

"That the thanks of this Board are due, and are hereby tendered, to Messrs. Andrew Robertson and R. S. DeVeber, for their kindness in attending the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain, at Newcastle, in September last, as delegates from the Dominion Board of Trade."

The motion was carried.

PAST PRESIDENTS.

The next subject on the Programme was the following resolution, submitted by the Executive Council:—

"That the Past Presidents of the Dominion Board of Trade be, and they hereby are, constituted *ex officio* members of the Executive Council, with the privilege of seats at all general meetings of the Board, and right to participate in the transaction of business."

Mr. WILLIAM ELLIOTT (Toronto), moved the adoption of this resolution, seconded by Hon. ROBERT READ.

The PRESIDENT: The resolution, as it stands, leaves it in doubt whether the Past Presidents are to be allowed to vote or not. It is desirable that no doubt should be left upon this point. If it is decided that they should have the right to vote, it should be expressly stated in the resolution.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa): In time, the Past Presidents may actually outnumber the members of the Council, although they might not

be the representatives of any Board. I do not think, however, that for a great many years to come any danger need be apprehended from that quarter; but it would be well at the outset to define clearly the share which the Past Presidents are to be entitled to in the transaction of business.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR. : I hope the Board will not adopt this resolution. I think it is based upon a false principle, and will have the effect of changing this body from a representative into an *ex officio* body. At present, this Board is supposed to represent the various commercial organizations throughout the country; and I think that when we meet together, we select a gentleman to preside over *us*, and not to give him a right to sit here irrespective of the body which sent him, and whose opinions he is supposed to represent. If this resolution is adopted, in the course of time you will have in the Executive Council a large body of gentlemen, who, by their experience and position, will exercise a very large influence, in the decisions of the Council. The resolution is contrary to the principle upon which this Board is based; namely, that it is to be composed of representatives of the commercial bodies throughout the country, elected at regular intervals to represent the views of those bodies at the time. In this country, new questions are constantly arising, and old questions are constantly assuming new phases, and it is, therefore, important that this body should be a strictly representative one. Parliament might just as well pass a law, declaring that every gentleman who is elected Speaker should for all time be a member of Parliament, without any reference whatever to the views of his constituents. Of course, if we had a second chamber, where we made provision for the gentlemen who have been our Presidents, and by that means obtain the benefit of their knowledge and experience,—something as they do in England with the Speakers of the Commons,—the proposition might then have its advantages. But in the position in which we stand, I can see no reason, and I have heard none advanced, for adopting the course that is proposed. The honor conferred upon the gentleman who holds the chair, is one which any merchant might be proud of; but I do not see any necessity for adding to it, by making him a permanent member of the Executive, irrespective of whether the Board of Trade which he is supposed to represent, wishes him sent here or not. There is considerable danger, when dealing with one another at this Board, of being carried away too far by a feeling of courtesy; and whilst that feeling is all very well in its way, it should not lead us to change the present representative character of our body, to which its present influence is chiefly, if not altogether due.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT : I think what Mr. White has said has considerable force. But, at the same time, when we remember that the gentlemen who have been our Presidents in the past, have come from different parts of the country to represent no sectional interest, and, moreover, are persons of experience; and further, as this Board has no legislative power, I cannot see the difficulties in the way that gentleman seems to contemplate. It is not very likely that any of these Past Presidents would attend our meet-

ings, unless they were elected delegates from their own Board; therefore I do not see that there is any serious objection to adopting this resolution.

Mr. THOS. COWAN (Galt): I can hardly agree with what Mr. White has said. He seemed to argue as if our ex-Presidents would live as long as the Board of Trade itself. I certainly hope that they will all enjoy long life; but we cannot suppose that any individual will live as long as the Dominion Board of Trade. I do not think these Past-Presidents would exercise any undue influence; and I believe that by their large experience, they would be of great service to the Board. For my own part, I am quite willing to carry out fully the spirit of this resolution, submitted by the Executive Council, and allow ex-Presidents not only to take part in the deliberations of the Board, but to *vote* also on all questions.

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa): I think we are going a little too fast. We must reflect that if we adopt this resolution, we make a very serious change in the Constitution of our Board. We would in a few years have five or six of these gentlemen at our meetings, although they might not represent any body whatever, and might perhaps hold extreme views on some important question. My own impression is, that we should not make any move in this direction at present, and I will therefore oppose the resolution. At the same time I may say, that as this is a proposition to make an important change in the Constitution, I think it cannot be adopted until the proper notice is given.

Mr. HENRY CUNNINGHAM (Kingston): I agree with the remarks of the last speaker. If the motion were adopted, occasions might arise where the ex-Presidents, although having no representative character, might control the decisions of this Board, in a direction not in conformity with the views of the large body of commercial men throughout the country. I think this Board should not have any other members than those who are delegated by the various Boards of Trade.

The PRESIDENT: I may say in explanation, that the object of the Executive Council in proposing this subject was a very simple one. With the exception of Mr. Henry Fry, we have never had the pleasure of the attendance or assistance of any of our ex-Presidents,—although these gentlemen, with the large experience they have attained, could render very valuable assistance to us. For instance, at the meeting in St. John last summer, I took the liberty of sending an invitation to the Hon. John Young, who was probably the only person who could deal in a practical manner with the subject of the Caughnawaga Canal. It seems to me that it was considerations such as these, that induced the Executive Council to submit this question. With reference to the Constitutional objection, I may say that a regular notice of this proposition was given at the last regular meeting.

The motion was then put, and declared lost on the following division:—

Ayes.—Messrs. Cowan, Elder, Elliott, Gillespie, Hughes, Morison, Pennock, Read, Skead.—9.

the other departments; it has, in short, been said to "have to do with every imaginable thing in the world, but not with trade." When the Treaty of Commerce between Great Britain and France inaugurated a freer commercial policy on the Continent of Europe, it was found that British interests frequently suffered for want of active and zealous vigilance on the part of the Government,—and a movement was begun by the Associated Chambers of Commerce in favor of the establishment of a Department of Commerce. The result of the agitation was the appointment of a Royal Commission in 1864, to inquire into the working connections of the Board of Trade with the Foreign Office. The report of the Commissioners showed that the Board of Trade had neither the power nor the organization for the performance of such functions in relation to commerce,—although one of its branches (*since abolished*, the duties being now performed in other offices,)—was designated the "Commercial Department." In fact, the Commission demonstrated that every department in Her Majesty's Government "decides upon " questions having the most important bearing upon commerce, with reference " only to its own particular sphere; thus the India Office imposes duties upon " manufactured cotton without considering how the Lancashire trade is affected or " injured thereby; the Colonial Office concludes treaties with the United States of " America, giving privileges to American produce which British goods do not possess; " the Foreign Office concluded conventions for the sugar trade, which ruined many " British refiners; the Treasury has proposed alterations in monetary and banking " systems of the country without duly considering the effects they might have upon " trade; taxes are imposed or removed without due regard to the interests affected " by them."

The Report of the Commission also shows that many of the measures above referred to would not have been taken, or very much modified, if each Minister had been obliged to consult a colleague charged with the duty of considering the ultimate effects of every measure upon the interests confided to his care.

The Association of Chambers of Commerce are renewing the efforts commenced so many years ago, and in their latest memorial to the Right Honorable Mr. Disraeli, they say :—

Your Memorialists submit that if such a department of the Government existed, the commercial public would have only one authority to whom to address their representations, assured that their matured and legitimate opinions would have a zealous advocate in the Cabinet, whose advice may be sometimes overruled by higher, more general, and even merely political reasons, but not without having been thoroughly discussed upon their merits.

It is by no means intended to convey the impression that commercial men desire to see trade interests overrule all others, for they know that there may be considerations of high State policy, or even facts not known, or sufficiently appreciated, by the general public, which may render the immediate fulfilment of their most legitimate demands inexpedient. But they feel themselves justified in expressing their strong conviction, that as hardly any great question can arise in any department of Government, which has not a more or less direct bearing upon trade, a satisfactory consideration of commercial interests can only be secured by their representation in the Cabinet by a Minister possessing the same power and influence as his colleagues who preside over the other chief departments of the State.

Such a Minister, animated with a due sense of his responsibility as the official guardian of the mighty and ever-widening interests of the industry of this great empire, would be summoned, as a matter of right to every Cabinet Council. He would there be enabled to see that no measure undertaken in the interest, primarily, of the national revenue or of finance—no diplomatic arrangement with foreign States, and no Act of colonial legislation requiring the sanction of the Government at home—received that sanction without its effect on the interests of the commerce and industry of England having been first duly considered and discussed, and its probable consequence to those interests maturely weighed. He would further, from the means of information afforded by frequent communication (on an equal footing) with other Cabinet Ministers, and by communication with the representatives of commercial interests among the people, be enabled to discern betimes openings and opportunities for promoting those interests, and to press them with authority and effect on the attention of the entire Cabinet.

The Movement in the United States.

The question of establishing a Department of Commerce in the Government of the United States has engaged more or less of the attention of commercial men. A movement in that direction was commenced in 1865, by the adoption of the following resolution at the Detroit Commercial Convention:—

“*Resolved*,—That in order to relieve some of the Departments of the General Government, and especially that of the Treasury, from many of the details with which they are now crowded,—and in order to secure for the various industrial interests of the country the benefits of a systematised, experienced, and permanent Board, it is the judgment of this Convention that a Government Board of Trade should be formed, for the especial oversight and care of all questions relating to our agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial interests, for the compilation of statistics, for inquiring into casualties, and for such other subjects as may properly be included in such a Department.”

The subject was afterwards taken up by the National Board of Trade of the United States, at several of its meetings, the idea of that body seeming to be that the Department of Commerce should be an *executive* branch of the Federal Government, the model being apparently the British Board of Trade. Congress was memorialised in favor of a Department of Commerce in the winter of 1869; and the views of the National Board on the subject were subsequently embodied in a proposed Bill, of which the following were the main features:—

1. The Department to be charged with the supervision and care of the agricultural, commercial, manufacturing and mining interests of the United States.
2. With the execution of laws relating to trade and commerce, both foreign and domestic,—to rivers and harbors,—to light houses, port charges, quarantine, emigration, pilotage, tonnage, and the measurement, registry, enrolment and licensing of vessels, and generally of all matters included in the navigation laws.
3. With the execution of the laws imposing duties on imports, and taxes and excises pertaining to internal revenue.
4. With the collecting, collating and tabulating of statistics relating to the agriculture, commerce, manufactures and mining.

There is at present before the Senate a Bill, proposing to establish a Department of Commerce in the United States Government, prepared by Hon. Wm. Windom, Chairman of the Senatorial Committee on Transportation, which will be discussed, if not more definitely acted upon, during the present Congress. But Mr. Windom is looking much further forward; for, besides a “Bureau of Commerce,” he suggests another, to be designated the “Bureau of Industry,” to include agriculture, manufactures, mines, &c.

Department of Commerce in France.

The Department of Commerce, in France, was established in 1830, and the Minister is a member of the Cabinet. Conjointly with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, he makes commercial treaties, *after consultation with the Chambers of Commerce.*

The Department includes two general divisions,—Home and Foreign. The division for Home Trade is subdivided into four bureaux, each of which is charged with numerous details; and the division for Foreign Trade is subdivided into three bureaux, to one of them being entrusted the subject of commercial treaties.

The Minister of Commerce, in France, is also Minister of Agriculture,—the latter Department embracing three bureaux, (1) relating to agricultural education; (2) relating to the encouragement of and giving assistance to agriculture; and (3) relating to the trade in Grain and Cattle, cattle-markets, slaughtering houses, Corn Exchanges, &c.

The Ministry of Commerce, &c., in Prussia.

Commercial affairs, so far as the German Empire is concerned, come under the jurisdiction of the Office of Foreign Affairs at Berlin.

The Imperial Prussian "Ministry of Commerce, Industries, and Public Works," has as its responsible head the Royal Prussian States Minister, who, in this connection bears the official title of Minister of Commerce, Industries, and Public Works. This Ministry is divided into four departments, and the business of each is superintended by Ministerial Directors. The first comprises the administration of Mining, Metallurgy, and the production of Salts; the second has the supervision and control of all Government railroads, and private railroad corporations; the third attends to all Government Building-matters, in reference to either land or hydraulic construction,—with the exception of railroad construction; the fourth Department has a care of all matters either directly or indirectly connected with Commerce and Industry. To this latter department belong any matters connected with Mechanical Industry, and manufactures; commercial law-courts, mercantile corporations, and artizan courts; Shipping, Marine Commissions in sea-ports, ship-owning, and Pilotage; Banking, Patents; Joint Stock, and Transport-Insurance-Companies; and the oversight of technical mercantile institutions.

An important point to be noted in connection with each of the general subjects embraced under these four Departments, is, that there are arrangements made for careful attention to the training of artizans, scientists, and parties intending to enter Governmental service.

The Situation in the Dominion of Canada.

In considering the necessity for a Department of Commerce, to be presided over by a Cabinet Minister, the reasoning and arguments used in favor of the proposal in Great Britain and in the United States apply equally in Canada,—the experience here being nearly the same, although necessarily on a smaller scale.

(1.) In the matter of printing and publishing the Census Tables of the Dominion,—while, possibly, the Minister of Commerce (had there been one) might not have preferred that the Agricultural, Industrial, and Shipping Statistics should be issued in advance of the Vital Statistics,—there can hardly be a doubt but that the whole work would have been printed before so many years had elapsed after the Census taking. Ere the third Census-volume is circulated, the middle of the next census decade will be not far off, and the question will then be, not so much—what of the past? as, what of the future?

(2.) It may be safely asserted, that, had there been a Minister of Commerce in the Dominion Cabinet, when the General Inspection Law was before Parliament in 1873 and again in 1874, it would not have been passed with so many glaring defects in it,—and its disagreement in a number of particulars with the spirit of the Weights and Measures Act, would surely have been prevented; while, as regards the working of the law, the difficulties experienced by Boards of Trade in giving effect to some of its provisions would have been promptly obviated.

(3.) The Minister of Commerce would undoubtedly be the proper member of the Cabinet to be entrusted with the arrangement of the general provisions and details of any proposed Treaty or Convention relating to Trade, and would be best qualified to deal with necessary Tariff changes.

(4.) Had there been a Minister of Commerce in the Canadian Cabinet, the anomaly could not have been allowed to exist, of thousands upon thousands of car-loads of various kinds of Produce passing through Canada from one United States port to an-

other, without let or hindrance,—while punctilious obstructiveness was observed relative to merchandise passing through the United States from one Canadian port to another.*

It must, of course, be borne in mind, that when, at the time of Confederation, the number of Cabinet Ministers was increased, Canada had not sufficient breadth of experience upon which to base the assignment of duties to the new port-folios. Now, however, the Dominion Government might with eminent propriety and advantage establish a Department of Commerce, with a Cabinet Minister at its head, and also re-arrange the duties and functions of such other Ministers of the Crown as would be affected by the addition of an active Member to the Cabinet.

Without venturing to dogmatize upon what ought to be included in the working details of a Department of Commerce, among the first things to be attended to should be :—

The making of arrangements for collecting systematically full statistics relating to the products of the Dominion Fisheries.

The publication of a monthly statement of imports and exports, for each Province—with a summary for the Dominion—specifying dutiable and free goods, &c,—giving *quantities* as well as *values*.

Summaries of Foreign Commercial Statistics, and of Foreign Tariffs should be published from time to time.

There should be a Register kept of prices of the various kinds of Produce, &c., in the principal markets of the Dominion.

Statements should be published periodically showing the course and magnitude of the *internal* commerce of the Dominion—its nature, extent, and value—and its relations to foreign countries.

The *value* of the *freight* carried by railways, steamboats, &c.

The capital represented by railways, steamboats, &c., &c.

The earnings of railways, steamboats, &c.

NOTE.—The foregoing information relating to France and Germany, is abridged from special communications received from Paris and Berlin, which contain many other interesting details on this subject.

The PRESIDENT: The resolution on this subject, submitted by the Executive Council, is as follows :—

“ That the question of constituting a Department of Commerce, in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, to be presided over by a Cabinet Minister, be urged upon the attention of the Dominion Government.”

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa) : Would it not be well to postpone this question until to-morrow, in order to give more time for consideration, as it is a matter of very great importance ?

Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.) : I would like to ask, for information, whether this resolution means that there should be a Minister of Agriculture and a Minister of Commerce, or simply that the Department of Commerce should be in connection with the Department of Agriculture ?

The PRESIDENT: It means that the two departments should be practically one. I may say at this point, that it is open for any member to move a resolution on this subject, of a different character from the one

* See Proceedings on afternoon of third day, and forenoon of fourth day.

submitted by the Executive Council, if it should be thought desirable. The Executive have no intention to confine the action of the Board to the exact words or terms of any resolution on the programme, which they may have introduced.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa) : The question is a very important one, involving weighty considerations which should receive careful attention, as well as the paper which has been read to us by the Secretary. Hence I agree with Mr. McGillivray that more time should be given for its consideration. I therefore move that the question be deferred until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT: Then you will have to refer it back to the Committee on Order of Business, who will give it a new place on the programme. I think it is a bad commencement to begin moving back subjects, for if we get into that practice, it will make it very difficult for us to proceed with anything like promptitude. For instance, the next question that comes up will also require consideration, as it is very important, and should also on the same grounds be moved back, inasmuch as it is a new subject to a large extent. Besides, there are several other subjects on the programme of which the same may be said.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR., (Montreal) : I beg leave to move the following resolution :

"That the question of constituting a Department of Commerce to be presided over by a Cabinet Minister, be urged upon the attention of the Dominion Government; and that the paper on the subject, submitted by the Secretary, be sent to the Secretary of State for the information of the Government."

I propose to strike out the words "in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture," from the motion of the Executive Council—and for this reason: by some fatality, under all Ministers, the Department of Agriculture has been the least efficient, although in many respects most important. It seems to me that it would be unfortunate to leave the questions which it is desired should be under the control of a Department of Commerce, to the officials of the Department of Agriculture and Statistics, when we consider the long delays which take place in securing statistics from that Department. For instance, take the municipal statistics of Ontario, which are supposed to be compiled from the different assessment rolls. It is generally about two years after the year to which they refer, before we can get these returns published in pamphlet form. In a country like Canada, where we think we are progressing, at any rate, statistics of that character are of really no value whatever. They are simply misleading; and it would be very much better not to have them at all. The preparation of the Census Returns is another illustration of the same fact. The Census of England was taken on the same day as ours. I had in my possession full abstract reports of the entire Census of Great Britain and Ireland, within less than six months from the time the Census was taken, and before they had even commenced in the Department of Agriculture in this country to add up the figures. The full reports of the English Census, which constitute some four or five large volumes, have

been in my possession for over eighteen months; and yet, to-day we have only two small volumes of our Census Returns,—while a most important volume to commercial men, namely, that relating to the trade, industries and agriculture of the country, has not yet seen the light. In view of these facts, it would be most unfortunate to ask this Department, which is so dilatory in procuring statistics, to take upon itself the further task of procuring the commercial statistics which we desire to have. In the United States they get monthly returns from the Agricultural Department, which are published by the 15th day of the following month, giving a summary statement of the condition of the crops throughout that country. This information, being of recent date, is always of a very valuable character. But, unfortunately, we do not get anything of this kind in Canada, chiefly owing to the fact, that there seems to be no one among the permanent heads of the Department—respectable gentlemen as they are—who has the slightest interest whatever in connection with statistics. For these reasons I make the motion which I have already read; including in it, that the valuable paper read by our Secretary, Mr. Patterson, be submitted to the Government along with the resolution.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK: I had prepared a resolution very similar in its terms to that moved by Mr. White, and if it is desired that the discussion should go on now, I beg leave to second his motion instead of moving my own. It will be borne in mind that at the time this Board was formed, we took grounds very similar to that taken by Mr. Patterson. It was then thought premature to move a motion such as the one now presented. When Mr. Fry was making his remarks in reference to the inaccuracy of statistics, I thought that if we had such a department as the one now asked for, the evil he complained of might be remedied. Of course, it will be urged against this, that we have already three Cabinet Ministers whose duties are more or less connected with commerce. I refer to the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the Minister of Customs. However, the duties to be assigned to a Minister of Commerce, are quite distinct from those of the ministers I have referred to. I do not desire that these duties should be assigned to the Department of Agriculture, for reasons similar to those adduced by Mr. White. It may be objected that it is undesirable to increase the number of Cabinet Ministers. But if the proposition contained in this motion could be carried into effect, it would not necessarily follow that the number of ministers would be increased, because there might be a re-organization of the departments relating to trade and commerce, and such a division of duties as would not necessitate an additional department.

Mr. F. M. SPROUL (King's County, N.B.): I think it very desirable, notwithstanding the fact that the Cabinet is now somewhat large and perhaps rather unwieldy, that the commercial men of this country should be placed in a position to obtain all necessary statistics in reference to trade and commerce; but under the present organization of the departments, they certainly have not that advantage. Although I do not intend to make any sweeping charges against the Minister of Agriculture, yet I hold,

—e
mu
Boa
sary
othe
mat
foll

has
resc
anc
one
tion
thin
of G
Agr
that
wer
mer
crea
the
depa
satis
spea
mati
infor
to m
a po
ing t
men
prob
no d
impo
stat

this
I
cial la
This
merch
to the
is of i
added

—and I think the arguments advanced in Mr. Patterson's able paper, must bring that conviction home to the mind of every member of this Board,—that such a department as the one argued for is absolutely necessary. It would be preferable to have such a department distinct from others, rather than in connection with one of the existing departments. This matter should be placed prominently before the Dominion Government, and followed up from year to year until we obtain what is desired.

Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.) : The form in which Mr. White has put his resolution meets the enquiry I addressed to you. The original resolution as presented, appeared to be ambiguous, and was not in accordance with the paper presented by Mr. Patterson,—the paper supporting one view, and the resolution another. I heartily endorse the recommendation, although not for the reasons that have been presented to the Board. I think we could not draw any inference from the condition of any department of Government at any particular time. It may be that the Department of Agriculture is, or has been, somewhat slow in getting out statistics ; but that is not an inherent feature of the Department of Agriculture. If that were the chief argument in favor of establishing a Department of Commerce, it would be better to reform the Department of Agriculture, than to create a new department because of the remissness of an existing one. If the same argument were carried out fully, we would have to create a new department every time we found that any one department was not working satisfactorily. Having had a good deal to do with statistical matters, I can speak from experience of the difficulty in obtaining such commercial information as the public desire. But of the importance of securing such information there can be no doubt. One great object with us should be to make this Confederation a commercial success,—for it cannot even be a political success if it is not so commercially—and I think we are promoting that end in making this suggestion to the Government. The recommendation to increase the number of departments if necessary, is probably one the Government would entertain with considerable favor ; and no doubt if the project were carried out vigorously, it would produce very important results in the direction of acquiring complete commercial statistics.

Mr. WHITE's amendment was then put and carried unanimously.

TRIBUNALS OF COMMERCE.

The PRESIDENT, W. H. Howland, Esq. read the following paper on this subject :—

It must strike every one who has given any thought to the question, that commercial lawsuits are rare in occurrence as compared with suits based upon other matters. This does not arise from a paucity of causes for suits, but because the experience of all merchants tells them that it is better to compromise, even at a serious loss, than to submit to the annoyance and expense of seeking redress at a court of justice. The loss of time is of itself a serious matter to a merchant in a large way of trade ; and when to that is added the fact, that the rules and customs which regulate the transactions between

traders, are in the majority of cases of no effect in a court of law, it will readily be seen that a less expensive and more expeditious tribunal, which should have the power of dealing with commercial cases, subject to the rules and customs of trade, would be a great boon to commerce in this country.

In Ontario, I believe that we have causes decided as expeditiously as in any country in the world; but we are subject to the prolonging of the cases by the right of appeal to higher courts, to an extent which makes it possible for any one litigiously inclined, to charge the suit with very onerous expenses, and subject the merchant to great loss of time.

In Quebec, on the contrary, the process is exceedingly dilatory, and in many cases I believe suits drag on from year to year.

As a general rule commercial disputes are simple in their character, and largely turn on accounts, differences of opinion as to the nature or extent of contracts or the enforcement of contracts, and it is evident that a much less cumbrous system than the law courts would be amply sufficient.

It is admitted by lawyers generally, that a large proportion of commercial cases have to be referred back to arbitrators or referees, after expensive proceedings have been taken in the courts, and in many cases after the trial has been partially proceeded with. In these cases the expense of a trial in court has to be incurred, before it is discovered that a decision can only be arrived at by calling in the services of a referee. This is, I think, of itself a sufficient argument for the establishment of tribunals which should be especially competent to deal with such questions.

Tribunals of Commerce have been established for years in Germany, France, and in the city of New York, while the result has not only been eminently satisfactory to traders, but these courts have also obtained the approval of the different legislative bodies and of the highest legal authorities.

In Germany the system is briefly as follows:

The court is composed of a legal judge, assisted by an even number of commercial judges. There is a right of appeal to the higher courts; but the statistics given show that out of 11,949 cases, only 139 appeals were entered, and out of this number sixty-seven per cent were confirmed. The percentage of reversals in the ordinary courts was very much greater.

In France the system is somewhat different, the judges being all chosen from among commercial men, though the clerk is required to be a lawyer of standing. The success of these Tribunals is even greater than in Germany, as in four years over 110,000 cases were presented, the number of appeals very small, and only thirteen per cent of these reversed.

In New York City the Tribunal is confined to the Chamber of Commerce. The judge is appointed by the Governor of the State, by the consent of the Senate, and the powers of the Court extend to all cases between members of the Chamber, except such as affect the rights of minors, married women, or relate to persons of unsound mind, or causes affecting real estate. The decision of this court is final, and can only be appealed from when fraud or collusion can be proven against the judge. The submission is, however, voluntary.

In England the question has been agitated to some extent, and a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider it. Some steps are proposed to be taken to meet the views of merchants by enlarging the powers of County Courts; but the advocates of Tribunals of Commerce are not satisfied with this, and are confident they will eventually succeed in getting an approximation to the French or German system adopted.

I
that a
for the
mercis
behav
be pai
by Bo
appeal
partie
to be f
the rig
questi
in Cou
Court
have a
cution
assista
T
on wh
mercat
tion in
effectiv
with li
the est
] are u
and a
must
in nin
be me
sugge
unac
move
" be bro
introdu
provid
copy of
] motio
of sett
establ
] might
busine
comm
been l

Looking to what is required in this country, I am of opinion it would be essential that a legal judge should preside over the court. He might either be appointed specially for the purpose, or be selected from the present Bench. A sufficient number of Commercial Judges should be appointed to ensure efficiency, to hold office during good behaviour. They should be selected from the different branches of Trade, and might be paid by fees, which should not exceed the ordinary fees for arbitration usually allowed by Boards of Trade. The summons should be absolute, not voluntary; but the right of appeal should be allowed to the highest court in the Province. In case, however, the parties to a suit should agree that there should be no appeal, the judgment of the court to be final. The powers of the court to cover all commercial cases, except such as affect the rights of minors and married women, or relate to persons of unsound mind, or to questions affecting real estate. The Commercial Judges to be appointed by the Governor in Council, out of a list to be furnished by the Boards of Trade of the City in which the Court is to be established. Tribunals of Commerce to be only established in cities which have a population of not less than 10,000 inhabitants. Causes on which criminal prosecutions could be founded, to be referred to the ordinary courts. Legal advice or assistance may be retained by suitors, but at the expense of the party employing them.

These recommendations are necessarily crude; but I think they contain the basis on which the structure can be raised. When it is more generally understood that the mercantile community are, to a great extent, debarred from the benefit of legal protection in their transactions under the present system, and that the want of a cheap and effective court is really a protection to rogues and swindlers,—I feel certain we will meet with little opposition in carrying a measure of so great value to merchants generally as the establishment of Tribunals of Commerce.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton): I am sure, Mr. President, the Board are under obligation to you for bringing this matter up, in the very clear and able document you have just read. Everyone engaged in commerce must from experience be sensible of the truth of your statement, that in nine cases out of ten the disputes arising in matters of business can be more easily settled in the simple and common-sense manner you have suggested, than by taking the ordinary proceedings at law. I think it unnecessary to add anything to the remarks you have made, and simply move the following resolution:

"That the question of establishing Tribunals of Commerce, or Arbitration Courts, be brought under the special notice of the Hon. Minister of Justice, with a view to the introduction of a measure during the next Session of the Dominion Parliament, to provide for the summary settlement of commercial disputes and differences, and that a copy of the paper now read by the President, be sent to the Secretary of State."

Mr. H. SHOREY (Montreal), seconded the motion.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto): I do not wish to offer any objection to the motion, but simply to remark, that if merchants would take the course of settling their disputes among themselves, it would be much better than establishing a new tribunal.

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa), said that while such a tribunal might not be an absolute necessity, yet it would be a great advantage to business men, especially in Lower Canada, where the delays in settling commercial cases were most extraordinary. He had cases which have been before Lower Canada Courts for the last fifteen years, and they did

not appear to be any farther advanced now than at first. A Board of Arbitration, or some such tribunal as the one proposed, would settle such cases in three or four days.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), said he was very glad this matter had been brought before the Board. Merchants who had been obliged to bring any matter of importance before a jury in the Upper Canada Courts must feel that it is very seldom justice can be obtained in that way. The same difficulty existed in Lower Canada, where the case usually came before the judge. If such cases were brought before a body of commercial men, they could at once see what was just and right in the matter, and decide accordingly. You could not put the decision of a case involving matters of moment into worse hands than an ordinary jury.

Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (King's County, N.B.), cordially endorsed the statements contained in the paper read by the President, and believed that the establishing of such a tribunal as the one proposed would be a great boon to the country. He believed it would be found very advantageous in the settlement of losses covered by insurance. As the law now stood, merchants and underwriters, in many cases, yielded more than they were entitled to, simply to avoid endless litigation. What the honest insured and the honest underwriter desired, was simply justice; and he believed justice could be obtained more speedily, and with less annoyance and expense, by Tribunals of Commerce than by the present system.

Hon. ROBERT READ (Belleville), said it was well known by commercial men, that their transactions were usually conducted in a hurried manner, and with very little time to guard themselves against defects in written contracts. A great deal is left to the good faith of the parties transacting. He was not a lawyer; but he believed they had a law in Ontario, under which the parties in a commercial case could, if they chose, have it referred to arbitration. But his experience was, that the lawyers rather discouraged such a mode of settling, and preferred the usual settlement by the courts, which was more lucrative to them. He believed the system proposed would be a great advantage, and he would therefore support the motion.

Mr. ADAM HOPE (Hamilton), said he had not found any difficulty in getting the courts in Upper Canada to enforce his contracts; but, of course, if men neglected to make a contract properly, they could not expect the courts to enforce it. But if a merchant made a contract, and stated in plain language what the agreement was, he would find the courts of law very ready to compel its fulfilment. He had had considerable experience in commercial matters, and had never had any difficulty with regard to litigation.

Mr. WM. R. MINGAYE (Kingston), said there really was such a provision in the Upper Canada law, with reference to arbitration, as Mr. Read had stated; but both the parties must agree to submit the case to arbitration, unless the judge decided that it was a case which should go to

arbit
the s
soon

read
consi
expe
estal

whic
refer
last
neve

Trad

the p
court
prese
other
temp
tribu
he th
they

part
the r

the
regre
could
thoug
and s
in mo

Upp
I do
somel
when
days
couns
twelv
that
Cana

arbitration. While he did not object to the paper which had been read, at the same time he thought that if people wished to go to law, they would as soon go to the courts as to arbitration as a general rule.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), said he was quite willing that the paper read by the President should be referred to the Government, and the consideration of the matter urged upon them; but he had very little expectation that the Government, or the Legislature, would at present establish a new court.

Mr. JOHN MORISON (Toronto), said he approved of many of the views which had been expressed; yet he found that the present provision for reference to arbitration was very seldom taken advantage of. Within the last four years in Toronto, he believed that the Board of Arbitration had never been called upon to consider a single case.

The PRESIDENT: The Board appointed by the Toronto Board of Trade have had only one case in five years.

Mr. MORISON said that if parties would not resort to arbitration under the present system, it was a question whether they would resort to the new court proposed in preference to the ordinary courts. The difficulty at present no doubt is, that where one party is willing to go to arbitration, the other party may not be willing. He wished to know whether it was contemplated by the proposed measure, to compel one party to resort to this tribunal in cases where the other party wished it. If that could be done, he thought a great point would be gained; but if not, he did not see that they would accomplish much, even if they got this court established.

The PRESIDENT: The proposition contained in my paper was, that the parties should be compelled to resort to this court, but they would have the right to appeal.

Mr. P. HUGHES said, that in a conversation with the Hon. Mr. Mowat, the Ontario Premier, the other day, that gentleman had expressed his regret that there was not a single merchant in the House with whom he could take counsel in matters relating to commerce. He (Mr. Hughes) thought it would perhaps be well for merchants to consider that matter, and see whether it might not be to their advantage to take their fair share in moulding the legislation of the country.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec): I do not know what our friends in Upper Canada have to suffer in the way of delays in commercial cases; but I do know that in Lower Canada under the *enquête* system, the delays are something frightful. I happened to be in a court in Quebec the other day, when a lawyer made application to the judge to postpone his case a few days longer, on the plea that his last witness was absent. The opposing counsel objected, on the ground that the case had now been in court over twelve years and was not yet closed. That was a sample of the delays that occurred. Such a horror have we in Quebec of going into the Lower Canada courts in commercial cases, that during the past season, cases of

collision on the river have been referred to me by merchants, which I reluctantly took hold of and decided in less than three weeks, at the expense of only a few dollars to the parties; whereas, had they gone to the courts the delays would have been endless and the expense very heavy. It is quite true that we have a provision in the charter of our Board of Trade, for the appointment of arbitrators, to whom cases might be referred; but I think we have only had two cases so referred in the past four or five years. This question has been discussed within the last few years to a very considerable extent in England. Mr. Sidney, of Waterloo, has taken a warm interest in it, and the chief opponent to the measure has been the *London Times*. The main argument in opposition to it is simply this: that cheap law is always bad law, and that in the course of time the commercial law would be thrown into confusion by the contrary decisions of incompetent men. In England, the lawyers and commercial men differ chiefly on this point: the lawyers hold that if such a court is established, while you may have two merchants as assessors, you must have a judge from the legal profession who should be responsible for the decisions; the merchants, on the other hand, say that they wish the court to be composed of two merchants and a judge, all of whom shall be judges in the case, and execute whatever the decision of the majority shall rule,—that is that the two merchants should have the same power as the judge. My impression is, that during the next session of the Imperial Parliament such a bill will pass, and then our Government will have something to guide them in legislating on this subject. Especially in Lower Canada, it is of vast importance to commercial men, that mercantile cases should be speedily and economically adjusted.

Mr. P. R. JARVIS (Stratford), said if the operation of the law was bad in Quebec, he had found it far worse in New Brunswick. He shipped a good deal of flour and oatmeal to that Province, and when one party to whom he shipped refused to pay, he could obtain no redress. He thought it spoke well for the mercantile community, that when so much was left to the honesty and good faith of one another, there was so little litigation; but when they came across parties like the one he had referred to, who chose to be dishonest, then some such tribunal as the one proposed would be of great advantage, as a decision could be reached promptly.

Mr. SPROUL (King's County, N.B.), said he believed that the laws of New Brunswick were just and equitable; but he admitted that the process in the law courts was sometimes very tedious, which led merchants occasionally to abandon their just claims rather than prosecute them in the courts. This fact he considered a strong argument in favor of the establishment of the tribunal proposed, which would very much expedite the settlement of disputes among merchants. Then there were certain cases which should be settled, not so much by reference to the law as to the usages of trade; and no one could be better qualified to decide questions involving the customs of trade than those who were engaged in it. While, therefore, he approved of the institution of tribunals of commerce as a speedy and economical way of settling disputes between merchants, he must say that

his f
were
the
diffic

muni
inter
fees
mark

the f
prote
repre
howe
comp
this s
were
opera
by-la
certa
that
busin
consi
allow
cours
But t
up ag
showi
comp
best
shoul
to see
glad t
with a
argun
theref

this re
of this
conser
Gilles
howev
the on

his friend from Stratford, in asserting that the laws of New Brunswick were worse than those of any other Province, was mistaken. He believed the laws were not so much to blame; it would generally be found that the difficulty complained of was due to carelessness in making bargains.

The motion was then put and carried.

MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS OBSTRUCTING TRADE.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), moved the following resolution:

"That in the opinion of this Board, the true interests of the citizens of every municipality are best served, by adopting the policy of untrammelled commercial intercourse with all the markets of the Dominion; and that By-laws exacting license-fees from Commercial Travellers should be repealed,—the advantages of an open market being more than equivalent to the revenue derived."

In moving this resolution, I have to call the attention of this Board to the fact, that some years ago it was thought necessary for certain cities to protect themselves from the competition of rival markets, by taxing the representatives of the parties doing business in other cities. It soon, however, became apparent to most people, that the advantages of free competition were much greater than any revenue which was derived from this source. The consequence was, that the by-laws imposing such taxes were either repealed in most municipalities, or were not carried into operation. However, at the present time, in the city of Quebec, the by-law is being enforced, and commercial travellers are required to pay certain taxes. Of course the argument in favor of such a tax would be, that some protection is due to those merchants who have established their business in a city and pay handsomely to the revenue; and it is not considered fair towards them, that the merchants of other cities should be allowed to go in and compete with them without also paying taxes. Of course, at first sight, that seems to be a reasonable kind of argument. But the interests of any one section of the community, should not be set up against the interests of the country at large; and I think it could be shown that the municipality itself would be benefitted by free and open competition with other cities. While it is quite true that protection is our best policy, as regards our trade with foreigners, it is equally true that we should have the freest commercial intercourse amongst ourselves. I am sorry to see that the city of Quebec has set a bad example in this matter, and am glad that the Board of Trade of that city has placed a notice on the paper, with a view to the abolition of the obnoxious tax. I think it requires no argument to show the disadvantage to trade generally of such a tax, and I therefore will merely move the resolution.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec): I have very much pleasure in seconding this resolution. But I wish to explain that the gentleman who had charge of this particular subject from our Board is not present, and therefore I consented to the plan of combining the motion from our Board with Mr. Gillespie's motion respecting the commercial travellers' tax. I may say, however, that the question proposed by our Board is very much wider than the one proposed by Mr. Gillespie. His applies merely to the particular

tax on commercial travellers ; whereas the motion of our Board referred to the whole question of municipality taxation as affecting the trade of the Dominion. In Quebec we have a vast number of people who do not pay their taxes at all ; and inasmuch as the merchants do pay their taxes, the city authorities seem to think the best plan is to pile the taxes on the merchants, in order that those classes who are not willing to pay may escape. With regard to the special tax upon commercial travellers, although Montreal merchants were very severe in their censure on Quebec for such a tax, it was found out subsequently that there was a similar by-law in Montreal for imposing the same tax. Of course it was not enforced in Montreal, and neither was it enforced in Quebec, except in a very few cases. A member of the Corporation told me, that the whole income from that source was only about \$500. Personally, I am opposed to this tax as strongly as any other man ; but I am not authorized to express the opinion of our Board. The Council of our Board petitioned the City Council to abolish the tax, as we considered it contrary to the interests of trade, and behind the spirit of the age. A considerable number of our members afterwards got up a petition in favor of retaining the tax. The question has never been discussed by the Board itself, and therefore I am not in a position to say what the opinion of the majority of the members is. It is a fact not perhaps universally known, that this tax, if carried out legally, applies not only to sellers, but to buyers. I happen to know of a case in Quebec, in which a gentleman laid out some \$50,000 in the course of one season in connection with his business, and he was taxed \$60, because he was regarded as a transient trader.

Mr. J. A. HARDING (St. John, N.B.), said that in his city this tax had of late years been imposed to a very small extent. He did not think it had the approval of the community generally, although he was very much in the position of Mr. Fry, and could not speak with authority as to the sentiments of his Board. The question had not been prominently brought before them.

Mr. Wm. DARLING (Montreal), said that they in Montreal, were very glad to see that the Quebec Board of Trade had introduced this matter. It was perfectly true that there was such a law in Montreal, but so little was it known that merchants generally had forgotten about it, and it was only when their attention was especially called to it, that it was found out that the law actually existed. That the law did not find much favor in Montreal was evident from the fact that it had never been enforced. He did not think the resolution went far enough. It merely objected to this particular tax ; but he thought an effort should be made to restrain municipalities from passing by-laws detrimental to the commerce of the country.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), said he was glad to find that Mr. Gillespie was in favor of free commercial intercourse within our own borders, and he hoped by-and-by that gentleman would see the advantage of equally free intercourse with other countries. With regard to the remarks of Mr. Fry, he would say that his own firm were obliged to pay

\$60 before their traveller could do any business in Quebec, whereas in Montreal he did not know of a single case in which the law had been enforced. In his experience, he had not found it enforced in any other place than Quebec. He thought the tax should be abolished, and he would vote for the motion.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), said he quite agreed with Mr. Darling, that the motion before the Board did not go far enough. It merely referred to the question whether the Legislature should give municipalities power to impose a tax upon commercial travellers. The mere expression of opinion on that subject would in no way affect the fact. The actual want was, that the power of municipalities should be limited, so that they would not have the right to impose taxes restricting the trade and commerce of the country. With regard to what Mr. Robertson had said as to the tax never being enforced in Montreal, he had to say that that gentleman was in error, as he knew of instances in which the tax had been levied.

Mr. THOS. COWAN (Galt), observed that it appeared to him they were going rather far, and the country at large might complain that the Board was becoming rather arbitrary and dictatorial, wishing to assume the whole government of the country upon its own hands. We had already recommended an additional member to the Cabinet, and had also recommended the establishment of another Court; and now it was proposed to dictate to the municipalities what their powers should be. Municipal corporations knew best what was in the interests of their own municipalities, and we should be very careful how we interfere with their jurisdiction. They were kings within their own realms, and they would look with a jealous eye on any dictation from this Board. He thought the original motion went quite far enough, and he would support it.

Mr. JOHN MORISON (Toronto), entirely agreed with the remarks of the last speaker. He did not think the suggestions of Mr. Darling or Mr. Joseph could be enforced. With regard to the tax upon Commercial Travellers, he might say that a few parties did get up a petition in Toronto with a view to impose this tax, but he was glad to see that the good sense of the mercantile community was diametrically opposed to any such step being taken, and the tax was never enforced. He was also of opinion that the resolution went far enough.

Mr. GILLESPIE'S resolution was then put and carried.

On motion, the Board adjourned until 7.30 o'clock, P.M.

EVENING SESSION.

TUESDAY, *January 19, 1875.*

The Board met at 7.30 o'clock, P.M., the President in the chair.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The Committee on Order of Business, by their Chairman, made their second report, as follows :—

They recommend that where delegates may desire to submit any question on the Official Programme to a Special Committee, they be permitted to move to that effect at any time, when there is no motion before the Chair, the motion being made, and the vote taken thereon without debate.

Respectfully submitted.

(Signed,) THOS. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

On motion of Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), it was resolved :—

"That a Special Committee be appointed to consider and report upon the 'Rights and Liabilities of Common Carriers,' and upon the 'Establishment of the Office of Average Adjusters at the principal ports of the Dominion.'"

The PRESIDENT subsequently appointed the Committee, to consist as follows :—

WM. DARLING,	Montreal, <i>Convener.</i>
J. A. HARDING,	St. John, N.B.
HON. JAS. SKEAD,	Ottawa,
WM. ELLIOTT,	Toronto.
ADAM BROWN,	Hamilton.
ANDREW ROBERTSON,	Montreal.

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. A. ROBERTSON (Montreal) : Last year this subject was fully discussed, the whole Act being gone over, and certain amendments suggested. At the meeting in St. John, the report of the Committee was presented; and you will find that it contains a number of amendments, which the Committee thought desirable should be incorporated in the Act. It seems to me, that as the subject has been so completely examined before, if you would appoint a committee to confer with the Minister of Justice, it would be sufficient in the meantime.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa) : I would suggest that the Committee be authorized to not only confer with the Minister of Justice now, but watch the course of the Bill through Parliament, and endeavor to secure such modifications in it as this Board might desire.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec) : I object to the course proposed. Probably there is no subject brought before this Board of greater importance than Insolvency. It has, I admit, been before us for, I believe, three

years ; and it is true, as Mr. Robertson remarks, that the Committee did meet in St. John, and did make a report ; but I think those who were at St. John will agree with me in saying that the subject was not discussed at all. I would like to see these amendments, referred to in the report of the Committee, discussed *seriatim* before this Board. The object should be to ascertain what the effect of the Act is in different parts of the Dominion. I believe I am safe in saying, that the trade of the Dominion wants an Insolvent Act. I have been informed by the Minister of Justice, that it is the intention of the Government to bring in a measure on the subject at the approaching session, and therefore there is a greater reason for having these amendments discussed here in open Board. Hence I propose that if the subject cannot be taken up to-night, it be postponed until to-morrow, and probably then the Minister of Justice, who has taken a lively interest in this measure, would be very glad to be present when the discussion takes place.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal) : The Committee of this Board reported upon the Bill that was brought in by Mr. Dorion last session. If that bill is to be entirely withdrawn, and if the present Minister intends bringing in a new one, it would be of no use for this meeting to discuss the amendments brought up in connection with Mr. Dorion's Bill. Therefore I think a committee should be appointed at all events, for the purpose of ascertaining from the Minister of Justice whether he adheres to Mr. Dorion's bill or not.

Mr. ROBERTSON : I am quite prepared to take up the measure and discuss it clause by clause. But in the meantime I think we should have a conference with the Minister of Justice, and I therefore move :—

"That a committee of seven members,—Messrs. Wm. Darling, A. Joseph, Wm. Pennock, W. F. Findlay, J. A. Harding, P. Hughes, and the mover, be appointed for the purpose of conferring with the Hon. Minister of Justice upon the subject of amending and continuing the Insolvent Act of 1869."

Mr. DARLING seconded the motion.

Mr. JOSEPH said he desired to have added to the motion, that the report of the sub-committee, submitting certain amendments to the Act, be the first order of business at the afternoon session to-morrow.

Mr. ROBERTSON said, of course it was understood that the committee would report as soon as they could see the Minister of Justice, and get their report ready. He had no objection to add to his motion, "and to report as early as possible."

Mr. JOSEPH said he had seen the Minister of Justice, and he had told him his bill was nearly ready ; therefore, if the Board had any amendments to suggest, they should lose no time in having them discussed here and presented to the Ministry.

The motion was then carried.

TELEGRAPH MONOPOLIES.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton) : The subject to which I am about to

draw your attention, was brought before this Board at the last Annual Meeting; but owing to press of business, it was decided to leave it over until the midsummer session; and again it failed to come up. The Hamilton Board of Trade discussed this question in a very exhaustive manner, and they have unanimously arrived at the conclusion, that it is an injustice to the Telegraph Companies to be deprived of the right of erecting their wires along the lines of the existing railways. You are all aware that it is of great importance to a Telegraph Company, to have easy access to the line, in order that they may repair any breaks in the wires; you can, therefore, easily understand what a convenience it is to them to have their lines along the lines of railways. In the case of the Dominion Telegraph Company, they found that they could not erect their poles along the Great Western and Grand Trunk Railways, in consequence of the so-called vested rights of the Montreal Telegraph Company. I do not propose to interfere with vested rights; but it is of great importance to this country, that we should have free competition among Telegraph Companies, as in every other department of business. We know very well that the establishment of the Dominion Telegraph Company has very greatly reduced the price of messages; and if I am not mistaken, the day is not very far distant when telegraphic communication will be so cheap, that it will pretty much take the place of commercial letter-writing. At all events, it is clear that there should be no monopoly of the Telegraph business, in respect to the placing of the lines along railways. The Legislature grants Charters to these Railway Companies, and gives them great privileges. In return for these privileges, surely it is no great thing to ask that they be compelled to allow any Telegraph Company to place its lines upon the line of railway. I do think there has been a great deal of "bluff" in regard to so-called vested rights, in other institutions besides Telegraph Companies. I do not mean to say there is that in respect to the Montreal Telegraph Company; but we have heard a great deal about the vested rights of Express Companies, and when the truth came out, it was found they had no such rights, but in the meantime succeeded in "bluffing off" competition. I think the true principle to be followed in respect to all railways to be built in the future would be, to compel them to grant the privilege to all Telegraph Companies who desire it, of erecting their lines along these lines of railway; also that the Government should enquire into these so-called vested rights, and see how far they really exist. I beg leave to submit the following resolution:—

"That in the opinion of this Board the interests of the country will be served by the privilege being granted to all Telegraph Companies, to erect their lines on the several railways and bridges of the Dominion now built or to be built, and that the Government be requested to enquire into the subject, and urge that a measure be introduced granting these rights, excepting where it clearly appears that vested rights would be interfered with."

Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND (Montreal): I understand that the motion before the Chair proposes to confer upon Telegraph Companies the right to place their poles within the ground belonging to Railway Companies. Now, I think before this Board commits itself to any recommendation of that

kind, it ought to take very good care it does not make a false step. I do not think the vested interests and rights of other Companies have anything to do with the matter; but it is a question involving the rights of the railway companies themselves. Take, for instance, the Grand Trunk Railway. The Montreal Telegraph Company have arranged with that Railway Company to erect their wires upon the line of railway, and it is entirely a matter of agreement between the two companies. That is quite a different matter from the proposal now made—that other telegraph companies should be allowed the right to enter upon the property of the railway company, and erect their poles, without any regard to the railway company whatever. If such a proposition were carried out, the telegraph company would be practically independent of the railway company, and the latter would be without any guarantee respecting obstructions on its track, which might be caused by the blowing down of telegraph poles,—and therefore the railway company could not be held responsible for any accidents arising from this cause. I had, in fact, at the last meeting, the authority of the Manager of the Grand Trunk Road for saying, that the Company would not guarantee the safety of the travelling public over the road, if telegraph companies were allowed to invade their property and carry on their operations entirely beyond the control of the railway company. I think there is a great deal in that position; and while opposed to monopolies, I must say that we would be doing something more than striking at monopoly if we adopted such a course as the one proposed.

Mr. F. M. SPROUL (Kings's Co., N.B.), thought there was too much monopoly in the telegraph business at the present time, and that it would be to the best interests of the merchants of the country, that some steps should be taken whereby that monopoly could be reduced. He was in favor of making it a condition in every railway charter to be granted by the Legislature, that they would give to every telegraph company that desired it, the right of using their lines. He would like to know really how far the vested rights of the existing companies extended. Of course, if they had really vested rights, he would not be in favor of interfering with them; but it should be ascertained exactly how far these vested rights extended, and then they would be in a position to deal with them.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), said he would instance one case in which so-called vested rights had interfered with free competition in the telegraph business. The Montreal Telegraph Company had been able to prevent its only rival in this country from extending their lines directly from Montreal to New York, because they were not allowed to cross the River St. Lawrence by the Victoria Bridge. It is now proposed to build another bridge opposite the city of Montreal; but yet, if the Montreal Telegraph Company with its large capital and influence, can succeed in securing the monopoly of that bridge, the Dominion Line will be no better off than before. In the case of the North Shore Railway, tenders for the construction of a telegraph line were asked for. The Montreal Telegraph Company tendered very much under the Dominion Telegraph Company, but with the stipulation that they should have the exclusive right; the Railway Company, however,

refused to accept that tender, because they would not be a party to creating a monopoly of that kind, and the consequence was that the contract was given to the Dominion Line which asked for no monopoly. Even if vested rights really existed at the present time, care should be taken to prevent the creation of other monopolies in the future.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), supported the resolution. The whole commerce of the country was depending, to a very large extent, upon telegraphic communication. When the country was in its infancy, it might have been very well, in order to encourage a company to start, to give it exclusive privileges; but now he thought it was time that these should come to an end. The whole voice of the country was rebelling against it; and it would be the duty of this Board to express its opinion at least as opposed to the creation of further monopolies. The exclusive rights enjoyed by the Montreal Telegraph Company operated, perhaps, very well in the early history of the country; but now, he contended that we had reached the period when we must extend these privileges to all other telegraph companies, so that there might be the fullest and freest competition. The railways had been built to a very great extent by public money, and it was only reasonable, that they should be made to serve the public interest. He therefore supported the resolution; and although it might not bring about the desired result at once, it would at any rate pave the way for breaking down the monopoly which the country was rebelling against.

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa), said he was very glad this subject had been brought up. The Montreal Telegraph Company had enjoyed a monopoly long enough. He had no interest in either line, except the general interest which business men all had. He referred to the reduction in the rate of messages which had followed the establishment of the Dominion Telegraph Company; and contended that that company was doing an important service to the country, and should be allowed free competition with its more powerful rival. If the Montreal Line really had vested rights, then of course let them enjoy them; but he hoped that in the future no such exclusive rights would be granted. Objection had been taken to this proposition, on the ground that if the privilege of building telegraph lines upon the lines of railway was allowed to all companies, the safety of the railway traffic would be injured by the falling down of telegraph poles. With respect to that objection he would say, that we had had telegraph lines along the lines of railway for the last twenty-five years, and he had never yet heard of a single accident arising from that source.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), said there were some difficulties in the way of dealing with this matter. Existing rights could not be arbitrarily interfered with; but at the same time, care should be taken that in future legislation, no exclusive rights should be granted to any company. He therefore begged leave to move the following amendment:—

“That all the words after ‘that’ in the original motion be struck out, and the following inserted—“while this Board declines to urge upon the government any interference with rights claimed by the Montreal Telegraph Company, (provided it really possesses such rights) as to lines along the Railways, yet it would urge upon its consideration the

desirability of enforcing such conditions in future legislation, as shall secure the right of competing lines to the erection of poles and wires along the several lines of railway."

Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND seconded the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think this motion can be regarded as an amendment, as it appears to me to be the same as the original motion.

Mr. PENNOCK: Perhaps I misapprehended the meaning of Mr. Brown's motion. I supposed it was to compel the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways to allow the use of their lines to the Dominion Telegraph Company.

Mr. DRUMMOND: That was my view of what the original motion meant. I understood Mr Brown's object was to compel the Grand Trunk and Great Western roads to allow other telegraph companies besides the Montreal, to erect their poles along the lines of their railways.

Mr. BROWN: That was quite remote from my intention. I stated that the Hamilton Board of Trade did not want to interfere with any vested rights. But we held that it was the duty of the Government to ascertain to what extent the so-called vested rights of the Montreal Telegraph Company existed, and that when these rights expired, they should not be renewed, and that there should be free competition among all the Telegraph Companies. I claim that my resolution does not touch vested rights, provided they are such in a *bona fide* sense. If they are, then let them be held sacred; but if they are not, let the country receive the benefit of the competition that will follow the construction of other lines of telegraph along the lines of railway. As before stated, I do not propose to interfere with vested rights at all; but the amendment actually admits that there are vested rights, while as a matter of fact, I do not know whether there are or not.

Hon. ROBERT READ (Belleville), said it seemed to be a very popular thing to interfere with other people's property. It had been asserted here that our railways were built by the public money. He thought that was a mistake. Take the Grand Trunk, for instance. Admitting that there had been fourteen millions of public money spent on that road, still that was a small sum compared with 120 millions, which was the total amount that had been expended. The proprietors of that road had invested their money, and had as yet received no return, and he thought that their rights to their property should be respected. If it was to their interest to allow other companies to enter upon their property, they would of course do it; he held it was a matter to be left entirely to their own decision. He was one who had always stood up for vested rights. In Parliament he had resisted the attempt to interfere with the vested rights of the Anglo-American Cable Telegraph Company, and although the Bill was passed, he was glad to see that it had not yet been assented to. This was not a matter essential to Telegraph Companies. There were plenty of public highways on which they could construct their lines, and therefore there was no interference with competition. He would suggest whether it would not be better, in

place of adopting the resolution, to recommend the Government to take the telegraph lines into their own hands, as in England. He believed if that were done, and the telegraph was managed by the Post Office Department, that telegraphing would be greatly cheapened. He hoped this Board would not recommend anything that would for a moment interfere with capitalists in investing their money in railways in this country.

Mr. J. A. HARDING (St. John, N.B.), said he did not see how the granting of this right to telegraph companies could interfere in the slightest degree with the management of railways. It was not proposed that the railway companies should grant the use of their stations, but merely that they should allow telegraph companies to erect their poles along the lines. Of course that right might be accompanied by any conditions that were thought necessary, in order to secure the safety of the railway traffic, or to protect the railway company from annoyance and inconvenience.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR.: I propose to vote against both the amendment and the original motion, and for this reason: I vote against the amendment, because I am not prepared to affirm by resolution that the Montreal Telegraph Company have any rights, or that anybody has any special rights. We are not a court to determine the rights of any one. I will vote against the original motion, because I do not see that this Dominion Board of Trade has any right to interest itself in cheapening the right of way for telegraph lines. That is practically the question. A good deal has been said, and very properly so, in relation to the right of the railway companies to go upon the land of the farmers or any one else, and take their land for the purpose of building their railway. But a railway is different from a telegraph line. To build a railway you must have the land; and, therefore, it is absolutely necessary to the very existence of railways, that they should have the right to compel parties to dispose of their land. But telegraph companies can extend their lines from one end of the country to the other, without necessarily going upon the land which belongs to railway companies, and which they have purchased, sometimes at a high price. Indeed, the telegraph companies may enjoy the benefit of the railway communication in getting access to their lines, without building their lines upon the railway property. For instance, they could set up their poles just outside of the railway; thus there is no necessity to compel the railway companies to give them the right of way. It is not because it is cheaper for the Montreal Telegraph Company to put their lines alongside the railway tracks that they have done so, but because it is necessary for the railway companies to have a line for their own use in running trains. I confess I was rather amused at the illustration of monopoly that Mr. Joseph gave us, when he said the railway company with which he is connected, declined the offer of the Montreal Telegraph Company, although it was much lower than the other, because the Montreal Company wanted the exclusive right to the line. It appears the Railway Company, in their great generosity, preferred to give the Dominion Company a considerably higher price for building a telegraph line, simply because by that means they could leave it open for any other

tele,
an e
unu
poly
upon
unfe
succ
thar
on.
one
popu
put
is go
be a
Rail
awa
opol
abou
tal g
othe
ente
betw
go o
is th
Gen
year
a rail
railw
quer
noth
shou
mucl
but i
of th
If it
pani
it he
chart
compr
railw
have
withc
altog
that
times
progr
aidec
admi

telegraph company to build along the same track. I must say that was an exhibition of generosity on the part of a railway company that is quite unusual. As to monopoly, surely it would not be an evidence of monopoly if a company, by open tender, offers to do work for a less price, upon certain conditions. The Montreal Télégraph Company started under unfavorable prospects, and now, by their enterprise and capital, they have succeeded in making a paying business. But it is no more a monopoly than any other public enterprise, which requires capital for carrying it on. I might say that the *Toronto Globe*, which is a larger paper than the one I publish, is a monopoly, because it has a larger capital, and a larger population among which to circulate. Mr. Joseph, and other gentlemen, put their money into the Dominion Telegraph Line, because they know it is going to be good stock some day; and by-and-by, when that comes to be a very large company, I suppose it will be considered a monopoly. Railways are said to be a monopoly; and yet municipalities are giving away large sums of money for the privilege of having these terrible monopolies, which we are told should not be tolerated. There is no monopoly about a railway or a telegraph company, except the monopoly which capital gives in the establishment of large public enterprises, because any other person, or number of persons, may put their capital into similar enterprises to their hearts' content. But to say that we shall interfere between rival enterprises of that kind, and give one of them the right to go over the property of another, seems somewhat extraordinary; and there is this evil connected with it, as Mr. Drummond pointed out, and as the General Managers of the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways last year indicated, that if you give a telegraph company the right to go upon a railway, in order to carry on their operations, you cannot hold that railway company responsible for any accidents that may occur in consequence of the existence upon their property of a line with which they have nothing to do. Of course, I can understand why a telegraph company should desire to have their poles within the railway fence. It is not so much that it is cheaper, because the right of way is not a heavy matter; but it is that if their line is along the railway track, they will have the use of the latter in getting access to every part of it, in order to make repairs. If it were proposed simply, that upon Government railways all telegraph companies should equally have the right to erect their lines, I would support it heartily. I would also favor the proposition, that in any future railway charters to be granted, there should be a condition that all telegraph companies should have an equal right to build their lines upon the line of railway. But to ask us to vote here, that any telegraph company shall have the right to go upon the property of the existing railway companies, without any regard to the right of these latter to their property, I consider altogether unjust. We hear a great deal of talk about the public money that has been invested in railways, while we have got back a hundred times more than we invested in these railways, in the shape of the increased progress and prosperity of the country. To say, that because we have aided these railways, we shall now ask the Government to force them to admit other companies upon their property, seems to me a most extraor-

dinary proceeding. For these reasons, I propose, as I said before, to vote both against the original motion and the amendment.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK said, that in order to meet the objection of Mr. White to his amendment, he would be willing to add these words, "provided it really possesses such rights." He desired also to call attention to the fallacy of the illustration used by Mr. White, with respect to the *Globe* and himself. In the case he had supposed, although it might require capital to establish a newspaper business alongside the *Globe*, still there was nothing to prevent any one from doing it who had the capital. But in the case of a telegraph company, they were prohibited from going upon the lines of the railways, although they were prepared with their capital to carry out the work.

Mr. JOSEPH said, that in referring to the North Shore Railway, he did not wish to convey the idea that the tender of the Dominion Telegraph Company was higher than that of the Montreal Company, because not being a director of the North Shore Railway, he was not prepared to say. But the idea he wished to convey was this, that the Montreal Telegraph Company, at the present day, was only carrying out the policy it had always followed, namely, of having no other contracts except monopolies. He had not to go far for an example of the evil effects of this monopoly. Wherever the Dominion Telegraph Company was established, there the rates were low; but where the Montreal line was alone, there the rates were high. He would ask the gentleman from St. John, if their rates were not double those charged in Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. WHITE: It is the Western Union Company that they have there.

Mr. JOSEPH said the rates from Montreal to New York, were in excess of those charged for a similar distance where the Dominion Telegraph Company was established. He did not wish to refer merely to the Montreal Company, but what he wished to point out was, that where there was competition there the rates were low. As to the danger of having two telegraph lines on a railway, that was all "moonshine." There was as much danger by having one line as in having two, and he never knew of any accidents occurring from there being one line. Mr. White had cited the case of the *Globe* as a parallel; but the case would be parallel if the Montreal *Gazette* was prohibited from selling its paper in Toronto, or any place else where the *Globe* circulated. The Dominion Line were excluded from carrying on their business over the railways, although the Montreal Line was allowed that privilege.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Has not the Montreal Line the same tariff over the whole of Canada?

Mr. JOSEPH: Of course they reduced their rates to the same as other lines.

Mr. SPROUL wished to draw the attention of the Board to a fallacy in Mr. White's argument, that it was essential to the existence of railways that they should have the right of expropriating private property, while

teleg
the
that
throu
limit
Comp
witho
able
comp

“
insert
graph
on Go
erect t
railwa
telegr

previ
the G
he be
now l
King
opera
high
very
up th
poles
there
advan

teleg
we co

either
subjec
and th
Comp
they
acqui
Refer
power
had th
railwa
they
the pr
of way

telegraph companies were not driven to any such necessity. The cases of the telegraph and the railway lines would be parallel, if it were provided that the railway company should—say, only go through the woods, or through certain particular portions of the country. That was virtually a limitation similar to the one now imposed upon the Dominion Telegraph Company. It was true that they might extend their lines across the country, without touching the railways; but it was greatly to their advantage to be able to go upon the railways, just as it was to the advantage of the railway companies to build their lines in the most favorable sections of the country.

Mr. WHITE moved in amendment to the amendment :—

“ That all after the word ‘ that ’ in the amendment be struck out, and the following inserted therefor :—“ In order to afford the greatest possible facilities for telegraphic communication throughout the Dominion, it is the opinion of this Board, that on Government railways, permission should be given to all telegraph companies to erect their lines upon the line of the railways; and that in future charters granted to railway companies, it should be a condition that similar privileges be granted to telegraph companies upon reasonable conditions.”

Mr. W. R. MINGAYE (Kingston), referred to the remarks of a previous speaker with reference to the acquisition of the telegraph lines by the Government, and said that experiment had been tried in England, and he believed it was generally admitted had proved a failure. The question now before this Board had been considered by the Board of Trade in Kingston. They had among them a gentleman who had formerly been an operator in the Montreal Telegraph Company, and who now held a very high position on the Grand Trunk Railway. That gentleman expressed his very strong conviction, that if every line of telegraph had the right to put up their poles on the Grand Trunk, and accidents should occur from their poles falling on the line, the railway company could not be held responsible; therefore, he did not think that such a proposition would be to the public advantage.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto), said he was not interested in either telegraph company; but he believed we needed all the telegraph facilities we could have, and he would be very happy to vote for the original motion.

Mr. H. CUNNINGHAM (Kingston), said that he also had no interest in either line; but he would vote for the amendment, because he thought this subject was one which should be dealt with between the railway companies and the telegraph companies. It was true, that the Montreal Telegraph Company had the monopoly over certain lines of railway, from the fact that they were the first in the field, and, when there was no competing line, had acquired certain rights which he considered could not be interfered with. Reference has been made here to the fact that railway companies have the power to expropriate private property for right of way. It was true they had that power, but they had to pay for the land. He was interested in a railway now being constructed from Kingston northwards, and sometimes they were compelled to pay double or treble of what was the real value of the property. He considered that when they paid for the land for right of way, and got it fenced in, it should be left to them to say what telegraph

company or companies they should permit to come upon it. His company had had applications from both the telegraph companies, and they had decided to give the preference to that company which would afford them the greatest facilities, and consequently they gave it to the Montreal Telegraph Line. There was no monopoly in that. It was simply a matter of bargain between the railway and the telegraph company.

Mr. DRUMMOND objected very strongly to the proposition, to ask the Legislature to compel existing Railway Companies to allow all Telegraph Companies' lines to come upon their property, without any regard to their own wishes or terms. The whole thing was purely a matter of contract, and the Dominion Telegraph Company to-day could go to the Grand Trunk Railway, and make their bargain with them.

Hon. Mr. READ pointed out that the Dominion Legislature had no right to interfere with Provincial Railways, which derived their charters from the Local Legislatures.

Mr. ADAM BROWN observed that he did not own a dollar's worth of stock in any of the Telegraph Companies, and nine-tenths of the telegraphing in his firm was done through the Montreal Telegraph Company; he was also free to admit that that Company conducted their business in a satisfactory manner, and had been of great benefit to the country. As he had said before, he did not propose to ask any interference with vested rights; but what he wanted was, that future Railway Charters should contain a provision, that all Telegraph Companies should be admitted on the same terms, and all have the same privileges on the railways now controlled by the Government. Mr. White, and some others, had objected to allowing this privilege to all Telegraph Companies, on the ground that it would create danger to the public traffic on the railways; and yet, at the same time, those very gentlemen who raised this objection, admitted that the privilege might be extended with propriety to the Government railways. Now, if any danger could arise on existing railways, surely the same danger would exist upon those of the Government.

Mr. WHITE: The idea I wished to convey was, that the Government, being proprietors of their railways, had a right to allow as many telegraph lines upon their property as they pleased. And so it would be with the Grand Trunk Railway. If they chose to allow a dozen telegraph lines to be built upon their line, they would be held responsible; but they could scarcely be held so, if, contrary to their wishes, they were compelled to admit these lines upon their property.

Mr. BROWN repeated that he did not propose to interfere with existing rights; but he desired to see the principle established, that there should be the freest possible competition allowed to the Telegraph Companies.

Mr. White's amendment to the amendment was then put, and lost on the following division:—

Ayes.—Messrs. Cunningham, Fry, Jarvis, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, Mingaye, Morison, Oille, Read, Robertson, Skead, White.—13.

Findl
Penn

follow

Findl
gall,
son, S

divisio

Hardi
Wylie

Magor
nock,

Nays.—Messrs. Brown, Cowan, Darling, Drummond, Elliott, Elder, Findlay, Gillespie, Harding, Hughes, Joseph, McGillivray, McLennan, Pennock, Routh, Shorey, Sproul, Tourville, Wylie.—19.

Mr. Pennock's amendment was then voted on, and negatived on the following division :—

Ayes.—Messrs. Drummond, Marshall, Pennock, Read, Skead.—5.

Nays.—Messrs. Brown, Cowan, Cunningham, Darling, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Harding, Hughes, Jarvis, Joseph, Magor, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, Mingaye, Morison, Oille, Routh, Robertson, Shorey, Sproul, Tourville, White, Wylie.—27.

The original motion was then submitted, and also declared lost on a division as follows :—

Ayes.—Messrs. Brown, Cowan, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Gillespie, Harding, Hughes, Joseph, McGillivray, Routh, Sproul, Tourville, Wylie.—14.

Nays.—Messrs. Cunningham, Darling, Drummond, Fry, Jarvis, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McLennan, Mingaye, Morison, Oille, Pennock, Read, Robertson, Shorey, Skead, White.—18.

On motion the Board then adjourned until 10 o'clock, A.M., to-morrow.

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

MORNING SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, *January 20, 1875.*

The Board met at 10 o'clock, A.M., the President in the chair.

The SECRETARY called the roll of members, and read the minutes of proceedings of the previous day, which were confirmed.

RECEPTION OF DELEGATE FROM THE UNITED STATES.

The PRESIDENT: I have great pleasure in informing you this morning, that we have a representative present from the National Board of Trade of the United States, in the person of Mr. Philo Parsons, President of the Board of Trade of Detroit. He is a gentleman of whom I have no doubt you have already heard, as he has taken a very active part in the discussion of commercial questions, and has repeatedly extended his attention to this country. I am certain you will receive him with all courtesy, and allow him the privileges of the Board. (Applause.)

Mr. PARSONS: *Gentlemen*: I will merely say, that it gives me very great pleasure to be present at this meeting. I feel, in looking over your programme, and in noticing the gentlemen composing your Board, that I shall be more than compensated for a somewhat tedious journey of 500 miles. It is by accident that I occupy this position. Mr. Hawley found himself unable to come, and he insisted that I should attend in his place. I am therefore here, and need only say at the present moment that I have very great satisfaction in meeting with you. (Applause.)

THE RECIPROCITY TREATY.

The PRESIDENT: The first order on the programme, is the Report of the Committee on the question of Reciprocity. I have been authorized to state "on high authority," that the Committee of the United States Senate has dealt with the draft Treaty of Reciprocity, and advised the President against its ratification. I presume that under the circumstances, it may be considered by the Board sufficient to either adopt or reject the report of the Committee without much debate.

spec
In m
whic
met
circu
ascen
recei
the C
woul
unan
by t
form
to ser
repor
what
upon
met a
verba
objec
prese
was t
had t
appea
felt it
which
to ent
Domin
sugge
to hav
than a
was to
instru
was d
comm
report
sugge
resolu
the de
on wh
to mo
" T
Free T
M
M
mittee
and I

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., (Montreal): I quite agree that there is no special reason why there should be any lengthened debate at this moment. In moving the adoption of the Report, I would like to state the principles which guided the Committee in preparing it. When some of the Committee met in Montreal, they determined that the best way to do, was to send circulars to each member of the Committee outside of the city, in order to ascertain what his views were in relation to the Treaty. These replies when received in Montreal, were examined and considered, and the members of the Committee residing in that city, determined to prepare a report that would embody what appeared to be the general sentiment—practically the unanimous sentiment—of all the members of the Committee, as indicated by the replies. Such a report was prepared, and a copy of it in galley-form addressed to the other members of the Committee, who were requested to send it back accompanied with any remarks they desired to make. This report was returned to us in the large majority of cases without any remark whatever, but simply a general approval. Some few comments were made upon it; and when all the replies were received, the Montreal gentlemen met again, and went carefully over the report a second time, making some verbal alterations so as to meet, if possible, the views of those who had objected to certain expressions,—and the result was the report as it is now presented to the Board. In taking this course, the object of the Committee was to adhere strictly to the resolution embodying their instructions. They had two great objects in view. One was to avoid anything that had even the appearance of political bias in connection with their report, because they felt it would be a very serious matter if, in the discussion of this question, which was largely of a political character, political bias should be allowed to enter into the deliberations of a body of commercial men such as the Dominion Board of Trade. I have no doubt the report contains some suggestions which some gentlemen of the Committee would have preferred to have otherwise, having considered the question from a national rather than a purely commercial point of view. But the object of the Committee was to avoid anything of that kind, and confine themselves simply to their instructions, which were, to point out to the Government wherein the Treaty was defective, and likely to prove injurious in its practical working, to the commercial interests of the country. That was the basis on which the report was prepared. Of course, if contrary to your expectation and suggestion, sir, there should be any debate on this report, as mover of this resolution, I may perhaps enter on a general defence of it at the close of the debate; but I think I have said enough, in simply stating the principles on which the Committee acted in preparing the report, and I now beg leave to move:

“That the Report of the Special Committee on the draft Treaty for Reciprocal Free Trade between the United States and Canada be adopted.”

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton) seconded the motion.

Mr. ADAM HOPE (Hamilton): I have read the report of the Committee who were appointed to report upon the draft Reciprocity Treaty, and I observe that they set out by saying, “that this Board reiterates its

“ frequently expressed opinion in favor of a Treaty of Reciprocity between the United States and Canada.” Well, we have all talked in favor of Reciprocity; and I think something more than a mere indefinite expression of opinion is now needed. There is a hostile criticism running throughout the whole of this report, which I do not approve of, and cannot allow to pass without entering my protest against. This draft treaty contains in all some thirteen articles, and I would like to hear this Dominion Board of Trade express its opinion upon these *seriatim*; then we would know what the Board really thinks upon the matter. We have always had this indefinite kind of expression,—something that would do very well for a debating club. But here, as the representatives of the business men of the Dominion, we should be expected to give some absolute opinion upon the subject. We have never before had such an opportunity of expressing our views upon the Treaty; and now, instead of shirking the question, as I consider this report does, it would be much better to take up and discuss the Treaty article by article, and definitely state whether we approve of it or not. In order to bring up this issue, I intend to move in amendment to the adoption of this report, that the Board approves of the first three articles of the Treaty. What I wish to arrive at is, to hear from the representative business men present what they really think about this Treaty; and if my proposition is seconded, I propose to move one amendment after another, and thus bring up the discussion on all the articles of the Treaty. We will then see what this Board really thinks of the Treaty, instead of retreating under a cloud of oratory such as this report contains. I therefore beg leave to move the following amendment:—

“ That the Report on the Draft Reciprocity Treaty be amended, by adding the words, ‘and that this Board approves of Articles 1, 2 and 3 of the Treaty.’”

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), seconded the amendment.

Mr. WHITE: I have no desire to discuss the amendment; but I merely want to point out a fact to Mr. Hope. We might all be in favor of the first three Articles of this Treaty, if we knew what we were going to get in exchange for it; but as we cannot know that until we consider every part of the Treaty, I do not see that we can adopt them. If it be urged that we have reciprocal advantages in these three Articles, in having conferred upon us the American market for our Fisheries, all I need say is, that we have got that already by the Washington Treaty, and therefore do not need another treaty to secure it.

Mr. I. WATERMAN (London), said he had a resolution upon the subject of the Treaty, adopted by his Board; but as it was very much similar to the report of the Special Committee, he would not move it.

Mr. PENNOCK: I have seconded the proposition of Mr. Hope, for the purpose of eliciting some little discussion. You mentioned, sir, that you had very high authority for stating that the Senatorial Committee of the United States had recommended that the Treaty be dropped. I imagine that although it may be dropped for the moment, it will be renewed on some future occasion; it will therefore be important that there should be

son
wh
pul
tra
Tre
vie
par
ter
to
ma
tio
hav
cus
has
Tre
the
a v
for

the
to
We
eri
tio
Gr
be
has
abc
cor
ing
of l
a n
for
par
me
cou
it i
ope
fut
whi
find
aga
whi
whi
Tre
the

some expression of opinion on the part of this Board with regard to the whole question. From the expression of this Board in the past, and of the public generally, I hold there is a strong feeling in favor of reciprocal trade relations. I am inclined to think that the discussions upon this draft Treaty, outside of this room, have been largely influenced by the political views of prominent politicians connected with one or other of the great parties of the Dominion. (No, no, and hear, hear.) I think the interests of the Dominion are too much involved in this subject, to allow it to be made the football of party, to be kicked about as party exigencies may seem to require. (Hear, hear.) I would deprecate the introduction of any political bias here. Of course the gentlemen of this Board all have their political preferences; but we must put these in abeyance in discussing this great question. The charge has been made, that this country has been placed in an abject position in seeking to obtain a new Reciprocity Treaty; but I think the universal expression of this Board, has been in the direction of urging upon the Government to open up negotiations, with a view to creating a new treaty. The arguments that have been advanced, for instance, with regard to the manufacturers—

The PRESIDENT: That question does not come up under this motion.

Mr. PENNOCK: Well, it can be discussed afterwards. I understand the first three Articles of the Treaty, referred to in the amendment, relate to the Fisheries. On that subject I wish to make one remark. By the Washington Treaty our American friends are allowed to go into our fisheries, upon equal footing with ourselves, and carry on their fishing operations. Previous to the Washington Treaty it was a disputed point between Great Britain and the United States, whether the three-mile-limit should be measured from a line drawn from headland to headland. That point has not been settled by the Washington Treaty, but has only been left in abeyance, and at the expiration of the Washington Treaty it will again come up. I think this point is one which should be regarded in considering the question of a new Reciprocity Treaty, because it is in the interest of both countries that that question should be settled, and the adoption of a new Reciprocity Treaty would be the means of determining it, at least for the period during which the treaty would have effect. I am not prepared, at this moment, to discuss the treaty in all its phases, and would merely remark, that twenty-one years in the life of an old-established country may not seem a long time; but in the life of a new country like ours, it is a very long period. Hence if we start out with a Treaty which will operate prejudicially against us, it might have a very serious effect upon our future national career. On the other hand, if we start out with a Treaty which will give us a fair chance of developing all our resources, we will find it to be of immense advantage to us. The same arguments have been used against this Treaty on both sides of the lines. I can conceive of a Treaty which would benefit one side to the injury of the other, but not of one which is going to be utterly ruinous to both. I can also conceive of a Treaty which would be mutually advantageous, and that I believe would be the effect of the present draft. Of course there are some points in it which

I should prefer to see changed. For instance, I do not approve of the "sliding-scale," if it can possibly be avoided. With regard to the canals, I think it would be to our advantage to improve them as much as possible; but of course it would be absurd for us to undertake obligations which we could not fulfil.

The PRESIDENT: The subject before the Chair is the first three articles only of the Treaty.

Mr. PENNOCK: There are certain abstract questions connected with the Treaty as a whole, concerning which some latitude is necessary in order to their proper discussion; but I will content myself, in the meantime, with seconding the amendment of Mr. Hope.

Mr. WM. CRAIG (Port Hope): I am in favor of the adoption of the Report, because I think it contains suggestions which, if embodied in the Treaty, would render it acceptable to this body and to the country. Before we enter into any discussion of the Treaty, it would be better to decide whether we shall adopt this report or not. In my opinion the subject has been discussed sufficiently. It was reviewed at considerable length in St. John, last summer. Mr. Hope says he wants the whole subject discussed, in order to find out what objections we have to the Treaty. I think he will find our objections clearly stated in this report; also that it is therein stated we are in favor of the Reciprocity Treaty, provided it is amended in the way in which the report suggests.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec): I am extremely sorry that Mr. Hope and Mr. Pennock were not present at St. John. Mr. Hope says the business men of this country never had a chance of discussing this Treaty. Now, I hold in my hand the report of twenty-nine speeches delivered at St. John, in which not only the principles of the Treaty, but all the principal features of it were fully discussed. Besides this, after the Delegates returned from that meeting, I believe nearly every Board of Trade in the Dominion discussed the Treaty in all its details, and expressed their views upon it. The opinion of this Board was something like five to one against the Treaty. I should think, after all this discussion by the various Boards throughout the country, and by this Dominion Board, that another discussion going over precisely the same ground, would be nothing more or less than a waste of time.

Mr. JOHN MORISON (Toronto): Before the question is put, I must say that I feel the force of the remarks of Mr. Hope and Mr. Pennock. As a young merchant, I, of course, came here more to listen to the speeches of older gentlemen, than to speak myself. Still, I think that a question of so great importance to the future welfare of this country, ought to have more discussion than we have had upon it. It has been said that the Treaty was fully discussed in St. John; but with all due respect to the gentlemen who composed that meeting, I must say I do not think it was done in a proper spirit. In a general way, that meeting opposed the draft Treaty; but what I think should be done is, to take up the Treaty article by article, and expressly point out wherein we consider it objectionable, if

we
be
ar

the
con
cei
de:
rea
sug
thi
ext
thi
Tre
bus
em
tha
Re
I t
bas
atte
rep
I ei
be s
som
are
bou
the

thre
chai

do n
excl
is b
Was
and
kind
cont
Trea

shall
thre
they

we have any objections to make to it. With regard to the amendment before the chair, I shall support it, because I approve of the first three articles of the Treaty.

Dr. L. S. OILE (St. Catherines): I had not the pleasure of attending the meeting in St. John; but I have read the report of the debate with a considerable amount of interest. I sympathize with Mr. Hope's views to a certain extent. I think it desirable that this Board should express in definite terms exactly what it desires in the Reciprocity Treaty. I find in reading the report of the Special Committee, that it makes certain definite suggestions, which, for the most part, meet my approval. I fancy that if this Board adopts the report of this committee, it will, to a considerable extent meet the views of Mr. Hope and the others who think with him. I think if the Government reads this report in connection with the Draft Treaty, they will be able to obtain a pretty definite idea as to what the business men of the country, as represented by this Board, desire to have embodied in the Treaty. I agree with the remark made by one gentleman, that although the present negotiations may have fallen to the ground, yet a Reciprocity Treaty of some kind or other will necessarily come up again. I think the compensation clause of the Washington Treaty is an excellent basis upon which to renew reciprocity negotiations, in case the present attempt falls to the ground. With regard to the particular clauses of this report, I find, first of all, that the sliding scale of duties is disapproved of. I entirely agree with that view of the case, and that there is not a word to be said in favor of it. It would be all right, if the duties on our side were something like the same in amount as those on the other; but our duties are not more than one-fifth or one-third of theirs, and to reduce them to the bounds proposed by this sliding-scale, would be simply placing ourselves at the mercy of the Americans, until the duties were entirely abolished.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment limits the discussion to the first three articles.

Mr. WHITE: the motion for the adoption of the report is before the chair, and it opens up the whole subject.

Dr. OILE: These first three articles of the Treaty, by themselves, I do not think can be taken up, because we would then recognize that the exchange, so far as the Fisheries are concerned, is equal. Now, that point is by no means admitted, and is, in fact, disputed by the terms of the Washington Treaty, which provides a means for ascertaining the difference and for securing compensation to Canada. Now, as a compensation of some kind is necessarily intended, in connection with these first three articles, I contend I am perfectly in order in referring to the other clauses of the Treaty, which provide for this compensation.

The PRESIDENT: To bring this point practically before the Board, I shall rule as I have done before, that the discussion is limited to the first three articles of the Treaty, and leave it to the Board to decide whether they shall sustain an appeal from that ruling or not.

Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.): I would prefer to see the whole subject opened up.

Mr. ADAM BROWN: I take it that in the event of this amendment carrying, the report of the Special Committee falls to the ground.

The PRESIDENT: I should say not; but that it would be adopted subject to this amendment.

Mr. BROWN: I believe the principal objection to the Treaty as a whole, is in relation to manufactures; and I would support this amendment pertaining to the first three articles, provided that the article relating to manufactures were erased. But as the question is now brought before us to approve of these first three articles, as against the adoption of the report, which actually condemns the manufacturing clauses, I see no other way way of meeting the case than by voting down Mr. Hope's amendment, and supporting the report.

Dr. OILLE: The position I take is, that under the Washington Treaty we give more than we receive, in granting the Americans free access to our fisheries, in exchange for a like privilege to theirs, and their markets for our fish,—and therefore compensation in some form is due to us. As to the particular form which that compensation should take, I think the prevalent opinion among the people of this Dominion is, that it should be reciprocal trade relations rather than a sum of money to be agreed upon. With that understanding I support the first three articles of the Treaty, and that brings up all the rest of the question.

Mr. ELDER: I rise to move an amendment to the amendment. I favor the reception of the report, but think we should have the fullest discussion of the whole question; and therefore, in order to get rid of the amendment, which I think would place us in a false position, I would move in amendment: "That all the words after "the coasting trade" in the first part of clause 3 of the report of the Committee be struck out, and the following substituted:—

The PRESIDENT: You must move an amendment to the amendment, and not to the report.

Mr. ELDER: I move then as an amendment to the amendment: "That all the articles of the treaty be taken up for discussion, instead of the first three articles."

Mr. WHITE: While Mr. Elder is writing out his proposition, I would beg of him not to move an amendment of that kind. What he wants, as I understand him, is to have the report adopted with some amendments in its form. Now, there can be no doubt that if Mr. Hope's motion should carry,—it being an amendment to the adoption of the report,—it will destroy the motion for the adoption of the report, and a motion once made and defeated cannot be made again. The result will be, if Mr. Hope's motion should happen to carry, that there can be no motion made for the adoption of the report. If Mr. Elder moves that the treaty be taken up as

a
wh
mo
It
fav
an
an

to
ap
thi
the
ag
in
em
of,
aga
que

way

imp
who
clau
that
St.
cour
perl
agai

Shel

ham.
Gris
McG
Sew
Wyl

not t
more
try f
"
words
A of t

a whole, and his amendment is carried, it will have precisely the same effect, which I am sure Mr. Elder does not desire; that is, it will destroy the motion for the adoption of the report, and the report cannot be considered. It seems to me that the only way to get at this question, is for those who favor the report, or the report with certain modifications, to vote down the amendment. Then we will come to the motion for the adoption of the report, and Mr. Elder can move any amendment to that which he thinks fit.

Mr. ELDER: Mr. White has stated very correctly the object I want to get at. But I find this practical difficulty, namely, that I heartily approve of the clauses of the treaty referred to in the amendment, but think it is unfair to the merits of this discussion to ask us to pass upon these articles, irrespective of the other parts of the Treaty. If we vote against the amendment, it must be deemed that we do so as an expedient in order to get at the report, for the substance of this amendment is really embodied in the report. Those clauses which Mr. Hope wishes to approve of, are approved of in the report. Therefore, I feel a difficulty in voting against the amendment; but I want to get at the merits of the whole question in some form. I am, however, in the hands of the Board.

The PRESIDENT: If you want to discuss the whole question, the best way would be to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HOPE: I would rather have the amendment voted on.

Mr. THOMAS COWAN (Galt): I think the general feeling is, that it is impossible to discuss the Treaty intelligently without taking it up as a whole. (Hear, hear.) It is impossible to consider, say the three first clauses, without reference to the other clauses. It is quite unfair to hint that the Treaty has not been fully discussed, for it was discussed at the St. John Meeting, and also by all the Boards of Trade throughout the country, as well as by the manufacturers of the Dominion. While I am, perhaps, in favor of the first three articles of the Treaty, yet I shall vote against the amendment, in order that the whole Treaty may come up.

Mr. HOPE's amendment was then put and lost by a vote of 8 to 39.

Ayes.—Messrs. Dougall, Hope, Hughes, Morison, Oille, Pennock, Shehyn, Woods.—8.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Drummond, Dufresne, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Henry, Jarvis, Joseph, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, MacPherson, Mingaye, Read, Robertson, Routh, Sewell, Shorey, Skead, Sproul, Tourville, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Wylie.—39.

Mr. HOPE: I rise to move another amendment to the Report. I shall not take up the time of the meeting by saying much upon the question, more especially as the subject of my amendment has been before the country for the last twenty years. I move:—

"That the Report on the Draft Reciprocity Treaty be amended, by adding the words: 'That this Board approves of the list of natural products contained in Schedule A of the proposed treaty.'"

I want to bring the Board right down to the point, and to ascertain exactly what they approve and what they disapprove of. I think that Schedule A has the entire approval of the agricultural community.

Mr. MORISON seconded this amendment.

Mr. WHITE: I sincerely trust Mr. Hope will withdraw that amendment. (Hear, hear.) Why a gentleman should force his opinion as to the way of dealing with this question, against the almost unanimous views of the Board, I cannot understand. It is quite clear that every gentleman in the room is in favor of Schedule A in the abstract; but to ask us, because we want to get at the report, to vote against what we all approve of, does seem to me a most extraordinary course. We are all in favor of the freest possible exchange of agricultural products, and the report is also in favor of it. The report favors every part of the Treaty which it does not specifically propose to amend. The Committee went over the Treaty just in the way Mr. Hope has suggested. They took up every clause, and considered them in all their bearings; and the only suggestion they made with reference to the interchange of the natural productions of the two countries, was a recommendation for the abolition of Consular Certificates, so as to make the interchange actually freer than the Treaty provides. It is quite evident that if the amendment is adopted, the motion to adopt the report will be destroyed, and cannot be brought up again; yet if Mr. Hope presses his amendment, he will compel those who desire to see the report adopted or modified, to vote against what every one is in favor of. But in adopting the report we will practically affirm the same thing, so that we cannot be charged with inconsistency in voting against the amendment.

Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND (Montreal): If Mr. Hope desires the discussion of the whole Treaty, his object will be served by taking up the report clause by clause.

Mr. A. WOODS (Quebec): It is very questionable whether Mr. Hope's amendment is in order. No amendment, I take it, is in order, unless it amends some main feature of the motion under consideration, and I therefore raise that point of order in this case. I do not agree with all the reasoning of the Committee in its report; but on this point it practically affirms what Mr. Hope desires. I voted for the last amendment, because I did not wish to be put in a false position; and I don't wish to be in a false position by this amendment.

The PRESIDENT: What is your point of order?

Mr. WOODS: My point of order is that the amendment before the chair does not amend the report.

The PRESIDENT: I must rule that the amendment does express approval of this portion of the Treaty in a more definite manner than the report, and is therefore in order.

Mr. WHITE called attention to that part of the report which referred to Consular Certificates, as indicating approval of Schedule A.

The PRESIDENT: I have no doubt that is the intention, but it is not so expressed. The amendment is a definite expression of opinion.

Mr. WOODS: It seems to me, if I correctly interpret the feeling of this Board, that it is very undesirable to lose a whole day in arguing this question, which has already been so fully discussed, and which in fact has passed beyond our control. From the information you gave us at the opening of the debate, it is not at all probable that this treaty, in its present shape, will ever come before this Board again. Consequently I would move in amendment to the amendment, in order to test the question whether this Board desires a discussion on the subject:

"That the Report now before the Board be laid on the table."

My reason for dealing with the report in this way is, that there seems to have been some difference of opinion among the members of the Committee themselves; and it is quite probable, that some of them may have gone a little farther for the sake of unanimity, than they would go if the matter were now being dealt with in detail. I fancy that this Board can hardly be said to be in a position to discuss this report intelligently as it has been in their hands for so short a time. I think it would be very desirable, seeing that nothing can come of our discussion of this question now, that this report should be laid on the table, and it might be taken up at some future time.

The PRESIDENT: According to our rules, a motion to lay a report on the table is not debateable.

Mr. JOSEPH SHEHYN (Quebec), seconded Mr. Wood's amendment, which was then put and declared lost.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), then moved in amendment to the amendment:

"That all the words after 'that' in the amendment be struck out, and that the Report now submitted be received, and the clauses discussed *seriatim*:"

This will bring the whole subject before the Board, and will open the way for all the discussion that gentlemen may desire. It should be observed, that almost every clause in the Treaty is dealt with in the report; and therefore it will be in order to discuss at the same time, any clause of the Treaty to which reference is made in the report.

Mr. MORISON: I cannot understand why so many amendments are required. (Laughter.) I came here to discuss the Reciprocity Treaty, and I am happy to say that I come as a representative from the Toronto Board, after declaring my views upon the Treaty; and I am not prepared to adopt the report without a fair discussion. Whether we discuss the Treaty article by article, or the Report clause by clause, let us state definitely what we are in favor of, and what we are opposed to, so that the Government and the public will know what we mean. As to taking up this Report and discussing it, I do not see why we might not just as well take up the Treaty itself.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal): I beg leave to second Mr. Gillespie's amendment, and would call the attention of the Board to the instructions that were given to this Committee. After a discussion of the Treaty at St. John, a resolution was carried, which declares: "That this Board, by means of a proper committee, or otherwise, do take steps to represent to the Government of Canada, those aspects of the Treaty in which it is unfair to Canada, or might operate prejudicially to Canadian interests." Under these instructions, the Committee had no right to state in their report what part of the Treaty they approved of. All they were directed to do was, to report what amendments they thought were needed in the Treaty. I may say, that I feel very awkwardly placed in being obliged to vote against Mr. Hope's amendment, for I am in favor of the first three clauses of the Treaty, and, indeed, of the Treaty itself, if it were modified in a few particulars.

Mr. P. HUGHES: Would it not be better to take up the Treaty, and discuss it article by article? I do not see what object is to be gained in "burking" it. We are told that it was discussed at St. John; but how many of this Board have read the Report of the St. John meeting; while, on the other hand, we have the Treaty before us, and I do not see why we should not consider it in preference to the Report.

Mr. WHITE: There is one point which I think the Board ought to remember. This Committee was appointed for the purpose of representing to the Government wherein the Treaty was defective, in the opinion of the Committee, as representing the Dominion Board of Trade. In accordance with these instructions, which we were bound to obey, the Committee have prepared this report. The instructions required that they should make certain representations to the Government, and these representations are embodied in this Report. Some ten weeks ago, this Report was sent to the Government; and now it is presented to this Board, as the report that was so submitted to the Government. Now, it seems to me, in view of these facts, that if the Board should discard the report entirely, and take up the Treaty in its place, it would be a most extraordinary proceeding. What we are called upon now to say is, whether the Committee did right in making these recommendations to the Government, or whether they did wrong. As the Report deals with the Treaty clause by clause, it will be competent, in considering the Report, for any gentleman to say whether he disagrees with the view of the Committee upon any particular point, and move an amendment accordingly, thus attaining the object that Mr. Hope has in view. I trust, therefore, that Mr. Gillespie's amendment will be adopted, and then we can go on with the consideration of the report clause by clause.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec): In addition to what Mr. White has said, I may say that this Board is not the Board of 1874, and for us now to refuse to receive the report of the Committee of the last meeting, would be to censure that Committee.

Mr. WOODS: It seems to me this report would be better dealt with, if

it
e
C
to
ar
th
re

up
Th
vo
pr
wh
int
thi
bri

ad
of
art
apl
the
tha
rep

was
the
hos
wh
ly
sho

rep
disc

only

carr

Darl
Gille
gall,
Shor
Wyl

it was simply received and fyled. From what Mr. White says, it is evident that this report is merely a declaration of the manner in which the Committee performed a certain duty. They received special instructions to follow a certain course, and they have followed out these instructions and reported to the Government; and now they simply report to us that they have done so. I cannot see that it is necessary for us to adopt the report, but simply to receive and fyle it.

Mr. COWAN. I understand Mr. Gillespie now proposes that we take up the Report clause by clause, and in that way get rid of taking up the Treaty clause by clause. I would be sorry to see Mr. Hope's amendment voted down. We are all in favor of the freest exchange of the natural products of the two countries; but we are decidedly opposed to making what we regard as extravagant concessions, in order to obtain that free interchange. At the same time, I think we shall most properly deal with this whole question, by voting for Mr. Gillespie's amendment, and thus bring up the whole subject before the Board.

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL (Windsor): I think if my motion had been adopted, at the St. John meeting, we would have been saved a great deal of trouble, both then and now. I moved then that the Treaty be taken up article by article, and discussed. There appeared to be then, and there appears to be still, a great dread of discussing the Treaty. I cannot see the reason, but there seems to be a desire to "burk" it. I understood that this Committee were to report to the Dominion Board of Trade before reporting to the Government.

The PRESIDENT: No.

Mr. DOUGALL: We know perfectly well that the meeting at St. John was composed of only a few members of the Dominion Board of Trade, and the greater part of those who were present, were so taken up with the hospitalities of the good people of that city, that they were not present when the vote was taken. (Laughter.) As the present meeting is entirely a new Board, and contains a great many new members, I think we should now take up the Treaty and discuss it article by article.

Mr. GILLESPIE: Every article of the Treaty is referred to in the report of the Committee, and therefore the whole Treaty will come up for discussion along with the consideration of the report.

Mr. DOUGALL: I have not had time to consider this report. It has only been in my hands since the morning, as I only arrived here to-day.

Mr. GILLESPIE'S amendment to the amendment was then put, and carried on the following division:—

Ayes.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Dufresne, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Henry, Jarvis, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McLennan, MacPherson, Mingaye, Read, Robertson, Routh, Sewell, Shorey, Shehyn, Sproul, Tourville, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Woods, Wylie.—39.

Nays.—Messrs. Hope, Hughes, Joseph, McGillivray, Morison, Oille, Skead.—7.

Mr. Hope's amendment to the original motion, as amended, was then put and carried.

The SECRETARY then read the first clause of the Report, and the President announced it as open for discussion.

Mr. WM. CRAIG (Port Hope) moved, seconded by Hon. Robert Read, (Belleville) :—

"That clause I, just read, be adopted."

Mr. ADAM HOPE: I move in amendment:

"That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following words substituted:—'this Board approves of that portion of Article IV. of the proposed Treaty, ending with the words 'any other country.'"

I have no doubt that the subject of the gradual reduction of duties was fully considered by both Governments, and this was doubtless the only way in which a Treaty could have been arranged at all. So far as my acquaintance among manufacturers goes, I believe they would be very glad to get one-third of the duties taken off, upon goods going into the United States. There are a number of people in Western Canada, whose business is to make machinery and export it to the United States, paying 40 per cent duty upon it; and it would be a boon to them to have one-third of it taken off.

Mr. P. HUGHES seconded the amendment.

A division being taken on the amendment, it was negatived as follows:

Ayes.—Messrs. Dufresne, Hope, Hughes, Jarvis, Morison, Tourville.—6.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Henry, Joseph, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, MacPherson, Mingaye, Oille, Pennock, Read, Robertson, Routh, Rowland, Sewell, Shorey, Shehyn, Skead, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Woods, Wylie.—41.

Mr. Craig's motion was thereafter adopted.

The PRESIDENT: As clauses 2 and 4 of the Report refer to the same subject, they might be taken up together.

These clauses having, on motion, been read by the Secretary:—

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN, moved, seconded by Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON:

"That clauses 2 and 4 of the Report be adopted."

Dr. OILLE: I have one remark to make with reference to the time clause. The time allowed, namely, up to the first of January, 1880, is not sufficient for the completion of the great works of public improvement alluded to in the Treaty. While I am, and have been, a firm and constant

su
th
m
w
th
w
ye
If
ha
cu
m

pe
th
on
co
ne
thi
Go
aft
co
an
the
ca
by
Ca
an
nav
we
am
Go
inc
effe
wo
tha
as
or s
mill
tute

trad
of th
is, t
seen
that

supporter of canal enlargement at the earliest possible moment, yet I think it would be inadvisable to bind this country down to the limit of time mentioned in the Treaty. You are all aware, that as far back as 1864, when the measure of Confederation was under discussion, it was agreed that our canals should be enlarged at the earliest moment our finances would permit. We are now in 1875, and as far as I know, the first step yet remains to be taken for the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals. If the introduction of the time clause would expedite the object we all have in view, there is something to be said in its favor; but under the circumstances, I shall feel obliged to support the resolution that has been moved.

Mr. ADAM HOPE: I suppose that when the Government of Canada permitted a time clause to be inserted in the Treaty, they understood what they were about, and were perfectly prepared to carry it out; and I for one do not see any difficulty in their doing it. I suppose they consulted competent engineers, who could give them the information which was necessary to enable them to come to a correct conclusion on a matter of this kind. We all know that the Canal Commission appointed by the late Government, took evidence from all parties from Quebec to Chicago; and after doing so, and giving the subject a full consideration, they came to the conclusion that there should be a depth of 12 feet of water in the canals and the harbors of Lake Ontario. They approved also of the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals, and of the construction of the Caughnawaga canal, and their report was approved by the Government, and sanctioned by Parliament. (No.) Perhaps the Government did not approve of the Caughnawaga canal,—but they approved of the enlargement of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, while the Commissioners approved of the Caughnawaga canal. Therefore this part of the Treaty is no new question. We were perfectly willing to enlarge these canals for our own benefit; and I am glad that this provision was made in the Treaty, in order to stir up our Government to increased activity in carrying on these works. If I were inclined to move any amendment on this point, it would be something to the effect, that instead of improving the reaches between the different canals, I would deepen the whole of the St. Lawrence to twelve feet of water, so that lake vessels could go down the St. Lawrence without breaking bulk,—as recommended by Maillefert and Raasloff, in their report some fifteen or sixteen years ago,—while the whole expense would not exceed three million dollars. I therefore move in amendment:—

“That all the words after ‘that’ be struck out, and the following words substituted:—this Board approves of Articles V. and VI. of the proposed Treaty.”

Mr. JOHN MORISON seconded the amendment.

Mr. JAMES WYLIE (Hamilton): As one who is engaged in the carrying trade, I would like to say a few words on this subject. We are all in favor of the enlargement of the canals, as speedily as possible; but the objection is, to obliging ourselves to complete the work within a limited time. It seems to me the whole work should be carried on simultaneously; that is, that the St. Lawrence Canals should be enlarged as soon as the Welland

Canal, so that we might have other communication to the tide water. Those in favor of the Treaty have said to me, that I ought to be in accord with it, because it would give our vessels the benefit of the coasting trade upon the lakes. That certainly is an advantage; but it does not seem to sufficiently compensate us for the concessions we are asked to make in order to obtain it,—because, as soon as the canals are enlarged through to Montreal, so as to admit of the passage of large vessels, the privilege of the American coasting trade on the upper lakes will be of very little value. Our object will be to carry grain through to Montreal or Kingston, and, therefore, we would not require to go to Oswego, as we do at present. As soon as we can get vessels drawing ten or twelve feet of water to go right through to Montreal, we can transport wheat from Chicago to Montreal at the rate of six or seven cents a bushel; and when that can be done, no other route can compete with us. With regard to the Caughnawaga Canal, it appears to me that it is not a necessary work, and that the obligation to build it is a sort of bribe to the American Government. I do not see what great advantage it would be, for after grain had been shipped to Montreal, it would certainly be a roundabout way to take it from there to New York.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN: After the remarks of Mr. Hope, I feel that I should say a few words upon the practical aspect of this question. In the first place, this Treaty binds our Government, in the interests of another people, to do its own work—a form of contract which I think is not agreeable to this country. In estimating our ability to accomplish this work, I think we should have something more definite than a general statement of what can be done. We have the statement of the eminent engineer at the head of the Engineering Department of Canada, and of other eminent engineers, who have reported on the whole subject; and I believe I am not astray in saying, that they are agreed that this work cannot be done in five years. (Hear, hear.) I believe that the Committee which drew up this report, were careful to obtain reliable professional information on this subject, and that the report is not composed of mere vague statements made without knowledge. With regard to the estimated cost, the eminent engineer to whom I have already referred, estimates that it may require ten millions to get ten feet of water in the St. Lawrence canals. As to the result which would follow if the work is not done within the stipulated time, the Treaty is very indefinite. All that we can infer from it is, that we will be subjected to uncertain consequences if the Treaty is not complied with, and this element of uncertainty would operate very injuriously to enterprises in this country. Would any man invest a hundred thousand dollars in a Canadian undertaking, when he knows there is a clause in the Treaty in great danger of not being carried out, and the non-fulfilment of which within five years, may cause the whole Treaty to fall to the ground? Coming to clause 4 of the report, we find something that takes us back to the previous Reciprocity Treaty,—a Treaty that was a Reciprocity Treaty,—and for the very good reason, that it related to subjects that are within the competency of the two Governments to deal with conveniently, and without raising those difficulties that are raised by

th
th
N
Ca
su
It
wh
in
ar
all
th
Ea
ca
ve
Su
th
W
int
enc
tha
lak
the
Ca
Ch
car
ma
of
this
pro
I c
the
def
to c

Me
rep

this Treaty. Under that Treaty, you will remember, the Government of the United States undertook to urge upon the Government of the State of New York to open up the Hudson River and the Champlain Canal to Canadian vessels. That was the last we heard of it (hear, hear);—and why such a clause should be introduced again is more than I can comprehend. It was certainly not an evidence of that wisdom of the Government to which my friend Mr. Hope referred. Yet this promise is all we are to get in exchange for the Caughnawaga Canal. I certainly think the benefit we are to get in return for that work, should be definite and unmistakeable. We all remember, that for a number of years under the old Treaty, the grain of the West was brought to Montreal, ground into flour and shipped to the Eastern States; but not long before the expiration of the Treaty, an order came from Washington interpreting the Treaty in another way, and that very large trade was stopped by a single stroke of the official pen! Surely it becomes this country in negotiating another Treaty, to see to it that it is so specific in its terms, that no Secretary of the Treasury at Washington, no more than a Secretary of State in Canada, shall be able to interpret it in such a way as to change its entire effect. There is a reference in the report to Articles VII. and VIII. of the Treaty. We all know that Lake Champlain is never considered in the category of the "great" lakes. It is not so considered in any of the Treaties regulating the use of the navigable waters between the two countries. If the Government of Canada were to construct the Caughnawaga Canal, and then be told that Champlain is not one of the "great lakes," and that therefore our vessels cannot enter it, that would be a very sorry fulfilment of the undertaking to make the coasting trade free. It would be no coasting trade at all. The clauses of the report speak for themselves; and if there could be any result from this debate, further than establishing the wisdom of the report, and giving proper recognition to the services of the gentlemen who drew it up, I think I could say a great deal more upon the subject. As I said before, I think the Treaty is disposed of, and we are merely discussing this report in deference to Mr. Hope and others, who are not satisfied to allow the Treaty to die the death to which it has been condemned.

Mr. Hope's amendment was then put and lost; after which Mr. McLennan's motion for the adoption of the second and fourth clauses of the report, was adopted.

On motion the Board adjourned until 2.30 o'clock P.M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, *January 20, 1875.*

The Board resumed business at 2.30 o'clock P.M., the President in the Chair.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., (Montreal), from the Committee on Order of Business, submitted the third report as follows:—

They recommend that the subject numbered 7, from the Ottawa Board of Trade, relating to the excessive rates charged by Express Companies, be taken up next after number 16.

From the Levis Board of Trade, the subject of the winter navigation of the River St. Lawrence from Quebec to the sea, has been presented; and the Committee recommend that it be placed as number 32 on the Official Programme.

From the Quebec Board of Trade, the subject of "exemption from municipal taxation, declared to be vicious in principle." They recommend that the subject be placed as number 33 on the Official Programme.

From the London Board of Trade, on the subject of the excise laws and regulations in relation to petroleum oils. They recommend that the subject be placed as number 34 on the Official Programme.

The subject of Insurance, placed number three on the original Official Programme, was, in consequence of doubts as to the Committee being ready to report, placed 26 on the Amended Programme. The Committee have ascertained that the gentlemen in charge of this question are now ready, and they recommend, in view of its importance, that it be taken up immediately after number 10 on the Amended Programme.

The subject of the Bay Verte Canal, numbered 32 on the Supplemental Official Programme, was by mistake omitted to be included in the arrangement recommended in the first Report of your Committee. They recommend that it be placed as number 31 on the Amended Programme.

The subject of Commercial Travellers' Associations, numbered 34 on the Supplemental Programme, your Committee recommend should be numbered 30 on the Amended Programme.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed), THOS. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

On motion, the Report was adopted.

FINANCE.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), from the Finance Committee, presented the following report:—

The Committee on Finance beg to report that 2,316 members contributed fees for 1874, amounting to \$1,737.75, which, with \$39 for extra copies of the Annual Report sold, made the total receipts of the Board \$1,776.75.

The total payments have amounted to \$1,753.37, leaving \$23.38 in the Treasurer's hands, but in consequence of the heavy expenses attending the semi-annual meeting,

printing of report, &c. (amounting to over \$400), there are debts due by the Board, and yet unpaid, amounting to \$459.00.

The following affiliated Boards have failed to pay their assessments :—

Chatham, O.....	\$60.00.....	(Refused)
Petrolia, O.....	34.50.....	(No reply)
St. Hyacinthe, Q.....	33.75.....	(Defunct)
Sorel, Q.....	33.00.....	(No funds)

The Committee estimate the number of paying members for 1875 at 2,595, yielding, at 75 cents, \$1,946.25, which they think will leave a small surplus over the ordinary expenses of the year.

They recommend that in order to pay off the existing debt, the assessment for 1875 be at the rate of 85 cents *per capita*,—and if a semi-annual meeting be decided on, that the assessment be raised to \$1.00 per head.

The Committee have examined the vouchers and Treasurer's account, and find them correct.

The whole respectfully submitted.

(Signed,)

HENRY FRY,
Chairman.

The PRESIDENT: I expect that there will be at least ten or twelve new Boards in connection with this body at the next meeting, and in that case our means would be sufficient perhaps, at the old *pro rata* assessment, to enable us to have a semi-annual meeting. In the meantime I suppose our only course is to adopt this report.

On motion of Mr. Fry, the report was adopted.

THE DRAFT RECIPROCITY TREATY.

The discussion on the Report of the Committee on the Reciprocity Treaty was then resumed.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR., moved, seconded by Mr. HENRY FRY, after its reading by the Secretary :—

“That clause 3 of the Committee's Report be adopted.”

Mr. ADAM HOPE, (Hamilton), moved in amendment :

“That all the words after ‘that’ be struck out and the following substituted : The Dominion Board of Trade approves of Articles VII and IX in the proposed Reciprocity Treaty.”

The PRESIDENT: Unless you desire to bring up any special resolutions on Articles VIII and X of the Treaty, would it not be just as well to include them in the motion ?

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR. : We have not the Treaty before us at all ; we have only the report of the Committee. If Mr. Hope desires to substitute certain clauses of the Treaty in place of the report, I think he should be allowed to select such clauses as he pleases.

[At this stage the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Dr. Tupper entered the room, and were greeted with loud applause, being invited by the President to a seat at the head of the room.]

Mr. JOHN MORISON seconded the amendment, which was then put to the meeting and lost on the following division :

Ayes.—Messrs. Dufresne, Hope, Hughes, Morison, Oille, Shehyn, Woods.—7.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Henry, Jarvis, Joseph, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, MacPherson, Mingaye, Read, Robertson, Routh, Rowland, Sewell, Shorey, Skead, Sproul, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Wylie.—38.

The original motion for the adoption of the 3rd clause of the report was then carried.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., moved, seconded by Mr. H. SHOREY (Montreal) :

“That the 5th clause of the Report be adopted.”

Mr. ADAM HOPE moved in amendment :

“That clause 5 be struck out of the Report.”

The PRESIDENT : Your object can be attained, Mr. Hope, by simply voting down the motion. Therefore there is no necessity for any amendment of that kind, which is, in fact, not an amendment at all.

The motion was then put and carried.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., moved, seconded by Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton).

“That the 6th clause of the Report be adopted.”

Mr. ADAM HOPE moved the following amendment :

“That this Board approves of the Articles contained in Schedule C, as part of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty.”

He remarked in moving the amendment, that some objection had been raised to this schedule, on the ground that it was difficult to designate what were “tweeds,” and what were not ; but for his part, he had had some experience in the matter, and did not see what obstacle there could be in passing those goods through the Custom House on both sides of the line. He saw manufacturers present at this Board, who had no difficulty in determining tweeds from other cloths ; and the same thing might be said with regard to “cottonades.” Therefore he could see no likely difficulty in carrying out Schedule C.

Mr. A. DUFRESNE (St. Johns, Q.), seconded the amendment, which was put to the meeting and lost on the following division :

Ayes.—Messrs. Dufresne, Hope, Hughes, Morison.—4.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Henry, Jarvis, Joseph, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, MacPherson, Mingaye, Oille, Read, Robertson,

Routh, Rowland, Sewell, Shorey, Shehyn, Skead, Sproul, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Woods, Wylie.—42.

The original motion was then carried.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON moved, seconded by Mr. JAMES MCPHERSON (St. Johns, Q.) :

“ That the 7th clause of the Report be adopted.”

Mr. ADAM HOPE moved the following amendment:—

“ That this Board approves of the Articles contained in Schedule B, as part of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty.”

He said he thought the manufacturers of Canada were quite able to hold their own with those of the United States, in the manufacture of agricultural implements. He had consulted a number of them, who declared that they had no objection to this Schedule, but on the contrary, they would hail this portion of the Treaty with pleasure.

Mr. WM. CRAIG (Port Hope), said he thought Mr. Hope misapprehended the nature of this clause of the report. The main object of it was to have a clear understanding, that articles which are manufactured in Canada, partly of imported material and partly of home material, should be admitted free into both countries. He had the honor of calling the attention of the Board to this subject last summer; and it was one which deserved careful consideration.

The PRESIDENT said he thought Schedule B could not very well be brought up in connection with this clause of the report; but if Mr. Hope would include Schedule C also, he would be in order.

Mr. HOPE said that the articles mentioned in schedule B, were imported into this country, and formed part of a large class of manufactured goods, and as this clause of the report referred to the free admission of these goods, which are made partly of foreign material, he thought Schedule B was applicable to clause 7, and that therefore his amendment was in order.

The PRESIDENT : If you join schedules B and C together, your amendment will be in order.

Mr. HOPE said he wished to have an expression of opinion directly upon schedule B.

The motion for the adoption of the 7th clause was then put and carried.

Mr. ADAM BROWN moved :

“ That the 8th clause of the report be adopted.”

He said the feeling of this country was entirely in favor of reciprocity with the United States, upon a basis fair and equitable to both countries. The expressions against this proposed Treaty had reference to certain clauses of it, which were regarded as injurious to the best interests of the country. But with respect to the portion of the Treaty which was referred to in this clause, he thought there was no difference of opinion, but

that they all desired the freest possible intercourse between the United States and Canada.

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL said he was in favor of clause 8, but thought that it should go a little farther with regard to Consular fees. At Windsor, where he lived, these fees were a great annoyance, while those charged upon the American side were much higher than the charges in Canada.

Mr. ADAM BROWN said this clause of the Report covered the objection Mr. Dougall had alluded to, in its reference to Consular certificates and fees.

Mr. DOUGALL: What I referred to was, small entries that did not require Consular certificates. If you would but insert after Consular certificates and fees, "custom house fees," I think it would meet my objection.

Mr. W. R. MINGAYE (Kingston): Mr. Dougall is in error. There are no custom house fees. What he alludes to is a charge of 25 cents for making out entries, and any person can make out his own entries, if he likes.

Mr. DOUGALL: I am thoroughly acquainted with that, for I am making entries probably every week, and know perfectly well that any person can make out his own entries if he chooses; but nine-tenths of the people are not aware of that, and therefore, for each of these small entries they have to pay 25 cents. But what I have to complain of is, that the charge for a Consular certificate on the other side is 95 cents, and there is no getting over it. I do not propose to move any amendment, but I thought it right to mention the matter.

Mr. JAMES MCPHERSON: I make entries two or three times a day, and am not aware that there is any charge on the United States side for any entry. If there is, and if it is charged by custom house brokers, some of whom are employed by the railway companies, I do not know it. The only charge that I have ever met in connection with the custom house, is simply a charge by the person who makes out one's papers, and that may be incurred in this country as well as in the United States.

Mr. HOPE: I rise to move an amendment. I think the question of the free interchange of the natural products of the soil ought to be set forward by the Dominion Board of Trade, in clear and unmistakeable terms, so that people would know what we meant. These Consular fees, of which so much has been said, are a mere drop in the bucket, compared with the grand principle of the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries; but I fail to see that this Report contains any approval of Schedule A. I therefore move the following amendment:—

"That all after the word 'that' be struck out and the following substituted:—this Board approves of the list of Natural Products contained in Schedule A, as forming part of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty."

Mr. JOHN MORISON seconded the motion.

HON. ROBERT READ: Before this question is put, it seems fitting to review the effects of the last Reciprocity Treaty, in reference to the interchange of natural products. Take for instance, the article of Barley, which is the most important agricultural product of this country as regards Reciprocity with the United States. It has been asserted that we are losing 15 cents a bushel on Barley sent from this country to the United States, because we have no Reciprocity Treaty. Now, I deny that. The free traders tell us that the consumers pay the duty. I do not admit that. I believe that at times they pay, and sometimes the producers pay, according to circumstances. But what has been the effect of the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty on this grain? I have gone over the files of the *Globe* for the last nineteen years—eleven years under the Reciprocity Treaty, and eight years since its repeal,—and what do I find? I have taken the steadiest market in Toronto, the middle of October, which is the height of the Barley season, and have taken the highest market price at that time, the result I find being,—that during the eleven years we had the Reciprocity Treaty, from 1855 to 1866 inclusive, the average rate was 67 cents a bushel, and during the eight years after the repeal of the Treaty, the average was 90 cents, or a difference of 23 cents a bushel in the two periods, so that so far as Barley is concerned, I do not see that we have lost much by the repeal of the last Treaty. But another fact to be taken into consideration in this connection is, that this country is the great Barley-growing region of this continent; and I am quite satisfied that so far as Barley is concerned, we have the market in our own hands, because there is no breadth of land in the United States that can grow it. Take other articles. Was the price of Beef ever so high as it is now? I do not think we are losing anything in that article. Then, if we come to Wheat, I think, it is a matter of no consequence whether the Americans take our wheat or not, because the ultimate market is not on this continent but in England, and if the Americans do not take it from us, and ship it, we can ship it direct ourselves. Then, it is said we are losing 20 cents a bushel on Peas. But such is not the case. Our great market for Peas is England, and the land of the United States does not grow Peas to any great extent. I ascertained when in London, that Peas used for splitting are entirely those which come from Canada, and that there is a great demand for Canadian Peas. Hence I consider we are not losing anything in that article, from the lack of a Reciprocity Treaty. At the same time, I am in favor of a Reciprocity Treaty between Canada and the United States, but am not in favor of making any great sacrifices to secure it. As a public man, I have urged reciprocity as long as I am going to urge it. I think the time has arrived when Canadians should stand on their dignity; and while we are prospering, as we are to a most astonishing extent, there is no reason why we should enter into any treaty which does not give us equal advantages. If we take up the statistics of this country, we will be surprised to find in what a remarkable degree we have prospered. Our Bank deposits have more than doubled in four years. The revenue of the country has increased in seven years from seven millions, to twenty millions, and that too with decreased taxation. With these evidences of

prosperity before us, there is no reason why we should enter into a Reciprocity Treaty, except one that is undoubtedly on a fair commercial basis.

Mr. A. DUFRESNE (St. Johns, Q.) : I will vote for the eighth clause of the report, because it expresses a desire for free commercial intercourse with the United States. I am only sorry that the rest of that document contains conditions which would prevent the Treaty from being obtained. I also regret to say that the Treaty has not, in my opinion, been fairly dealt with. It has been regarded from a narrow point of view. No treaty between two nations can be framed, that will not bear rather severely upon some portions of the community on both sides. The Government is not the government of a small section of the people, but of them all. Now, all over Canada this Treaty has been criticised,—by whom? By the traders and manufacturers. But the Government is not for the traders and manufacturers alone;—they must look to the interests of the whole country; and I say that this Treaty as it stands, if agreed to, will be a great benefit to nine-tenths of our whole population. That proportion of them are farmers; and is it not a great benefit, that nine-tenths of our population should have, in addition to their own market, a market of forty-four millions of people close by them? I am not prepared to say, as some have said, that we have grown so large and so prosperous, that we can now shut our doors to strangers, and live alone. (Hear, hear.) When we see two such great nations as Britain and France striving to have the freest commercial intercourse with one another, we surely need not be ashamed to go to the United States, and endeavor to come to some understanding for the mutual benefit of both countries. If we are to get a treaty at all, we must be ready to give as well as take. What does this Report amount to? It accepts everything that is favorable to us, and asks for more, and says to the Americans: "We do not want to give you anything." It has been stated that we are giving all to the United States, and receiving a mere bagatelle in return. Some persons say we are giving away our fisheries; but the most of our rights in the fisheries were given away by the Washington Treaty. What remains is a mere trifle, compared with what we have given away. A great deal has been said about the millions that will be required to enlarge our canals. Well, if I am not mistaken, whether we have the treaty or not, it is well understood that our canals will be improved. (Hear, hear.) That was the policy of the late Government; it is the policy of the present one, and of the country also. We are not going to deepen the canals for the sake of the Americans; but for our own interest, in order to draw the produce of the far West by our route, instead of allowing it to go by the Erie Canal. We will do that work in any case. Then, what do we give next, besides our fisheries and the use of our canals? Nothing. On the other hand, our ship-building in the Maritime Provinces would be largely increased under the operation of the proposed Treaty. Our manufacturers, I think, are too much afraid. I do not believe they would suffer so much as they apprehend. We can manufacture cheaper than they can on the other side of the line;

and I believe the practical effect of the Treaty would be, that leading American manufacturers will transfer their establishments to Canada, and supply both markets. Then, with regard to the free interchange of the natural products of the soil ;—that will certainly benefit nine-tenths of our population, as I said before, by enabling them to realize more for their produce ; and I ask you, whether making nine-tenths of the population better off, will make the other tenth poorer ? (Hear, hear.) These nine-tenths are the feeders of our manufactures, and if their circumstances are improved, the benefit will not be to them alone, but to those from whom they buy as well. Both the merchant and the manufacturer will sell more. For these reasons, I felt it my duty to vote against all the previous clauses of the Report. And now I am happy—believing I am also doing my duty in that—to vote for this last clause.

Mr. JAMES MACPHERSON : I may perhaps be allowed to say, that while Mr. Dufresne is my colleague, his sentiments are not those of the majority of our Board. My votes here to-day have been in accordance with the views of the majority of our members. I fully agree with what the Hon. Mr. Read has said, as to the effect of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty upon our agricultural interests. Before the discontinuance of that Treaty the Americans used to come in and buy up our cattle, take them over to the other side, milk them, and there make cheese and butter to be shipped to England. Since the abrogation of the Treaty, our farmers have undertaken that industry themselves. Cheese factories have been established upon an extensive scale ; and if I mistake not, the value of our exports of cheese in 1869 amounted to something like \$540,000, while in 1873 they amounted to \$2,240,000. That is the way the abrogation of the former Treaty “ruined” us. I could go over the statistics relating to our coarse grains, very much as Mr. Read has done, and show that our farmers really lost nothing by the abrogation of that Treaty ; while it had this other effect, that it forced our farmers into improved modes of agriculture. I can remember when hay was \$4 a ton ; but now we can send it over to the States, and realize as much as \$20 or \$25. I approve, with all my heart, of free trade in the natural products of the country ; but I think it is premature to adopt the same principle with reference to manufactures. We are now, in many branches, simply beginning ; and by-and-by, when we attain full strength in this respect, we may be able to throw open our doors, and compete with the whole world.

Mr. P. HUGHES said he had voted against the previous clauses of the report, but he was in sympathy with this eighth one. He thought the arguments of the last speaker were rather in favor of than against the proposed Treaty. That gentleman had pointed out the advantages which would accrue to Canada, upon the opening up of new enterprises, and new markets for our produce, which was the very thing that this Treaty proposed to do. He was also of opinion, that if an extended market would benefit our farmers, it would equally benefit our manufacturers ; while, on the other hand, the whole country would be benefitted by the competition among our

manufacturers and those of the United States, which would result from the adoption of this Treaty.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR. : I think it is worth while to say a word or two with reference to this report, which has been so slightly referred to by Mr. Hope and others. It is said that it contains no distinct statement in favor of the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries. If you will look at the resolution passed at the semi-annual meeting in St. John, you will find that this committee were limited to their instructions. That resolution is embodied in their report, and forms part of it, and it contains a distinct statement, as the expression of the Dominion Board of Trade—and not merely of the committee,—in favor of the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries. That being a part of the report, the Government to whom the report was sent, had the right to assume that the Board of Trade was strongly in favor of those features of the Treaty which refer simply to the interchange of natural productions. If Mr. Hope presses his motion, as a matter of course the last clause of the report, (which I am glad to find meets with the approval of several gentlemen who opposed the other clauses,) will not come before this Board at all, simply because a gentleman who is determined to oppose every clause in the report, asks us to vote upon a proposition in amendment to this eighth clause, to which we all gladly give our consent. Under these circumstances, of course all those who are in favor of this clause of the report will be compelled to vote down Mr. Hope's amendment, however much they may approve of it in itself. Now, I must say I have been somewhat amused and astonished, to find that my friend Mr. Hope, is so anxious to have the clauses of the Treaty discussed here, and to have some expression of opinion upon them. It is quite clear, however, from his standpoint, the Treaty requires no discussion. He has not suggested that there should be any amendment to the Treaty itself. On the contrary, he is opposed to this Report, and has moved in amendment that the articles of the Treaty be accepted instead of the Report. While, therefore, professing to wish the discussion of the Treaty, he desires that no result shall follow from such discussion except that we should adopt the Treaty as it stands. The Report simply recommends certain amendments to various features of the Treaty, which the Committee, acting under their instructions, considered should be made in it, before it would be acceptable to this country. That was the result of the discussion we have already had upon the Treaty;—and yet, Mr. Hope wishes us to set aside all that we have already done, after a great deal of discussion, and adopt the Treaty *en bloc*. Mr. Dufresne has taken the ground that nine-tenths of the people would be benefitted by the Treaty,—referring to the agricultural interests; and he seemed to complain that the discussion thus far had been confined entirely to those articles which related to the manufacturing and trading interests. Well, I am quite certain that the trading and manufacturing classes of the community would have been exceedingly delighted had they been permitted not to discuss this Treaty at all. If they have had to discuss it, it is because they conceived that through it their interests were

being attacked ; but I think I may lay down a principle, which will be accepted by every member, that there is no interest in Canada, whether agricultural, commercial, or anything else, that is in such a position of depression, as to require the sacrifice of another interest for its benefit. (Hear, hear.) We know that the farmers of Canada to-day are more prosperous than at any time in the history of the country.

Mr. DUFRESNE: One-half of our people have gone to the American side since the abrogation of the Treaty.

Mr. WHITE: That is not because of the abrogation of the Treaty, for the farmers, as Mr. McPherson has said, are getting better prices for their produce than they obtained under the Treaty. It is because the young men of Lower Canada (Province of Quebec), instead of striking out into new enterprises, have literally crowded themselves off the soil by a system of sub-dividing their farms. That is one reason why so many French Canadians have gone to the other side. Another reason is, not because these people desired to get rid of agricultural pursuits—for they are admirably adapted for those pursuits, being an industrious hard-working people ; but they found opportunities for employment in the manufacturing industries of the Americans, which, unfortunately, we could not supply them here. But I appeal to all the other Provinces in the Dominion, and ask you whether their farmers are not better off to-day than they were under the Reciprocity Treaty?—although I should be sorry to say that the Reciprocity Treaty injured them in any way whatever. We all know that at the time the Treaty was abrogated, and just before it, there was scarcely a farm in Upper Canada that was not mortgaged. Men were compelled to mortgage their property, for the purpose of carrying on their farming operations ; and the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, under Providence, was at the time one of the best things that could have occurred to this country, because it drove the farmers into other systems of agriculture, and developed other industries which have added greatly to the wealth of the country. It is quite true that the extension of our markets will be a benefit to the country. But it is equally true that a home market is the best of all markets ; and if we can create that by the building up of our manufactures, it will be a great boon to the farmers, for they will then have a market at their own doors for their produce. Therefore I hold that anything that is injurious to the manufacturing interest, cannot be to the advantage of the farming community (hear, hear). Mr. Dufresne has told us that we have already given up the fisheries, and that really we give up nothing in this Treaty. How does that assertion comport with his argument in relation to farmers ? The fisheries of this Dominion are scarcely less important than the agricultural interests. What did we get in exchange for the fisheries under the Washington Treaty ? We got precisely what Mr. Dufresne says would be a great boon to our farmers, namely, an extended market,—that is to say, we got it for our fish. But Mr. Dufresne declares that it is an extended market for our agricultural produce that the farmers so much need. Not only do we get a market for our fish, under the Washington Treaty ; but provision was made for secur-

ing to us a money compensation for the value of our fisheries, over and above the value of the American fisheries. Under the proposed Reciprocity Treaty we abandon our claim to this money compensation. We have not touched that question in the report, because it is more of a political than a commercial one, and we were careful to avoid anything of that kind. But if we had got this Treaty, we would have been compelled to give up that money compensation, which has been variously estimated at from one to six millions of dollars per annum. It is quite true, as Mr. Dufresne says, that the policy of this country has always been, to make our Canals the great highway for the trade of the Western States; and we are only too glad to afford our American neighbours the opportunity of using them. But it is one thing for the country to do this of its own free will, and quite another thing to bind itself by Treaty to do it. The difference between the two cases is this: In the one, the people of Canada are free to adopt what policy they please, in relation to their canals and the time for the completion of the work; on the other hand, if we bind ourselves by Treaty to build these canals within a specified time, we then become obligated by the terms of the treaty to do that, whether it be to our advantage or not—we at least give up the right of determining that question in the future, and these canals cease virtually to be ours, and become the Americans'. Then, has it been the policy of Canada to build the Caughnawaga Canal? I have no hesitation in saying, that if we could get an outlet by way of the Hudson river,—which is almost too much to hope for,—I am in favor of the construction of the Caughnawaga canal, because I believe it would bring down the volume of trade through our channels, and would build up Montreal and Quebec. But what are the facts of the case? What advantages are we to derive from the State of New York, in return for the building of the Caughnawaga Canal? I read last night the message of the Governor of the State of New York, and the report of the Canal Auditor, in which documents the canals are referred to; but there is not the slightest reference made to this Treaty and matters connected with it, although it had been discussed all over the country at the time they were written. In the Governor's message, the only canal referred to at all is the Erie. The whole message is devoted to the development of the Erie canal; and the reference made to the Champlain canal in the Canal Auditor's report is, that it ought to be enlarged to the depth of seven feet,—while we are expected by this Treaty to build the Caughnawaga canal to the depth of twelve feet. What I hold is, that in this report now before the Board, the committee have in moderate terms, and simply with reference to the commercial aspects of the question, pointed out those features of the Treaty, which, if they had come into effect, would prove injurious to this country. The committee, while objecting to certain features of this Treaty, were strongly in favor of a Reciprocity Treaty, and they pointed out certain amendments which, in their opinion, would make the Treaty acceptable; and it is to be regretted that Mr. Hope, in his anxiety to get a vote upon the Treaty itself, has forced the Board to vote down article after article of the proposed draft. So far as the committee are concerned, I am sure

they
them.
large

it ne
claus
instru
that t
in the
Domi
energ
most
Domi
tion i
enga
based
inform
that i
accep
my d

ing d

Darli
Grist
McG
Rout
man,

to a
the s
of th
confe
They
sever
some
it.
upon
condi
tions
to en
if pu
these
long
“
possil

they feel grateful to the Board for the confidence that has been placed in them, as shown by the adoption of the several clauses of their report by the large majorities which have been recorded in their favor.

Mr. I. N. BELLEAU (Levis, Q.) : The Levis Board of Trade had deemed it needful to draw the attention of this Board to some very objectionable clauses of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty. We, as delegates, were instructed to submit those objections. It is satisfactory for us to ascertain that the views of our Board are in accordance with the opinions expressed in the report now under consideration. The commercial community of this Dominion will have to congratulate itself upon the independent spirit, energy, and intelligence that has been displayed in the discussion of this most important question, since it was brought before the people of this Dominion. In fact, I do not agree with those who pretend that this question is one mixed with politics; the Treaty was condemned by all parties engaged in trade and industry, irrespective of politics, and for reasons based upon considerations of the highest national interest. Now, we are informed, the Treaty is dead. Let it lie in its grave, and let us hope that if ever it comes back to life, it will be in such a condition as shall be acceptable to the people of this Dominion. For these reasons I deem it my duty to vote for the adoption of the report.

Mr. HOPE's amendment was then put and declared lost on the following division :

Ayes.—Messrs. Dufresne, Hope, Hughes, Morison, Oille.—5.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Henry, Jarvis, Joseph, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, McPherson, Mingaye, Pennock, Read, Robertson, Routh, Rowland, Sewell, Shorey, Shehyn, Skead, Sproul, Tourville, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Woods, Wylie.—43.

Mr. A. WOODS : I rise to move an amendment. I think this Board is, to a certain extent, under a debt of gratitude to the gentlemen who form the special committee. Though I have not been able to coincide with some of the reasoning by which they arrived at their conclusions, yet I must confess that they have gone into the matter in a very exhaustive manner. They have treated the subject most ably, and I think the report must, in several respects, carry conviction to the minds of many parties,—even to some who previously were not satisfied on the various points referred to in it. Yet I cannot see from the report that it is definitely insisted upon, that all these recommendations must necessarily be accepted as a condition to the acceptance of the Treaty. Each one of the recommendations is in itself very desirable, and it would be the duty of the Government to endeavor to obtain these concessions if they possibly could; and indeed, if public rumor be true, steps have been taken with a view to secure some of these concessions. The discussion of the question has already gone on so long that I shall simply move :

“ That the following be added to the last words of the report—‘ Should it be found possible to obtain the consent of the other contracting parties.’ ”

Mr. A. DUFRESNE seconded the amendment, which on being put was lost on the following division :

Ayes.—Messrs. Dougall, Dufresne, Hope, Joseph, Shehyn, Sproul, Woods.—7.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Darling, Drummond, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Hughes, Henry, Jarvis, King, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McGillivray, McLennan, McPherson, Mingaye, Morison, Oille, Pennock, Read, Robertson, Routh, Rowland, Sewell, Shorey, Skead, Tourville, Waterman, White, Wilkes, Wylie.—41.

The question being now taken on the adoption of clause 8 of the report, it was carried.

The PRESIDENT: I think we can now, with great pleasure, call upon Mr. Parsons of Detroit, to give his views upon the subject from the American standpoint.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN: Before Mr. Parsons is called on, I think there is a duty which devolves on this Board, and that is to return thanks to the Committee for the work which we have now so thoroughly endorsed. I have therefore great pleasure in moving the following resolution :

"That the thanks of this Board be returned to the Special Committee for their exhaustive and satisfactory report."

Mr. W. F. FINDLAY (Hamilton), seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. PHILO PARSONS (Detroit, Mich.), was then introduced, and was received with loud applause. He said: I had much rather be in at the birth, and be able to give you my cordial congratulations upon the passage of the Treaty, than to be in at its inquest, for I am firmly of the conviction,—and that conviction has been formed upon the experience of 21 years, in the city of Detroit—that a treaty equitable and just in its character, equally to both sides, can be passed, and will contribute to the prosperity and happiness of both countries. (Loud applause.) For 21 years I enjoyed the benefit of almost unrestricted intercourse with Canada. We did—not only myself, but all the merchants of Detroit—a profitable and satisfactory trade with Canada; a trade that contributed to our interest and to our pleasure, because those with whom we had business transactions generally became our warm friends. I believe it is most unfortunate to both countries, that this Treaty should have failed as it has, by the act, as I conceive it, not of the Dominion, but of the United States. I have only to say that after having listened to the debates here, conducted without the least asperity of feeling, and with the utmost fairness, I should be prepared to concede to-day on this subject what I would not have done yesterday. One other great misfortune in connection with this whole question, as I look at it, is that a body of commercial men like this before me, cannot meet each other from both sides of the line, and discuss this question dispassionately, fairly, and justly. Could they do so, and could the matter be entirely removed from politics, such a Treaty would be established, as would con-

tribut
gentl
judgm
will c
this f
wishes
week
his ac
stanc
Then
but o
Mr. C
action
the n
positi
sion,—
devot
unani
of the
that
becom
anoth
has C
ever
an un
That
obser
that
appre
consi
refere
lumber
thing
lumber
thous
region
they
shipp
to tell
\$30
quent
is no
all de
equita
trade,

tribute to the profit and happiness of both countries. (Hear, hear.) But, gentlemen, the Treaty has failed. It has failed, not on its merits, in my judgment, (hear, hear,) but from the force of circumstances. I think you will comprehend me, when I mention some influences in connection with this failure. First, President Grant, at the present juncture, has all that he wishes to bear. The Louisiana trouble is no slight load. For the last few weeks, throughout the whole country, north and south; resolutions against his action have been passed almost unanimously. Under these circumstances, he has had no time or disposition to come into this question. Then again, a certain number of senators, whose names I need not mention, but one of whom resides in the State of Michigan,—although I may name Mr. Cameron and Mr. Morton—found it to their interest to coincide with the action of the Grangers. Not only so, but they led off on the subject, while the newspaper of one of the senators in Michigan came out distinctly and positively against the Treaty, when the Board of Trade after a fair discussion,—not a large meeting, to be sure; but the morning and afternoon were devoted to it, and it was called by public advertisement,—passed an unanimous resolution in favor of the Treaty. It was not for the interest of these three gentlemen, to do or say anything that was discourteous, or that might affect their influence with the Grangers, because that body has become powerful, and exercises a very large influence. Then there is another point. Detroit has been almost an unit in favor of the Treaty; so has Cleveland, Oswego, Toledo, and other points near the border. Wherever they are in a position to appreciate the whole question, they have been an unit almost, outside of politicians, in favor of the Reciprocity Treaty. That feeling is perhaps a good deal stronger than you think it is. As I observed to one of your Executive Council in Detroit, it is a misfortune that you do not visit us more. You would learn more of us, and perhaps appreciate us better, although I think you are disposed to treat us with a considerable degree of fairness. But, as I was going to remark, with reference to another point in connection with the failure of this Treaty, the lumber interests of Michigan have set the people against it more than any thing else. One year ago last summer, the three principal qualities of lumber were selling in all our markets at the North-West for \$45 per thousand, and our large lumber markets throughout the whole northern region, were doing a very extensive and profitable business. What did they care then for the paltry fifteen millions of lumber which might be shipped to Albany from Canada? But there is an entirely different story to tell to-day. The three principal qualities of lumber are now selling at \$30 per thousand; it barely pays the cost of production, and, consequently, every lumberman is against this Treaty. Now, gentlemen, there is no doubt that the time is coming,—it may be more distant than we would all desire that it should be,—but the time is coming, when a fair and equitable Treaty will be passed, that will draw us together in the bonds of trade, and in the more indissoluble ties of friendship. (Loud applause.)

EXTENSION OF THE EXTRADITION TREATY.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), moved the following resolution on this subject:—

"That this Board is of opinion, that the existing Extradition Treaty between this country and the United States is too limited in its operation, and insufficient to meet the exigencies of criminal justice within the two countries."

He said he was glad to mention, on good authority, that the Secretary of State at Washington was in favor of an extension of the present Extradition Treaty. After referring to the provisions of the present treaty, and pointing out its restrictive character, he proceeded to say, that there were no doubt hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly lost, from the absence of an extension of this Treaty, so as to include absconding debtors. He felt sure that an expression of this Board in favor of such an extension of the Treaty, would be a correct reflection of the public sentiment on the subject, and he did not see what difficulty there could be in the way of carrying it out. Both countries would benefit by it, and, in fact, the United States would gain more by it than we would. As the Extradition Treaty stood at present, it practically offered a premium to fraud. Clerks and others in confidential positions, could embezzle their employers out of large sums of money, and then quietly slip over to the other side of the line, and enjoy their ill-gotten gains with impunity. He instanced two or three cases of this kind, and argued that they furnished strong reasons for the extension of this Treaty, in the direction he had indicated, in the interests of both countries. Within the last three years, a treaty similar to this had been concluded between Great Britain and Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Italy, Belgium and other countries. He was satisfied that the matter only required to be brought to the attention of the authorities on both sides of 45°, to secure the desired result. He did not think it was necessary to discuss this resolution, and he would therefore submit it to the Board.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), seconded the motion.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR. (Montreal), said that the old Extradition Treaty had already been considerably extended, so as to include and apply to a number of offences which had in them the element of fraud. He believed it would be perfectly useless for this Board to pass any resolution, recommending a Treaty that would include offences which were without fraud, because no country would consent to give up to a foreign country mere debtors, unless there was an element of crime connected with their indebtedness. The new Treaty, in regard to the extradition of criminals, between Great Britain and the United States, would come into force very shortly, and it would include every case which embraced the element of fraud, and consequently that of crime. Hence he thought it would be unnecessary to pass this resolution.

Mr. GILLESPIE said he disagreed with Mr. White. The Treaty was not yet in force; and he thought it would be well for the Board to adopt the resolution, as expressive of their opinion on the subject.

M
abstra
resolu
I
Treaty
M
M
take a
be ver
dicatio
satisf
M
Treaty
be wel
I
Gillesp
of the
any s
M
not ye
reflect
it wou
which
operat
Gover
Treaty
T
M
Findla
McLe
Tourv
M
Comm
Yo
On
ciations
Repres
last :—
" SIR,—
" V

Mr. WHITE: I think we should not be called upon to vote on a mere abstract motion. We should have some definite object in view in passing resolutions.

Hon. ROBT. READ (Belleville): I would ask, whether the Extradition Treaty passed last session has yet been assented to?

Mr. WHITE: No.

Mr. A. WOODS (Quebec): I think it would not be well for us to take any further action upon the subject under the circumstances. It will be very undesirable to give any expression, which might be taken as an indication that we considered the Treaty now in process of completion unsatisfactory.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), expressed a similar opinion. While the Treaty was still incomplete, and its details were not before us, it would not be well for this Board to pass any resolution upon the subject.

Dr. L. S. OILLE (St. Catherines), suggested the propriety of Mr. Gillespie's withdrawing his resolution. As the matter was now in the hands of the Crown, he thought it would be out of place for this Board to offer any suggestions.

Mr. GILLESPIE did not agree with that view. The new Treaty had not yet been ratified, and the resolution he proposed did not in any way reflect upon the Government in the course they had taken. He thought it would be very wrong for this Board to take any position on this subject, which might indicate that they were satisfied with the Treaty at present in operation. On the contrary, the Board should strengthen the hands of the Government, and urge upon them to secure the final ratification of the new Treaty as early as possible.

The motion was then put and negatived on a division as follows:

Ayes.—Messrs. Elliott, Gillespie, Henry, Hughes, Morison, Fry.—6.

Nays.—Messrs. Belleau, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Dufresne, Findlay, Harding, Hope, Jarvis, Joseph, King, Marshall, McDougall, McLennan, MacPherson, Oille, Read, Robertson, Rowland, Sewell, Shehyn, Tourville, White, Woods.—24.

UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS IN INSURANCE POLICIES.

Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (King's County, N.B.), as chairman of the Committee on Fire and Life Insurance, presented the following report:

Your Committee beg to report as follows:—

On 25th November last the following Circular was addressed to the various Associations of Fire Insurance Agents in the Dominion, and to a General Meeting of the Representatives of Fire Insurance Companies held at Montreal on the 8th December last:—

“ SAINT JOHN, N.B., 25th Nov., 1874.

“ SIR,—

“ We send you by mail a copy of the proceedings of the meeting of the Dominion

Board of Trade, held at Ottawa in February last, and would say that upon reference to pages numbers 177, 178 and 184, you will find detail of the action taken by the Board in reference to the subjects of Fire and Life Insurance.

At a subsequent meeting held at the City of St. John, in July last, upon the matter being referred to, the following joint committee was appointed and directed to report to the annual meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade which opens at Ottawa, 19th January, 1875, viz :

ROBERT MARSHALL, Chairman,
W. J. KEAYS,
W. F. FINDLAY,

G. A. DRUMMOND,
WILLIAM HARTY,
A. C. FAIRWEATHER, Secretary.

Will you kindly bring the matter before your Insurance Tariff Board, and ask it to consider whether it would be expedient to have a uniform Fire Policy for the whole Dominion, and if so please send such a form as would meet the approval of your Board.

As to Life Insurance, the Committee are required to report as to whether any additional legislation by the Parliament of Canada is desirable.

With the assurance that any suggestion your Board may make in respect to these important subjects will receive the most careful consideration of the Committee,

We await your early reply, and have the honor to be,

Very faithfully yours,

(Signed,) ROBERT MARSHALL,
Chairman.

(Signed,) A. C. FAIRWEATHER,
Secretary.

To this Circular various replies have been received, but your Committee regret to say that the important subject of a Uniform Fire Policy has not yet been agreed upon—mainly, for these reasons:—

1st. The Agents of the Insurance Companies, having their head-quarters beyond the limits of the Dominion, have, in reality, no power to decide on the terms of such a Policy, and would have to negotiate its acceptance by their respective Head Offices.

2nd. The various Agents and Representatives of Insurance Companies are not at all agreed upon the subject, which has repeatedly been discussed among them without result.

Nevertheless, your Committee, recognizing the great importance of the subject, are not without hope of ultimate success; and recommend that it be again referred to a Committee, with power to confer with the Insurance Companies, and to negotiate with them a form of Policy which, while securing the interests of the Insurers, would be concise simple and intelligible to all classes seeking Insurance, which is not the case at present; as some Policies now current in the Dominion are in the highest degree complicated, and contain conditions not only onerous, but even unreasonable, and which, unquestionably, place the Insured at the mercy of the Insurance Company. Such a state of things is much to be deprecated, as not in the interest of either party.

We very willingly testify that the business of offices having such Policies, has been commonly conducted on fair and equitable terms, but the Assured having paid the stipulated Premium and acted in good faith, is entitled to have his relations to the Insurance Company unencumbered with complicated conditions, and any claim upon it based on right, and not sufferance.

Nevertheless, your Committee earnestly deprecate immediate Legislation on this subject. It may ultimately be necessary to give effect to any agreement as to a Uniform Policy, agreed to by a majority of Offices doing business in the Dominion, and approved

of by tl
recently
in rega
country

If,
difficult
with or
no oppo

We
" F
By

tion of
dollars
propert

hereina
twelve
twelve
as here
Compar

2. '
riot, civ
or his a
made pe

ment m
endorse
every su

reasonal
other pa
sold an
transfer

reason
policy s
3. '
powder,

4. '
control
policy, s
Compan

period.
5. '
loss by f
will per

value an
other ins
nish a co
nearest 1

Compan
once ma
giving c
appraise

of by this Board, by making such a form imperative; but any attempt, such as has recently been made in Ontario, to force upon Insurance Companies a form of Contract, in regard to which they have no voice, can only end in driving Foreign Offices from this country, and increasing the cost and insecurity of Insurance.

If, as is reported, there is a probability of legislation in England on the subject, the difficulties which beset the subject will be largely removed, and the British Act may, with or without modification, be adopted by our Legislature, and will probably excite no opposition from foreign companies.

We beg to suggest the following form of Policy :

" Policy No. Amount insured, \$

By this Policy of Insurance Fire Insurance Company, in consideration of the receipt of dollars, do insure in the sum of dollars against all such immediate loss or damage as may occur by fire to the property specified, not exceeding in any case the sum insured, subject to the conditions hereinafter provided, from the day of , eighteen hundred and , at twelve o'clock noon, up to the day of , eighteen hundred and , at twelve o'clock noon, to be paid within sixty days after due proof of the amount thereof, as hereinafter required, with interest from the date of lodging of such proof with the Company.

2. The Company are not to be liable for any loss caused by invasion, insurrection, riot, civil commotion, military or usurped power; nor for loss or damage if the assured, or his agent, in the written or verbal application for insurance,—which application is made part and condition of this policy—makes any false representation or any concealment materially affecting this risk; nor for loss if there is any prior insurance unless endorsed hereon, nor after subsequent insurance is effected unless written notice of every subsequent insurance is served on the Company or its duly authorized agent, with all reasonable diligence after the same is effected; nor for loss to property owned by any other party unless the interest of such party is stated on this policy, excepting goods sold and not delivered or held; and if the property is assigned, or the title thereof transferred or changed otherwise than by succession or by the operation of law, or by reason of death, without written permission endorsed hereon by the Company, this policy shall thereby become void.

3. This policy shall be voided by keeping over twenty-five pounds of gun or blasting powder, so long as such excess is kept in store without written consent of the Company.

4. Any change material to the risk, either in itself or adjacent premises, within the control of the assured, whether occurring after the making or after the renewal of the policy, shall void the policy, unless notified to the Company; and when so notified the Company may at once cancel the policy by returning the premium for the unexpired period.

5. All persons entitled to claim under this policy shall give immediate notice of any loss by fire, and render as particular an account thereof as the circumstances of the case will permit, with an affidavit, stating the time and circumstances of the fire, the whole value and ownership of the property insured, the amount of the loss or damage, and of other insurance, if any. They shall also, if required, exhibit their books of account, furnish a copy of all policies, and other proper vouchers, and the certificate of one of the nearest resident magistrates as to the extent of the loss or damage, if required by the Company; and in the case of damaged goods or personal property, the assured shall at once make, or cause to be made, an inventory in detail of the same as far as practicable, giving cost and quantity of each article; appraisers mutually appointed shall then appraise the damage on each article; and until compliance with all such requirements,

the loss shall not be payable; and in no case shall the Company be liable for a greater sum than the actual damage or cash value at the time of the fire; the Company may, instead of paying money for the loss or damage, enter on and repair, restore or replace the property damaged or lost, on giving notice of such intention, and if prevented, in consequence of municipal restrictions or otherwise, may pay the sum it would cost to repair or reinstate.

6. Assignors, unless the assignee owns the property, must furnish proof of loss.

7. The insurance may be terminated at any time at the option of the Company, on giving 30 days' notice to that effect to the assured, whereupon the Company shall be liable to return a rateable proportion of the premium for the unexpired term of the policy.

8. Every suit, action, or proceeding against the Company for the recovery of any claim under or by virtue of this policy shall be absolutely barred unless commenced within the term of one year next after the loss or damage shall occur.

9. Either party by serving a written notice on the other within sixty days after any loss or damage may have occurred, may require a reference of the claim in respect thereof to arbitration, and the written award of the arbitrators shall be conclusive and binding to all parties.

10. Books of account, securities for money, evidences of debt and money, are uninsurable.

12. Plate, jewels, medals, paintings, sculptures, curiosities and musical instruments, are not insured, unless particularly mentioned in the policy.

WITNESS the common seal of the said Company, and the hand of the President and Secretary, at _____, this _____ day of _____, in the year of our Lord 187—,

In regard to Life Insurance, your Committee believe that with a view to the increased security of insurers, an *extension* of the principle of enforcing a deposit in the Dominion funds from all foreign Offices had better be made. It is especially desirable also that some rigid system of inspection be carried out by a qualified public officer, of the financial condition of all Fire and Life Insurance offices doing business in Canada, somewhat similar to that in force in the United States, and we recommend that this be urged on the Legislature.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) ROBERT MARSHALL, *Chairman*.
G. A. DRUMMOND,
W. F. FINDLAY, } *Committee.*

Mr. MARSHALL moved as follows :

"That the Report of the Committee on the subject of Fire and Life Insurance be received, adopted, and entered upon the minutes of the Board, and that a copy of the same be forwarded to the Dominion Government; and further, that the Executive Council be, and are hereby authorized and directed to memorialize the Dominion Government in favor of the adoption of a system of inspection of all Fire and Life Insurance Companies doing business in Canada, as suggested in the said Report."

Mr. I. N. BELLEAU (Levis, Q.): I will, with the greatest pleasure, second Mr. Marshall's motion for the adoption of the report of the Committee on Fire and Life Insurance, and in doing so, I must state that I shall not press upon this Board the consideration of the question submitted by the Levis Board, for the nomination of insurance inspectors. The report deals with

that question in the very spirit recommended by our Board. It was agreed between Mr. Marshall and myself, that the two aspects of the question should be combined. This insurance matter, everyone admits, is of the highest importance. It has already occupied the attention of this Board on several occasions, and there always seemed to prevail in this body a strong feeling in favor of a system of insurance, affording protection to policy-holders. Statistics show that there are now more than 60 million dollars of risks on Canadian lives, of which about 40 millions are held by foreign Companies. We pay in Canada more than two million dollars for premiums to English and American companies,—and what guarantee do we receive from them? I dare say we have none. The deposits which the law obliges them to make with the Government are by far insufficient, and are often found to be made to cover the risks taken not only in Canada, but in all countries. Those deposits, at least, ought to be proportionable to the amount of risks taken in Canada. I remember it was suggested last year, that the Government should do the life insurance business of the country. But there are a great many objections to this course; perhaps it would be better to leave that business to public competition. In the meantime, it is necessary that some steps be taken for the protection of the large interests involved in insurance matters, and for that reason, I think the suggestion made in the report should receive the favorable attention of this Board.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto), said he had the honor of introducing this subject at the last meeting, and he was very much gratified at the progress which had been made. He was in favor of the report and the motion, with the exception of the reference to the action of the Ontario Legislature on this question. He did not intend to offer any amendment. But he thought, after the direct allusion to some necessity for legislation upon this subject, made by a judge of the Superior Court, that the Attorney-General of the Province could scarcely do less than propose some remedy for the evils which had been complained of. He thought the report was faulty, in representing that a policy could be framed under the new act without the consent of the Insurance Companies. That was a mistake. The main point of the Act was, that the Lieut. Governor-in-Council should issue a commission to three Judges of the Superior Court, and authorize them to make the fullest enquiry, respecting what they consider to be a fair and reasonable policy of fire insurance. He felt that no one who knew anything of their judiciary in Upper Canada, would fail in agreeing with him, that in their hands the matter would be perfectly safe. It was well known what difficulties sometimes arise, and what injustice was sometimes perpetrated, by the complicated conditions which were attached to many policies, and which were made a part of the contract. Very few business men read these conditions; and the consequence was that they were frequently at the mercy of the insurance companies. He did not mean to say that the companies would take advantage of this to act unfairly; but sometimes suspicion might get abroad against an innocent party, and the companies would use these conditions as a means of escaping from

their obligation to that party. Under these circumstances he thought it very desirable that they should have a fair and reasonable fire insurance policy. As the companies were widely scattered over the country, it would be quite difficult to get them all to agree to one uniform policy. He therefore thought the Ontario Legislature had acted very wisely in taking the course they had. The idea was, to appoint three Judges of the Superior Court, who were to make full inquiry into the subject, and lay down certain conditions which they considered would be fair to both parties; and after that, the companies would still have a right to make other conditions, but would be bound with regard to these other conditions, in case any dispute arose, to submit them to the judge, who was to say whether they were reasonable or not. He thought there could be nothing fairer than that. However, he did not intend to offer any amendment to the report, but would support it.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), said he did not see why the judges should be called upon to interfere in a contract of insurance, any more than in any other contract. However, he did not intend to discuss the subject at present, but rose for the purpose of asking a question. He would like to know, if it was the intention to force upon insurance companies an uniform policy? If so, he thought it would be interfering with the rights that insurance companies possess under their charters, and that any attempt to force them to adopt an uniform policy would be wrong.

Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND (Montreal): In justification of the Committee, and with reference to the remarks of Mr. Elliott, I would ask the Board to bear in mind what an insurance policy really is. It is a contract between two parties, the insured and the insurer, for a specific purpose; and that contract is precisely upon the same footing as all other contracts. If the Ontario Legislature has a right, after a bargain has been made, to declare whether that bargain is equitable or not, and to modify the contract as they may see fit, upon equitable grounds alone, they have just as much right to say, when I sell a party goods, that the price I charged is too high, and that, therefore, the contract cannot be enforced. They have no more right to declare what conditions are equitable in a contract of insurance, than they have in a contract of sale; and if insurance contracts are thus to be exceptionally dealt with, I fear the result will be, that the foreign offices will be driven out of the country, because they will not brook such interference. That is a result which should be avoided, if possible, because their withdrawal would be a great injury to the mercantile community, and to all those who are in the habit of insuring. Consequently, we referred to this matter in the way we have done in the Report; and I still hold the same view, notwithstanding what Mr. Elliott has said. But to turn to another point. If any progress is to be made in this question of an uniform policy, it would be well for the Board to consider the form of policy embodied in this Report,—to modify it if they think necessary, and then adopt it. I do not otherwise see how the Committee can proceed. If this policy is adopted, as the form which the Board approves of, then the

Committee would have a solid foundation upon which to carry on negotiations with the insurance companies.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), observed that while the Ontario Legislature might control charters of insurance companies issued by themselves, still they could not interfere with charters given by the Dominion Government. The result would be, if the matter were to be left to the legislatures of the different Provinces, and of the Dominion, that we might have three or four different sets of charters, and as many different forms of policies.

Mr. W. F. FINDLAY (Hamilton), said with reference to the question put by Mr. Joseph, that the Committee did not desire that an uniform policy should be forced upon the insurance companies, because they considered the policy was in the nature of a contract, and should receive the assent of both parties. Their object, therefore, was to get the insurance companies to all agree to a form of policy which would be acceptable to them, and also to the Board.

Mr. JOSEPH: They will never agree to it.

Mr. FINDLAY said with regard to the policy itself, recommended in the report, he quite agreed with Mr. Drummond, that the labors of the Committee would be entirely ineffective, unless the Board took the trouble to consider the form submitted, and express their opinion upon it. At the last session of this Board the subject had been very ably dealt with in a paper by Mr. Elliott, and also in the discussion that followed. Hence the Committee had taken a great deal of trouble, in preparing a form of policy which they thought would meet the views of the mercantile community, and they hoped of the insurance companies also. The objection he had to the Act of the Ontario Legislature was, that it destroyed the contract which an insurance policy ought to be. It left it uncertain whether the conditions of a policy, other than those submitted by the Commission, really were a part of the contract or not; and therefore the companies would never know, when they issued a policy, whether it was actually a contract or not.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto), suggested that as it was getting very late, the Board now adjourn, and in the interval before the next sederunt the members would have time to consider this form of policy.

This was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT intimated that the Delegates from the Ottawa Board of Trade, had invited the members of the Dominion Board to lunch at the Rideau Club to-morrow at 1 o'clock, P.M.

On motion the Board was thereafter adjourned until 7.30 o'clock, P.M.

EVENING SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, *January 20, 1875.*

The Board met at 7.30 o'clock, P.M., the President in the chair.

UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS IN INSURANCE POLICIES.

The discussion on the Report of the Insurance Committee was then resumed.

Mr. ROBT. MARSHALL (King's County, N.B.), again read portions of the Report, and explained its provisions.

Mr. WM. CRAIG (Port Hope), approved of the action of the Ontario Legislature; and therefore, while he would vote for the adoption of this Report, he desired to say that he did not endorse the reference in it to the Ontario Act. He adverted to the very complicated conditions which were embodied in many insurance contracts, and believed that the action of the Ontario Legislature was necessary, in order to the protection of the public.

The resolution was then put and carried.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton), from the Committee on Credentials, reported the arrival of the Hon. W. J. Stairs and Mr. Robt. Boak, Jr., delegates from the Halifax, N.S., Chamber of Commerce.

INSPECTION OF FISH.

Mr. E. W. SEWELL (Levis, Q.), moved the following resolution:—

"That the Executive Council of this Board be requested to petition the Dominion Government on the necessity of establishing a more thorough Inspection of Fish."

He observed that the present system of inspection was very inefficient, and often worse than useless. In one case that he knew of, a gentleman received a barrel of what was marked "first class No. 1 herring," and when it was opened, he found that it was "spoiled." (Laughter.) Another merchant bought a large quantity of first-class herring, all with the inspector's mark, and when the barrels were opened, they were found to contain ling and halibut. In another instance, herrings which had passed inspection, and been removed to a distance of 24 miles, were found, on being opened, so much decayed as to be perfectly useless. In all these cases, when the injured party called upon the seller for redress, he was met with a shrug of the shoulders, and told to call upon the inspector. The inspector, under the Act, was obliged to open only ten barrels in every hundred. He thought that it would be an improvement in the law, if the inspector was required to open every barrel.

Mr. I. N. BELLEAU (Levis, Q.), seconded the motion.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), thought that before adopting

this motion, the gentleman from Levis should explain how he proposed to have a more efficient system than the present. He believed that in Montreal fish were properly inspected, and if they were not in Quebec, it was very likely because the Inspector did not do his duty. It seemed to him that it would be impossible to require the Inspector to examine every barrel of fish. Of course the more the barrels were handled and opened, the more damage was done to the fish, and he thought if ten out of every hundred barrels were examined it was sufficient.

Mr. SEWELL said that he had suggested a more thorough inspection of fish. He did not know how that could be effected, except by providing that every barrel should be opened and examined, and he was quite willing to add such a provision to his resolution.

Mr. A. WOODS (Quebec), said he believed that many of the difficulties experienced in connection with the inspection of fish, might to a large extent be obviated, were the appointment of Inspectors entirely under the control of the Boards of Trade throughout the country. Therefore he thought the subject on the programme, of which notice had been given by the Toronto Board of Trade, would probably meet the difficulties better than any other course. He was free to admit that during the past season, in his own section, the Act had not worked satisfactorily, and he had no doubt that the complaints made by the mover of the resolution were well-founded. In many cases large quantities of fish had been inspected and marked, which afterwards turned out to be anything but what they were represented to be. Of course the public depended upon the inspection; hence he thought the Inspectors should be under the control of the local Boards of Trade. In that case, complaints could be referred at once to the Board, and the matter decided without any delay. At present all representations must be forwarded to the Dominion Government, and a great deal of inconvenience and delay were occasioned before they could be attended to.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), was of opinion that the best way to secure an efficient inspection, was to hold the Inspector responsible for a wrong inspection. If he knew that he would be liable to a penalty in any case of incorrect decision, he would be very careful to see that no barrel of fish passed his hands that was not up to the mark.

Mr. JOHN MORISON (Toronto), said that he was engaged in the trade, and he did not think that any trouble had been experienced in Toronto in connection with the inspection. At the same time, it occasionally happened that the fish did not turn out as represented, and he concurred in Mr. Pennock's suggestion as to the remedy.

Mr. I. N. BELLEAU (Levis), said it was difficult to find fault with an inspector, so long as the law did not bind him to examine every barrel. Under the present system, the position of those engaged in the trade was worse than before. When there was no inspection at all, then every one was on his guard. Now, every barrel was marked by the inspector; but merchants, although having some confidence in the inspector's marks,

thought some provision should be made whereby the inspection would be rendered as correct as possible. The matter had been discussed by his own Board, and he was of opinion that the suggestion of the Toronto Board of Trade—that the inspectors should be appointed by the various local boards throughout the country—would probably meet the difficulty. But, in the meantime, he thought it would be well to pass this motion, so as to bring the matter under the notice of the Government. It would show the Government how the inspection law was working, and would perhaps be a strong inducement to them to accept the suggestion of the Toronto Board.

Mr. ROBERT BOAK, Jr., (Halifax, N.S.): In Halifax, where we do a considerable business in fish, we find the Inspection Act to work remarkably well. We have had great satisfaction with it, and in no case has a barrel of fish turned out other than according to brand. There are two objections which we have to the law. One is, that the barrels are branded by stencil plates instead of hot irons; and the other is, that in some counties the law has not been made applicable. I have been in the fish business for twenty-seven years, and we never had a law to work so satisfactorily as the present one.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec): Is every barrel opened and inspected there?

Mr. BOAK: Yes, except when fish comes from Newfoundland and Labrador, and then only one barrel out of every ten is examined. Then the inspectors are responsible, if the fish proves to be of inferior brand. We have had only two cases, where fish from Newfoundland, branded by the Deputy Inspector, turned out to be inferior, and in both cases the inspectors have borne the loss.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto): Who appoints your Inspectors?

Mr. BOAK: The Dominion Government.

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa), observed that in opening a barrel of fish, and examining it, considerable damage was done to the contents; and this would be greatly increased if every barrel was to be examined. If it were possible for the fish to be inspected where they are originally packed, it would save a great deal of trouble, both to the buyer and seller, and the fish would be much better than if inspected either in Montreal or Quebec. Mr. Magor of Montreal, perhaps knew more about this than any of the gentlemen here, and no doubt he would give the Board his views upon the subject.

Mr. JAMES MAGOR (Montreal), said that as far as they were concerned in Montreal, the Act, which had been in operation for the last twelve months, had worked very satisfactorily. However, he approved of the suggestion, that the Inspectors should be appointed by the Boards of Trade, rather than by the Government. With regard to disputes between the Inspector and the owner of the fish, they were referred to a Justice of the Peace, who referred the matter to arbitration; and by this course, a good deal of inconvenience and delay had been occasioned. He thought

it
Ex
see
the
by
tro
poc
pos
in
get
the
atic
any
Lal
tha
to t

Pre
had

mov
Insp
opin
appo
men
anti
rem
duri
men
thos
grea
the
alth
and
the
had
dissi
ment
Gove
refer
takin

it would be better if disputes of that kind could be referred to a Board of Examiners, as in the case of the inspection of flour and meal. He did not see any reason why the inspection of fish-oils should be compulsory, because these were not on the same footing as other oils, as they were sold always by sample, and inspection was, consequently, not required. He believed the trouble which had been experienced in some quarters, arose from their having poorly qualified Inspectors. If they had good, responsible men for the position, he was inclined to think they would have very little to complain of in the law. For himself and his firm, he might say that they managed to get along pretty well. But there was one point to which he desired to call the attention of the Board. Since the Washington Treaty came into operation, fish from Boston were being imported into Western Canada, without any inspection; the result is, that fish are being brought there designated as Labrador herrings, which are really not that kind of fish at all. He thought that these fish thus imported into the Western Province, should be subjected to the same inspection as in Montreal.

The motion was then put and carried.

Hon. JAMES SKEAD (Ottawa) here took the chair, in order to allow the President to introduce a resolution on the subject of Inspection, of which he had charge for his Board.

APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTORS.

Mr. W. H. HOWLAND (Toronto), said the resolution he was about to move, had reference to the appointment of Inspectors. At the time the Inspection Act was brought forward, some four years ago, the general opinion of the Dominion Board was decidedly against the Inspectors being appointed by the Government. The result of the law placing the appointment in the hands of the Government, quite corresponded with what was anticipated. As far as Toronto was concerned, their Inspectors were removed after a great deal of trouble and delay, but the trade were during the whole Fall without any Inspectors, although they had recommended others to take the place of those removed. The result was that those who were interested in the inspection of flour, were put to a very great deal of inconvenience; while, with regard to the inspection of grain, the Corn Exchange instructed the old grain Inspector to go on inspecting, although it was illegal, or else they would have had very serious trouble and hindrance to business. He knew that with regard to another trade, the result of leaving the appointment in the hands of the Government had been, that they were saddled with men notoriously incompetent and dissipated; and although they had represented the matter to the Government, all they had yet succeeded in doing was, to get a note from the Government to the effect that the matter would be attended to. He referred to these matters in order to indicate the necessity that existed for taking the appointment of Inspectors out of the hands of the Government,

and placing it in the hands of the local Boards of Trade. He would therefore move the following resolution :

"That the delays and other inconveniences, which almost necessarily result from the appointment of Inspectors being placed in the hands of the Government of the time, are injurious to trade generally,—and that the old system of appointment by the Boards of Trade was prompt and satisfactory ; and this Board recommends that these appointments be again given to the local Boards of Trade."

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), seconded the motion.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto), supported the motion, and instanced a case which occurred a few years ago, in which a notoriously incompetent person had been appointed head Inspector, simply because he had some political influence. He thought that the Government would be glad to have the responsibility in regard to those appointments taken out of their hands.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), called attention to the fact, that there were many places requiring Inspectors in which there was no Board of Trade, and therefore it would be necessary to provide some machinery by which an Inspector might be appointed for such places, if the appointment was to be taken out of the hands of the Government.

The motion was then put and carried.

INQUIRY INTO MARINE DISASTERS.

Mr. HENRY FRY introduced a resolution on this subject, submitted by the Quebec Board of Trade. He observed that probably no more important matter could be brought before the Dominion Board than this. When he told them that after the 1st of November last, no underwriter in England could be got to take a risk on lumber, or any kind of merchandise, from Quebec to any portion of Great Britain at a less premium than 8 per cent, they would perceive that the question he now brought under their attention, was one of very great interest to the whole country. Of course, the underwriters regulated their rates of insurance upon the average losses during a series of years ; therefore, if any means could be provided by which the average losses on the lower St. Lawrence could be lessened, of course the result would be to reduce proportionately the rate of insurance. It was intolerable that 8 per cent., should be insisted on year after year ; the effect of it was to prevent a large number of ventures, which would otherwise take place. He held in his hand a list of the casualties which had taken place in the lower St. Lawrence during the last (1874) season, taken from the official records which it was part of his duty to keep as representing some of the underwriters in England. He submitted the following list :—

1. Viking (ss)—total loss ; no pilot.
2. Bear (ss)—grounding ; pilot.
3. Goldfinder
4. Princess of Wales } collision ; both had pilots.
5. Pearl of India—ashore White Island ; pilot.

6. Canova } collision.
 7. Siberia }
 8. Elisiff—ashore Anticosti ; no pilot.
 9. Ocean
 10. Eldorado
 11. Alex. Hall
 12. Lotus
 13. Maria
 14. Beethoven
 15. Ceres
 16. Bruce
 17. Gov. Langdon
 18. Endymion
 19. Ottawa } Collisions.
 20. Sunbeam—ashore Anticosti ; no pilot
 21. Matilda Hilyard } collision.
 22. Lennie }
 23. Merrington—*total loss* on Escoumains.
 24. Hope—*total loss* on Escoumains.
 25. H. C. Hall—ashore Green Island ; pilot.
 26. Baltic—*total loss* on Red Island ; pilot.
 27. Favourite } collision ; no pilots.
 28. Ossian }
 29. Celeste—collision with barge ; pilot.
 30. Therese—ashore Gaspé ; no pilot.
 31. Kyellstaadt—masts cut away.
 32. Piquot—ashore Traverse ; pilot.
 33. Arran—ashore off Brandy Pots ; pilot.
 34. Harvest Home—*total loss* on Magdalen Islands.
 35. Victory—ashore Anticosti.
 36. Glenallan } collision ; both pilots.
 37. Clara Killam }
 38. Eldorado—ashore St. Antoine ; pilot.
 39. Monsoon—collision with Matawan (ss).
 40. Iris—collision with New York (s).
 41. Czar—broke from moorings ; no pilot.
 42. Augustina—collision with unknown vessel ; pilot.
 43. Matilda Hilyard—ashore Manicouagan ; no pilot.
 44. Pocahontas—ashore Cacouna ; pilot.
 45. Amelia (ss) ashore Traverse ; pilot.
 46. James Leed } collision ; *one total loss with five lives* ; both had pilots.
 47. Norma }
 48. Villa Franca—aground Beaujeau Bank ; pilot.
 49. Henrietta Maria—*total loss* on Magdalens ; no pilot.
 50. Nova Scotian } collision Hare Island ; both pilots.
 51. Norge }
 52. Corinthian (ss)—aground at Matane ; no pilot.
 53. Dunbrody—ashore and abandoned at Mille Vache ; no pilot.
 54. Langen—*total loss* on Anticosti ; no pilot.
 55. Marthine } collision off Indian Cove ; both pilots.
 56. Fria }
 57. Marthine } collision.
 58. Polazzo Primo }
 59. Shandon—*total loss* on Anticosti ; no pilot.
 60. Quebec (ss)
 61. Princess Alexandra } collision ; all had pilots.
 62. Chas. Chaloner }
 63. Somerville—ashore on Green Island ; pilot.
 64. Delta (ss)—*total loss* at St. Ann's ; no pilot.
 65. Maggie Lauder—*total loss* on Anticosti ; no pilot.
 66. Carleton—ashore Richelieu ; pilot.
 67. Dauntless—*total loss* on Anticosti ; no pilot.

68. Cleughs—*total loss* Cap Anguille ; no pilot.
 69. Augustina }
 70. Emma Muller } collision at Pillars ; both pilots.
 71. Hattie M—ashore Traverse ; pilot.

ABSTRACT :

Number of ships lost or damaged 71

Of these :

Totally lost13

Seriously damaged 29

Slightly damaged ..29

—————71

Ascertained to have pilots on board 30

Number of casualties, reckoning collisions as one only, 54

It was not for want of legislation that they had no inquiries into the cause of the shipwrecks upon the lower St. Lawrence. The Act provided two modes of instituting inquiries, one of which he might call private, because it simply authorized every officer of customs, or any agent of the Marine Department, to make inquiries as to the causes of the accidents. The other mode was a public inquiry, which could only be set in motion by an order from the Governor in Council. He might say that out of those 71 ships which had been the subject of accidents, not a single public inquiry of any sort, so far as he knew, had taken place in Quebec. Under the old Trinity House Act, some of these 30 pilots would have been brought before the Trinity House, and if they had been found guilty, their licenses would have been taken away. But under the present Act, it was the opinion of the Attorney General of the Province of Quebec, that the jurisdiction of the Trinity House was taken away, and therefore the offenders could only be tried by indictment for misdemeanor in a criminal court. In conversation with the Minister of Marine, he had stated that the Minister of Justice was of the belief, that the opinion of the Attorney-General of the Province was wrong. However that might be, the fact was as he had stated, that not one of those pilots had been tried, and that there had been no public inquiry. Then it had to be remembered that another Act was passed a few years ago, respecting the granting of certificates to masters and mates, and providing that no Canadian ship should leave any port in the Dominion on a foreign voyage, unless her master and mates were provided with these certificates. The certificates were recognized by the British authorities, and provision was made in the Act for the withdrawal of these certificates, in case the parties holding them should be guilty of gross negligence in the management of their ships. However, during the past season, at all events, no action had been taken under that Act. The only objection he had heard raised against making inquiries into all accidents compulsory, was the simple one of cost. The Minister of Marine stated it would be very expensive to the whole country. But he hoped that when a proper representation of the subject was made by this Board, that that plea would be abandoned. When they considered that frequently a single steamer coming up the St. Lawrence had a cargo worth a million dollars on board, and that that cargo might be placed

in the
questi
accide
until
rence,
high r

“5
after al
of Mar
necessa
action
witness
of Mar

M
put, w

T
connec

Inq
“The G
table,—
vessels
not near
of life a
ment ha
most inl
sight of

The
is large ;
wrecks ;
vessels h
two-thir
in dense
crossing
channel

Besi
the wrec
alluded ;
weather
less than
been alle

The
with an e
the same

in the hands of incompetent men, it would be easily understood that the question of cost should not be allowed to prevent the fullest inquiry into all accidents that might occur. At any rate they might depend upon it, that until some steps were taken to diminish the losses in the lower St. Lawrence, the Insurance Companies would continue to charge these excessively high rates. He begged leave to submit the following resolution :

"That in the opinion of this Board a public inquiry should take place immediately after all shipwrecks or serious accidents in Canadian waters, and that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should be authorized by law to institute such inquiry when necessary, without waiting for the authority of the Governor-in-Council, immediate action being necessary in such cases, in order to secure the attendance of necessary witnesses. And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

Mr. R. T. ROUTH (Montreal), seconded the motion, which, on being put, was carried unanimously.

WRECKS IN CANADIAN WATERS.

The SECRETARY, Mr. WM. J. PATTERSON, read the following paper in connection with this subject, under the inquiry :

CAN LIABILITY TO WRECKS BE LESSENE D ?

Inquiries which were instituted by me in connection with my pamphlet, on "The Great Water Highways of the Dominion"—copies of which have been laid on the table,—for the purpose of procuring reliable information in reference to wrecks of vessels in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, indicated that while the particulars were not nearly all that could be desired, they were sufficient to show that the annual loss of life and property by shipwreck was very large. The aim of the Dominion Government has been, and continues to be, to have all Canadian coasts, from the ocean to the most inland navigable point, so studded with lighthouses, that as the navigator loses sight of one he comes in sight of another.

The number of lighthouses, both on the Canadian sea-coast and on inland waters, is large; and to one unacquainted with the difficulties of navigation, the number of wrecks which occur yearly is somewhat surprising. Conversations with masters of vessels have elicited the statement, which has been corroborated by others, that about two-thirds of all the wrecks that are reported in our river and lake navigation, happen in dense smoke, fogs, or snow-storms, and they occur not infrequently by vessels crossing each other for the purpose of taking the proper or legal side of the water or channel in which they meet.

Besides the wreck-figures given in the pamphlet referred to, the following, showing the wrecks in 1873 and 1874, will probably go to substantiate the statement just alluded to; for it will be seen that while, during the months of navigation when clear weather is most supposed to prevail, generally speaking the wrecks are considerably less than in the other months, yet the proportion is perhaps not quite so great as has been alleged. They are still large enough to challenge serious consideration.

The subjoined recapitulation gives the number of disasters in each month, together with an estimate of the damage involved, and a comparison with the disasters during the same time in 1873 :

	1874.		1873.	
	No.	Damage.	No.	Damage.
December	10	\$44,000	2	\$12,000
January	15	82,000	12	15,000
February	14	18,500	2	1,000
March	20	15,000	7	7,000
April	131	92,000	50	41,000
May	170	231,200	115	242,000
June	152	125,900	97	299,000
July	111	264,500	134	177,000
August	100	277,600	114	203,000
September	154	208,100	235	731,000
October	145	654,900	291	1,407,000
November	221	968,000	211	708,000
December	8	50,000	48	131,000
	1,251	\$3,031,700	1,318	\$3,976,000

Some one has recently suggested the cataloguing or codifying, so to speak, first, of all the Ocean lights, and next, of the lights on the Great Inland Lakes, assigning to each lighthouse or light, a special, distinct, individual peculiarity, that would, without fail, admit of its being immediately identified on being sighted,—thus enabling the mariner to ascertain without doubt his whereabouts.

In the case of fogs, or snow-storms, however, the brightest light is of no avail to warn the mariner of impending danger. At headlands on the sea-coast, therefore, but especially on the Great Inland Lakes, there is an absolute necessity for steam-whistles. A notable instance of this necessity has happened within the past few days, in the case of the total loss of a fine steamer belonging to the Gulf Ports Company,—the S.S. "Georgia,"—while on a voyage from Halifax to Portland. This vessel struck, during a snow-storm, on the "Triangles," on the Coast of Maine; and there can hardly be a doubt, that, had there been special peculiarities of lights, supplemented by the identifying signalling of steam-whistles, the fatal error would not have been made, of mistaking White-Head light for one of the Matinicus lights,—there being two at the latter place, one of which was rendered invisible by the very thick weather.

Conversations, within the past few days, on this most important subject, with Captains Fortier and Leslie, of Montreal, and others, induced the sending of a letter to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, making certain inquiries, to which the following prompt and explicit reply was received :—

OTTAWA, 12th January, 1875.

WM. J. PATTERSON, Esq.,
Secretary Board of Trade, Montreal.

SIR,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, requesting to be informed as to the points at which fog-whistles have been established in the Lower St. Lawrence and Gulf, and Upper Lakes; and, in reply, I beg to inform you, that steam fog-whistles have been established at the following points in the Lower Saint Lawrence, and Gulf, viz :—

In Lightships stationed at Red Island Reef and Manicouagan Shoals.
At South Point, Anticosti.
At Gaspé Cape.
At Etang du Nord, Grindstone Island, Magdalens.
At Cape Ray, Newfoundland.
At Point Escuminac.

A
be put
N
Govern
near l
Superi

P.
station

Ju
compar
Many c
made, v
ly conti
the da
sailing-
points t

Nav
located,
they are
desidera
any one
pay for
one at t
nor wou
summer
probably
Salmon
Sho
to enter
of takin
der the
heretof

A steam fog-whistle has also been erected on Miscou Island, which will probably be put in operation next season.

No steam fog-whistles have been established on the Upper Lakes by the Canadian Government. Powerful fog-bells have, however, been established at Nine-Mile Point, near Kingston, Gibraltar Point, Toronto Harbour, and Michipicoten Island, Lake Superior.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

(Signed,) WILLIAM SMITH,
Deputy Minister of Marine, &c.

P.S.—The Lightship and Steam Fog-Whistle at Manicouagan Shoals was not at its station last season, on account of the loss of the Red Island Lightship.

W. S.

Just here it may be remarked, that had there been a whistle at Cape Chatt, the comparatively recent wreck of the SS. "Delta," in a fog, might have been averted. Many other points have been mentioned by the gentlemen to whom reference has been made, which cannot all be instanced. There is another branch of this inquiry, intimately connected with our extensive and rapidly expanding commerce with the West, viz., the dangers incident to navigation between Kingston and Chicago. The ordinary sailing-route between these ports is well established and well lighted; the principal points touched in that voyage (and where there are light-houses), are:—

Big Point au Sauble.....	Lake Michigan.
South Manitou.....	Do.
Point Waugoshance.....	Straits of Macinac.
Thunder Bay Island.....	Lake Huron.
Pointe aux Barques.....	Do.
Fort Gratiot.....	Do.
Point Pelee Shoals.....	Lake Erie.
Long Point.....	Do.
Port Colborne.....	Do.
Point Peter or Long Point.....	Lake Ontario.
False Ducks.....	Do.
Nine Mile Point.....	Do.

Navigators tell us, that in snow-storms or fogs, these, or other lights, however well located, are of little if any value. In the one or two instances where there are fog-bells, they are seldom, if ever, of service as warnings from danger; and it is urged that the desideratum is a powerful steam-whistle at each of the places above-mentioned. At any one of these points there has been more loss to the mercantile interest than would pay for the steam whistles, and maintain them for many years to come. Had there been one at the "False Ducks," the *Stanley* would not likely have run upon the rocks there; nor would the boats and their barges have gone on Amors Island in the smoke last summer. Again, had there been a whistle at Longue Point, the schooner *Jessie* would probably not have been lost with cargo, nor would part of her crew have perished on Salmon Point in a snow storm.

Should not this Dominion Board of Trade memorialize the Dominion Government, to enter into arrangements with the Government of the United States, for the purpose of taking precautionary measures in the interest of the trade of both countries, to render the great inland international route freer from liability to wreck disasters than heretofore? But that is not all. Canada must also adopt the concise, but efficient code

adopted by the U. S. marine service on the Upper Lakes—that by which vessels nearing each other can arrange by mutual signals how they shall pass.

The following are the Rules and Regulations from Hawks' "Coast Pilot," which it is deemed important to quote in full:—

LAW OF MARINE LIGHTS AND SIGNALS ON THE LAKES.

For the Prevention of Collisions.

Article 1. In the following rules every steamship which is under sail, and not under steam, is to be considered a sailing ship; and every steamship which is under steam, whether under sail or not, is to be considered a ship under steam.

Article 2. The lights mentioned in the following articles, and no others, shall be carried in all weathers between sunset and sunrise.

Article 3. All steam vessels when under way shall carry—

(a) At the foremast head, a bright white light, so fixed as to show an uniform and unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 20 points of the compass, so fixed as to throw the light ten points on each side of the ship, viz., from right ahead to two points abaft the beam on either side, and of such a character as to be visible on a dark night, with a clear atmosphere, at a distance of at least 5 miles.

(b) On the starboard side, a green light, so constructed as to throw an uniform and unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of ten points of the compass, so fixed as to throw the light from right ahead to two points abaft the beam on the starboard side, and of such a character as to be visible on a dark night, with a clear atmosphere, at a distance of at least two miles.

(c) On the port side, a red light, so constructed as to show an uniform, unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of ten points of the compass; so fixed as to throw the light from right ahead to two points abaft the beam on the port side, and of such a character as to be visible on a dark night, with a clear atmosphere, at a distance of at least two miles.

(d) The said green and red side lights shall be fitted with inboard screens, projecting at least 3 feet forward from the light, so as to prevent these lights from being seen across the bow.

Article 4.—Steamships, when towing other ships, shall carry 2 bright white masthead lights vertically, in addition to their side lights, so as to distinguish them from other steamships. Each of these masthead lights shall be of the same construction and character as the masthead lights which other steamships are required to carry.

Article 5.—Sailing ships under way or being towed, shall carry the same lights as steamships under way, with the exception of the white masthead lights, which they shall never carry.

Article 6.—Whenever, as in the case of small vessels during bad weather, the green and red lights cannot be fixed, these lights shall be kept on deck on their respective sides of the vessel, ready for instant exhibition, and shall, on the approach of or to other vessels, be exhibited on their respective sides in sufficient time to prevent collision, in such manner as to make them most visible, and so that the green light shall not be seen on the port side, nor the red light on the starboard side.

To make the use of these portable lights more certain and easy, they shall each be painted outside with the color of the light they respectively contain and be provided with suitable screens.

Article 7.—Ships, whether steamships or sailing ships, when at anchor in roadsteads or fairways, shall, between sunset and sunrise, exhibit where it can best be seen, but at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull, a white light in a globular lantern of 8 inches in diameter, and so constructed as to show a clear, uniform and unbroken light, visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 1 mile.

Article 8.—Sailing pilot vessels shall not carry the lights required for other sailing vessels, but shall carry a white light at the masthead, visible all around the horizon, and shall also exhibit a flare-up light every 15 minutes.

Article 9.—Open fishing boats and other open boats shall not be required to carry side lights required for other vessels, but shall, if they do not carry such lights, carry a

lantern having a green slide on the one side, and a red slide on the other side, and on the approach of or to other vessels, such lantern shall be exhibited in sufficient time to prevent collision, so that the green light shall not be seen on the port side, nor the red light on the starboard side. Fishing vessels and open boats when at anchor, or attached to their nets, and stationery, shall exhibit a bright white light. Fishing vessels, and open boats shall, however, not be prevented from using a flare-up in addition, if considered expedient.

Article 10.—Whenever there is a fog, whether by day or night, the fog-signals described below shall be carried and used, and shall be sounded at least every 5 minutes, viz.:

(a) Steamships under way shall use a steam whistle placed before the funnel, not less than 8 feet from the deck.

(b) Sailing ships under way shall use a fog horn.

(c) Steam ships and sailing ships when not under way shall use a Bell.

Article 11.—If two sailing ships are meeting end on, or nearly end on, so as to involve risk of collision, the helms of both shall be put to port, so that each may pass on the port side of the other.

Article 12.—When two sailing ships are crossing so as to involve risk of collision, then, if they have the wind on different sides, the ship with the wind on the port side shall keep out of the way of the ship with the wind on the starboard side, except in the case in which the ship with the wind on the port side is close-hauled, and the other ship free, in which case the latter ship shall keep out of the way. But if they have the wind on the same side, or if one of them has the wind aft, the ship which is to windward shall keep out of the way of the ship which is to leeward.

Article 13.—If two ships under steam are meeting end on or nearly end on, so as to involve risk of collision, the helms of both shall be put to port, so that each may pass on the port side of the other.

Article 14.—If two ships under steam are crossing so as to involve risk of collision, the ship which has the other on her own starboard side shall keep out of the way of the other.

Article 15.—If two ships, one of which is a sailing ship, and the other a steamship, are proceeding in such direction as to involve risk of collision, the steamship shall keep out of the way of the sailing ship.

Article 16.—Every steamship, when approaching another ship so as to involve risk of collision, shall slacken her speed, or, if necessary stop and reverse; and every steamship shall, when in a fog, go at a moderate speed.

Article 17.—Every vessel overtaking any other vessel, shall keep out of the way of the said last mentioned vessel.

Article 18.—Where, by the above rules, one of two ships is to keep out of the way, the other shall keep her course, subject to the qualifications contained in the following articles.

Article 19.—In obeying and construing these rules, due regard must be had to all dangers of navigation; and due regard must also be had to any special circumstances which may exist in any particular case, rendering a departure from the above rules necessary, in order to avoid immediate danger.

Article 20.—Nothing in these rules shall exonerate any ship, or the owner, or master, or crew thereof, from the consequences of any neglect to carry lights or signals; or of any neglect to keep a proper look-out; or of the neglect of any precaution which may be required by the ordinary practice of seamen, or by the special circumstances of the case.

FOG SIGNALS.

Every steamer, when under way, shall use a steam-whistle. Sailing vessels, and all other craft, propelled by sails, shall use a fog horn.

Whenever there is a fog, whether by day or night, the fog signals described below shall be sounded.

Sailing vessels, and every craft propelled by sails, upon the ocean, lakes and rivers, shall, when on their starboard tack, sound one blast of their fog horn; when on their

port tack, they shall sound two blasts of their fog horn; when with the wind free or running large, they shall sound three blasts of their fog horn; when lying-to, or at anchor, they shall sound a general alarm. In each instance, the above signals shall be sounded at intervals of not more than two minutes.

Sailing vessels, when not under way, and anchored or moored in the channel or fairway of commerce, shall sound the general alarm signal at intervals of not more than two minutes, and all steamers navigating in a fog or thick weather, shall, by the rules governing pilots, sound their steam whistles at intervals of not more than one minute.

Sailing vessels shall, at all times, on the approach of any steamer during the night time, show a lighted torch upon that point or quarter to which such steamer shall be approaching. And upon any craft navigating rivers without being in tow of a steamer, such as rafts, flat-boats, wood-boats, and other like craft, they shall sound a fog horn at intervals of not more than two minutes. It shall, at all times, be the duty of steamers to give to the sailing vessel or other craft propelled by sails, every advantage, and keep out of her way.

In order to avoid confusion and risk, and also to insure uniform sounds of fog signals on all water craft, other than steam vessels, that may be distinguished from steam whistles, the Treasury Department designates the "Anderson" and the "Van Trump" fog horns as the standard instruments for use on all water craft, except steam vessels, under requirements of the section of the law above quoted, these instruments having received the approval of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of steam vessels, and also of this department.

The St. Lawrence River from Montreal to Kingston.

The foregoing remarks have had reference, first, to the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, and second, to the navigation of the Upper Lakes. I will only trespass further upon the time of the Board, by indicating some apparently necessary improvements for the safety of navigation between Montreal and Kingston. An important requirement for that part of the river is a proper chart, as none such are now available. I am informed that the requisite surveys and soundings have already been made, and the material for a really serviceable chart is supposed to be in the possession of some Government Department; if so, it lies there unused, and meanwhile large amounts of valuable property are being lost every year, because of a lack of knowledge respecting the river, that such a chart would afford. One was issued in 1856 in book-form, but only a limited number of copies were distributed amongst legislators; very few pilots or navigators ever saw the book, and it may safely be affirmed that very little practical benefit was derived from its publication. Pilots have hitherto obtained, and they are now acquiring, their knowledge of the river by *experience*. Rocks and shallow places are not infrequently being discovered to the sorrow and at the expense of vessel-owners and underwriters; and it is beyond question that a less expensive and more scientific method of teaching pilots and navigators how to avoid the hidden dangers in their pathway, should be adopted.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN (Montreal), moved, seconded by Mr. JAMES McDUGALL (Montreal), as follows:

Whereas it has been represented to this Board that about two-thirds of the wrecks which occur on the Great Lakes, happen during snow-storms, fogs, or dense smoke,—and often take place, moreover, at or near localities where there are lighthouses;—therefore

Resolved, That a petition be presented by the Executive Council to His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council, earnestly praying that steam fog-whistles be established at the principal points and headlands in Canadian waters, in the ordinary route followed by navigators of the Great Lakes,—and at such other points as may afterwards be deemed necessary,—for the purpose of enabling masters and pilots in command of steam and sailing vessels to avoid the dangers so often encountered;—

Resolved, That the Rules and Regulations for the government of Pilots navigating

U. S. vessels on the Upper Lakes, should be extended and made applicable to Masters and Pilots navigating Canadian waters,—and that the Paper read at this Board by the Secretary be also presented to the Governor-General-in-Council ; and further

Resolved, That, in the interest of international commerce and navigation, His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council, be solicited to take the necessary steps to bring the question of establishing fog-whistles at dangerous points in United States waters on the Great Lakes, in the ordinary route followed by vessels of both countries, to the notice of the Government at Washington, D.C.

Dr. L. S. OILLE (St. Catherines) inquired whether the motion included Lake Superior.

The PRESIDENT said it included all the Lakes.

Dr. OILLE observed that it was very important that some better arrangement should be made for preventing disasters on Lake Superior. Our trade upon that Lake was increasing very largely, and the provision against shipwrecks was too incomplete.

The motion was then carried.

MONTREAL HARBOR CHARGES.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto) introduced this subject as submitted by the Toronto Board of Trade. He stated it would be remembered that there was a good deal of correspondence last year in the newspapers upon the subject, and it was brought before the Toronto Board of Trade. Without further preface he would move the resolution which was submitted by that Board, as follows:—

Whereas, Montreal being the chief seaport for the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, it is important that the harbor dues levied at that place should be considered equitable by those who pay such dues, and the plan of collecting them be as simple as possible ; and believing that improvements may be made in both these respects,—be it therefore

Resolved, "That the Secretary be instructed to present this matter to the proper authorities for their best consideration, accompanied by a copy of the report presented on this subject to the Council of the Toronto Board of Trade."

He proceeded to read from the report of the Committee of the Toronto Board upon the subject, as follows :

1st. On examination of the schedule of the Tariff of rates to be levied on merchandise, &c., landed or shipped in said harbor, they find it to consist of 195 items. This large number they believe could be reduced more than one-half without impairing its efficiency, in a way hereinafter to be mentioned.

2nd. They find the Harbor Commissioners are authorised to collect on all goods, wares and merchandise, not otherwise classed and described, $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent. on the value of said merchandise, as Harbor dues on the same. And as nearly all the most expensive kinds of goods, coming to the port of Montreal, are not classed, your Committee are strongly of opinion that such a mode of collecting harbor dues is very unreasonable, and may prove injurious to the trade of said port. Because, first, no more room is occupied on the wharves of said harbor, if reckoned by measure, and no more wear and tear is caused by a ton of expensive goods, than by a like quantity of cheap articles. Secondly, it not unfrequently happens that the harbor dues on a package amounts to as much

as, and in some cases more than the freight across the ocean. And in numerous instances, the large proportion which said dues bear to the whole freight, makes a strong temptation to importers to employ foreign vessels and harbors in preference to our own, which should by all means be taken away.

3rd. Your Committee believe that an improvement would be made in the schedule of the tariff of dues, and in the plan and principle of collecting them, by making the following alterations. *First*, that all rates based on the value of goods be abolished. *Second*, that apples, barley, pot and pearl ashes, be rated by the barrel instead of the minot or bushel, and 1000 lbs. respectively. *Third*, that Indian Corn, Malt, and grain of all kinds be rated by the cental of 100 lbs., in place of the minot or bushel. *Fourth*, that oils, wines, and liquids of all kinds be rated by the ton, instead of 100 gallons. *Fifth*, that all items rated by weight should be by the ton, and that the ton be reckoned by actual weight, or measure, as may be stated in the ships' bill of lading. *Sixth*, that all articles rated by the ton weight or ton measure be left off the schedule. *Seventh*, that all wares and merchandise not in the schedule be rated by the ton, weight or measure at a uniform rate, excepting ballast, cinders, coal, coke, clay, china-ware in packages, earthenware in packages, glassware in packages, phosphate of lime unmanufactured, plaster of Paris ditto, sand, and stoneware in packages, on which it would be expedient to levy lower rates than on other articles. Thus the percentage system would be abolished.

4th. Your committee are quite satisfied that the adoption of the foregoing alterations would greatly facilitate the collection of the dues in question, and the work of merchants in calculating the laid down cost of goods; and what is of great consequence to the Dominion West of Montreal, would tend to prevent a diminution of the import trade of the Port of that city and the consequent lessening of traffic on the canals and Railways to the West.

Mr. Elliott observed that every business man knew the importance of simplifying business transactions, in order to save both time and expense; and if the schedule of articles on which harbor dues had been levied in Montreal, could be reduced to one-half, it would certainly facilitate the operation of collecting dues, and would be more satisfactory to the trade generally. As was intimated in the report he had read, there was a strong feeling in the West, that it would be better to import goods by way of Boston and New York to Toronto, than to pay the charges imposed by the Montreal Harbor Board. He did not know another port where the dues were levied by a percentage on the value, as they were at Montreal; it was always by weight or measurement. It had been found, with regard to articles of great value, that the harbor dues imposed at Montreal, amounted to more than the cost of freight across the Atlantic. As one who took a deep interest in this country, he did not wish to see New York or Boston favored at the expense of Montreal; but at the same time, there was a strong feeling in favor of resorting to the American routes, if the harbor rates of Montreal continued to be imposed in the present manner. He did not bring forward this motion as in any spirit of rivalry between Toronto and Montreal. He was proud to recognize Montreal as a great city, one that was rapidly growing, and which in time would be equal to New York. Neither was this motion brought up on the supposition that the merchants of Montreal had any advantage over those in the West, for they all paid dues at the same rates. He thought if the principle was adopted of levying these

dues according to weight, it would satisfy the people of the West; and he hoped that some such plan would be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS CRAMP (Montreal), said that although he was a Harbor Commissioner of Montreal, he of course had no power to deal with this question, and he would therefore simply confine himself to facts. It appeared to him that the Harbor Board had suffered from excessive good nature. They had to raise a certain amount of revenue for the improvement of the Harbor, and they had been in the habit, for the last 25 years, of imposing a tax upon all goods that passed through Montreal or that entered Montreal, and which thus obtained the advantages of the Montreal Harbor. They early found that it was exceedingly inconvenient to the merchants of the West, to require that their goods should be delayed at the wharves of Montreal, in order that the duty might be collected. Therefore, the Board of that day contrived a system by which the whole amount of dues was commuted. Under this system, the amount of dues paid by Upper Canada was only a very small proportion of the total revenue of the Harbor of Montreal. His attention had been drawn to this matter only a short time before leaving Montreal, and he had not been able to look over the statistics upon the subject to any great extent; but he could say, at any rate, that since the change had been made last summer, which was for four months of navigation, or about two-thirds of the entire season, less than ten per cent. of the entire revenue received by the Montreal Harbor was paid by these dues. In other words, the city of Montreal paid ninety per cent., and the trade of Upper Canada paid ten per cent. With regard to the schedule, he might say that it was carefully prepared upon the *ad valorem* principle. He thought that cheap goods should not be so heavily taxed as expensive goods, although they might occupy more bulk. As a Montrealer, he felt exceedingly anxious to have as large a share of the trade come by that city as possible. He could only say, that the Harbor Commissioners desired to treat the Western trade as fairly as possible, and any resolution passed by this Board would receive their most respectful consideration.

Mr. JAMES MAGOR (Montreal), said that as an importer of Montreal, he was anxious, if a grievance really existed, that it should be redressed. With regard to the mode of levying these dues, he might observe that he dealt in oil, and had to pay on a barrel of oil five times as much as he had to do upon a barrel of flour. There was a similar tax imposed upon Petroleum going out of the country, and he believed this tax operated as a drawback to exporting this article.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto), said the merchants of his city desired no preference over those of Montreal; but he felt that it would give more satisfaction, if the dues were levied upon the package instead of upon the value.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), said he believed the dues would amount to a much larger sum, if they were imposed upon the package or by the weight instead of according to value.

Mr. THOS. CRAMP said he had no objection to the resolution. But he

should like to ask Mr. Elliott, whether he could suggest any simpler way of collecting harbor dues than that now in operation, because the Harbor Commissioners would like to give effect to a resolution of this Board, provided they could do so.

Mr. ELLIOTT said that the suggestions were embodied in the report from which he had read.

Mr. CRAMP inquired if they had made any computation as to what revenue would be reduced under the system proposed.

Mr. ELLIOTT replied they had not.

Mr. CRAMP said this was the important part of the question, because the Harbor Board of Montreal must provide a revenue to meet the demands upon them. He might observe that under the system which had been in operation before the present one, the merchants of Upper Canada did not pay more than one quarter of what the merchants in Montreal had to pay. The Board had discovered that while they had commuted the total tax for \$6,000 a year, that under the present system, it amounted in four months to between \$14,000 and \$15,000.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec,) said that this was simply a local matter, to be dealt with properly by the Montreal and the Toronto Boards of Trade, and he did not think it should be brought before the Dominion Board at all. He took objection to the preamble of the resolution, which stated that Montreal was the chief sea-port of the Dominion (laughter). He begged to deny that statement. If the merchants of the West felt themselves unjustly treated by the Montreal Harbor Commissioners, he thought they should bring the matter before the Montreal Board of Trade, or before the Government. Subjects brought before this Board, should only be such as concern the whole Dominion.

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa), approved of the *ad valorem* system of imposing these dues, as the most equitable one that could be adopted, and the one that caused the least delay. He would rather pay a little extra than have to wait a considerable time to have his goods weighed in order to be taxed. He had no doubt if the present rates were too high, that the Harbor Commissioners would reduce them.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), suggested that Mr. Elliott withdraw his resolution, as his object had been attained in drawing attention to the subject. It was evident from the remarks of Mr. Cramp, and he knew it also from his own experience, that the merchants of the West not only paid no more dues than those of Montreal, but that for many years they had paid a great deal less.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), said that the Toronto Board of Trade had now called the attention of the Montreal Board to their own interests. They had pointed out that the tendency of the present state of things was, to divert trade by way of New York and Boston in preference to Montreal, and if the Montreal people preferred to let this state of things continue, of

course that was their own business. The resolution was simply recommendatory in its character, and he hoped it would be allowed to pass.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr. (Montreal), observed that the resolution was much more than recommendatory. He thought it was very objectionable for this Board to get into the way of passing resolutions, asking the Executive Council to communicate with some other body, in relation to a matter which might fairly be referred to the negotiation of the two bodies interested. He was not aware that the Toronto Board of Trade had communicated their grievance to the Harbor Board of Montreal, or had given them any opportunity of discussing the question in a friendly way. The resolution contained,—through the report of the Toronto Board's Committee,—the schedule, which was to be recommended to the authorities as a proper one to adopt; and in adopting this resolution, the Board would be giving their sanction to that schedule. Now, he did not believe that the members of this Board were prepared to say whether that schedule was the proper one to adopt or not. It would, therefore, be better, if the resolution was to be adopted, to adopt it without reference to that document, which might be submitted afterwards by the Toronto Board, as part of its case. His own conviction was, that Mr. Elliott had accomplished the object he had in view, by calling the attention of the Harbor Trust to the state of the case, and it would be much preferable if he would now withdraw his resolution.

The PRESIDENT asked whether Montreal was not at the present time complaining of the action of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners, in imposing harbor dues of one-tenth of one per cent.

Mr. WHITE: I am not aware that they have asked the Executive Council of this Board to interpose on their behalf with the Quebec Harbor Board.

Mr. GILLESPIE explained that the subject was not a local one, merely affecting Toronto,—it affected the whole trade of Western Canada.

Mr. CRAMP said that one-tenth of one per cent, imposed on goods by the Quebec Harbor Board, was not upon goods landed upon the wharves, but upon goods which were transferred from one vessel to another in the open water in front of the city.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN (Montreal), said that he understood the complaint was one of overcharging. It was simply a matter of account. He understood that there was no objection to the Montreal Harbor Board imposing such a tax as was necessary to meet the enormous outlay they had to incur, not merely in improving the Harbor, but in deepening the river; but the objection appeared to be against the form in which the tax was levied, and he did not consider this was the place to settle that point. The whole objection appeared to him to be, that the dues were not imposed by the weight, but according to the value of the goods. He thought this was a matter to be arranged between the Toronto merchants and the Harbor Commission of Montreal, and believed that the latter were fully prepared to do justice in the matter.

Mr. A. JOSEPH said while he did not object to the one-fourth per cent. being levied in Montreal, yet the Montrealers seemed to object seriously to the one-tenth per cent. being levied in Quebec for the same purpose, namely, for carrying out extensive contemplated harbor improvements. He considered the Montreal and Quebec Harbor Commissioners would have as much right to appear before this Board, and to submit their complaints, as the Toronto Board had. He repeated that this was a question to be decided between the local Boards, and it should not have been brought here at all.

Mr. THOS. COWAN (Galt), was of the same opinion, and he hoped the discussion of this subject would drop altogether.

Mr. W. R. MINGAYE (Kingston), said that he did not believe the merchants of Kingston complained of the tax imposed by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, but there were certain anomalies in it to which exception might be taken. For instance, a package of jewellery that might be worth, say \$1,000, of very small size, had to pay the same amount of dues as coarse goods which were of far larger bulk, but of no greater value. He thought the charge should be made according to measurement.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton), said he believed the mode of imposing the tax was equitable and convenient, and so far as his section of the country was concerned, he had heard no complaints.

Mr. WM ELLIOTT said it was a mistake to suppose that this was a mere local matter between Toronto and Montreal. It affected the whole Province of Ontario, about half of Quebec, and the whole of Manitoba; and he might as well say that we should not consider in this Board the subject of the Bay Verte Canal, as to say that this question should not be discussed. Mr. Brown seemed to be perfectly indifferent about the matter, because all the goods he imported were heavy, and therefore the anomalies of this tax had not perhaps come under his notice. But the case was different with regard to dry goods, and also with regard to drugs. Sometimes he imported very valuable goods, and although they took up very little bulk, they were charged very heavy dues. He believed that the plan which had been suggested would be found to be much simpler in its operation, and much more satisfactory to the people of the West.

The motion was then put to the Board and lost.

DECK LOADS.

Mr. J. A. HARDING introduced this subject from the St. John, N.B., Board of Trade. He said that about two years ago this question was discussed from an opposite standpoint to that from which he now intended treating it. It was then urged that deck loads between the Dominion and Great Britain, and between the Dominion and the West Indies, should be limited to certain dimensions. However, in New Brunswick they felt that the same rules should not be applied to vessels trading with the West Indies

as were applied to those trading with Great Britain. There appeared to be an anomaly in the legislation on this subject, inasmuch as while it prohibited deck loads greater than $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet, in vessels running from New Brunswick to the West Indies, it permitted a vessel going from St. John to any port in the United States, to carry any amount of deck load without restriction. He believed that the Government should not interfere in this question, while it would be safe to allow the insurance companies to regulate it. The grand argument which had been used in favor of Government interference, by means of legislation, was, that it was in the interests of humanity that they should do so. On that point he would say, that statistics on this subject were very often misleading, and he did not believe, that in the trade between New Brunswick and the West Indies, there was any increase of danger caused by unrestricted deck loads. With regard to the effect of the present Act upon their trade with the West Indies, he might say, that their business in carrying shooks had fallen off the year the Act came into operation, by one-half. It might be said, that this was caused by the rebellion in Cuba; but a sufficient answer to that would be found in the fact, that while our trade had fallen off, the trade of the Americans with Cuba had increased. The effect, therefore, of the present Act, was to transfer the trade from New Brunswick to the United States. With regard to the question of humanity, as he said before, he did not believe there had been any greater loss of life in proportion to the traffic between the United States and the West Indies before the operation of this Act, than there was between this country and Great Britain under the Act. There was really no increase of danger caused by deck loads, for the fact was, that if a storm came up, the deck load was swept off, and the only result generally was that the property was lost. He believed that the less trade and commerce was restrained by legislation the better, and if there was any excessive danger caused by deck loads, no doubt the insurance companies would impose such rates as would prevent it. He therefore moved, seconded by Mr. E. W. SEWELL (Levis, Q.):

"Whereas, the restrictions on deck loads to Great Britain and the West India Islands for certain months in the year, hamper and injure the deal and shooks trade of the Province of New Brunswick; therefore, *Resolved* that this Board memorialize the Government, urging upon them the advisability of repealing the law restricting the carrying of deck loads between the ports of New Brunswick, and Great Britain and the West India Islands, as by Act of 1873."

Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (King's County, N.B.), strongly opposed the system of deck loads, and gave an account of the way in which the matter had been treated by the St. John Board of Trade. The subject had been discussed at the last Annual Meeting of this Board, and on the return of the St. John delegates, they reported what action had been taken. He referred to a correspondence which had taken place between the Board of Trade of St. John and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, arising out of a dispatch received by the Governor-General, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, calling attention to a letter received by the Board of Trade in England, from the Consul-General at Havana. This Consul-General, who could have had no object other than that of promoting the

cause of humanity, stated in his letter, that "from the almost constant losses which are reported, it occurs to me that there is something wrong in the practice, and that many vessels are overloaded, and consequently not only run an extraordinary risk as regards both ship and cargo, but endanger the lives on board." This letter was sent to the Governor-General, and referred to the Department of Marine, and from thence it was sent to the St. John Board of Trade, and the subject was fully discussed by that Board, in which he took part. In consequence of the position he had taken at the meeting of the Board, he found it necessary, in self-defense, to prepare a paper, going over all the grounds of argument which he had used at the meeting, and this paper was embodied in the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, when they had the subject under consideration. In this paper which he had prepared, he expressed his full approval of the suggestion of the St. John Board of Trade, in reference to the deck loads of vessels coasting between ports in New Brunswick and ports in the United States, stating generally that the class of tonnage engaged in the carrying trade between ports in the Maritime Provinces and ports in the United States north of Hatteras, was particularly adapted for bearing the burden of heavy deck loads, being fore-and-aft schooners specially constructed for such trade. They are mostly shallow vessels, with great breadth of beam, their dimensions averaging a depth of hold of from seven to eight feet, with a breadth of beam of from twenty-seven to thirty feet, fore-and-aft rigged, and calculated to carry, in many cases, much over *one-third* of the whole cargo upon deck; and that while other classes of vessels are occasionally employed in this coasting trade, that it would not, in his opinion, be expedient to make any regulations with reference to this particular trade, nor with that to Ports in South America at present—the description of cargo taken to the latter country being, as a rule, long dry lumber of superior quality which makes a buoyant cargo. The voyage, too, being much longer than to the West Indies, the deck loads as a rule are kept within the bounds of safety. As to the coasting trade, there are many harbors on the way, and vessels put in for refuge at the approach of a storm, thus escaping the dangers of deep-sea voyages. From the foregoing and other circumstances, he argued that it was obvious the true policy should be to hold legislation upon these matters in abeyance, until the same had been the subject of a joint and uniform arrangement between the United States and Canada. But with regard to the Shook and Lumber Trade between Ports in the Maritime Provinces, especially the port of St. John, and the West Indies, he held that—and his opinion was derived from observation and experience in the matter—the official statement made by the Consul at Havana, was in perfect accord with the facts. The trade between ports in the Maritime Provinces of Canada and the West Indies is rapidly increasing; in fact the Shook and Lumber supply of those Islands is mainly procured from these Provinces. The description of lumber manufactured in the United States being very valuable, is almost entirely used for other markets, as the quality required in the West Indies, although merchantable, is not No. 1; the boards being chiefly what are called "shippers,"

and
rial
in t
fre
re-s
the
ves
brig
upv
sag
and
dea
load
load
crev
and
they
for t
her
&c.
decl
strai
to be
sel i
pum
of m
be a
occa
ment
prev
will
unav
by d
the r
merc
point
patch
action
him,
S
years,
1. Br
2. Ba
3. Br
4. Br
5. Br
6. Br
7. Ba

and the poorer kind of lumber stock is worked up into shooks. The material for the manufacture of such boards and shooks is more readily obtained in the Provinces, and the cost of manufacture much cheaper, for shooks are frequently sold at St. John, N.B., to merchants in Portland and Boston for re-shipment from those ports. These Provinces have therefore enjoyed the monopoly of exporting lumber to the West Indies. As to the class of vessels employed in this trade, they are chiefly small barks, brigs or brigantines, and schooners, having a depth of hold of ten feet and upwards, so as to stow three tiers of hhd. of Molasses on the return passage. These vessels are entirely different from coasters, being of deep and comparatively narrow model, with the requisite dimensions for carrying dead weight or under-deck cargoes. Among the abuses of the deck load system, it may be stated that owners or charterers now pile on deck loads without let or hindrance, thus increasing the risks run by vessel and crew. The cargoes are wet and icy, sugar box shooks or unseasoned lumber, and if such cargoes are piled above the rail, as is always done more or less, they are more trying upon the vessel than even a full cargo of dead weight, for the heavy deck load destroys the trim of the vessel and interferes with her proper handling, the crew being deprived of the protection of bulwarks, &c. Then when stormy weather is experienced, the excessive weight on deck makes the vessel tender, opens her waterways, seams and stanchions, strains the top sides or throws the vessel on her beam ends, when she is apt to become waterlogged, as the water running along the bilge while the vessel is hove down cannot be reached by the pumps, (there being no bilge pumps in this class of vessel), and thus the overloading is the primary cause of many disasters. The loss of property involved in this state of things would be a sufficient warrant for restrictive legislation; but when the loss of life occasioned thereby is considered, it is confidently hoped that the Government will feel impelled to pass a measure which will in future effectually prevent the overloading of vessels trading to the West Indies, and which will protect our seamen from dangers imposed on them, other than the unavoidable perils of the seas. With reference to the loss of life occasioned by deck loads, he might say, that during the discussion at Ottawa, upon the present Act, when it was before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, a telegram was sent to him, asking for some information upon this point, and within twenty-four hours of the time he had received the dispatch, he had procured a list of disasters, quite sufficient to warrant the action that was taken in passing the present Act. If the Board permitted him, he would read this list of casualties, which was as follows:—

Summary of casualties to vessels, occasioned by deck-loads during the past few years, while sailing from St. John, N.B., to the West Indies.

1. Brigantine Evergreen; water-logged, deck-load carried away, vessel condemned.
2. Bark Minnie; *one man* washed off deck-load and *lost*.
3. Brigantine Active; lost deck-load and otherwise damaged.
4. Brigantine Mohawk; hove on beam ends, righted on throwing over deck cargo.
5. Brigantine Osprey; lost part deck-load; *a man* named John Alcocks washed overboard and *drowned*.
6. Brigantine G. A. Coonan; *a seaman* lost off deck-load.
7. Bark Edward Cecil; thrown on beam-ends, waterlogged and abandoned. *Carpenter washed overboard; rest of crew exhausted pumping.*

8. Brigantine Fawn; deck-load lost. Crew lided on top of house till the vessel reached Nassau full of water.
9. Brigantine Delano; put into Norfolk full of water and sold.
10. Brigantine Let Her B; total wreck on Pacific reef.
11. Brigantine Ella; heavy deck-load shifting, had to put into port.
12. Brigantine Merino; leaking, deck-load thrown overboard.
13. Schooner Unexpected; waterlogged.
14. Brigantine Mary Givan; deck-load lost, leaking.
15. Brigantine Southern Cross; stranded with heavy deck-load. Waterlogged and lost deck-load, water casks, &c. Crew 9 days on deck starving. Killed ship's dog. Rescued.
16. Schooner Alatia; picked up derelict. *Crew all lost.* Enormous deck-load washed off, taking crew with it.
17. Brig Birdie; *never heard of.*
18. Brigantine Mary Kelly; having heavy deck-load, became waterlogged. Crew rescued by passing vessel.
19. Schooner Nanta; waterlogged, abandoned. Crew landed.
20. Schooner Ambro; unmanageable through heavy deck-load. Total loss.
21. Bark Ida E; deck-load lost. Crew's lives imperilled. Captain attributes disaster to excessive deck cargo. \$9,000 to repair.
22. Schooner Minnie; heavy deck-load. *All lost.* Never heard of.
23. Schooner Carrie Douglas; waterlogged and unmanageable. Repairs cost over \$4,000.
24. Brigantine Bessie; unmanageable and driven on rocks. *Captain* washed overboard and *drowned*, crew barely escaping with their lives.
25. Brigantine John Lewie; heavy deck-load washed away. Crew had a narrow escape.
26. Brigantine Martha; drifted ashore derelict. Part of deck-load gone, which was unreasonably large. *Crew* been evidently washed overboard and perished.
27. Brigantine Phoebe Ellen; encumbered with heavy deck-load, which had frozen. Crew unable to relieve the vessel. *Captain and two or three of the hands perished.*
28. Schooner Charles A. Bovey; heavy deck-load of shooks. Sprung a leak. Two men died from over-exertion and exposure in keeping vessel from sinking. Rest of crew completely worn out. Towed into port, shipped new crew, proceeded on voyage. Result not yet known.
29. Brig Scud; high deck-load. Became total wreck.
30. Brig Victoria; deck-load three feet higher than main rail. Waterlogged. Crew rescued. Overloading cause of disaster.
31. Schooner Bessie Black; high deck-load. Part of it lost, carrying *a man* with it who was *drowned*.

The *Brigt. Martha*, of St. John, N.B., sailed thence for Cuba, on the 11th January, 1870, and drifted ashore derelict a few days later at Meteghan, N.S., with part of deck load gone and a signal of distress flying. She too had a most unreasonable deck load, and, judging from the appearance of the vessel, it was evident that it was the main cause of the disaster which followed, and that the crew had been washed off along with the deck load; they all perished.

Many of the vessels engaged in the West India trade, are provided with light spar decks, that is to say, from ten to twelve feet depth of hold, and from four to five feet between decks. Such vessels should never attempt to carry cargo upon the spar deck; but they frequently do so, although it is simply carrying a deck load on top of a deck load, and it is not surprising that the most serious consequences ensue. The result of the operation of the Act had been very satisfactory, for under it, they had little or no disaster. It was true, that there was a falling off in the exportation of shooks to Cuba; but he believed that that was owing partly to the troubles in Cuba, and partly to the fact, that previously business had been overdone. At any rate, he was quite clear in making

the
ver
the
tha
any
tha
ove

a m
frie
suc
tho
this
was
of e
tion
it, a
that
tren
und
ber
unti
five
after
sub-
say
" co
" in
" th
" be
" thi
" inc
" jus
" Oc
" the
" en
" the
" in
tee a
short
tistic
the
Lloy
" off
" per
" and
" in

the statement, that previous to the passing of the Act, business had been very disastrous, while these disasters had been greatly diminished under the Act. With reference to the Atlantic trade, he was free to admit that he knew of no great disaster occasioned by over deck-loading, of any of the vessels leaving St. John; but he attributed this to the fact that these vessels were more valuable, and the owners took care not to overload them.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), said he trusted the Board would not for a moment listen to the resolution which had been brought forward by his friend from St. John, whom he was exceedingly sorry to see fathering such a motion. The subject was fully discussed two years ago, and he thought the matter was permanently settled. If there was one thing which this Dominion Board of Trade ought to be proud of more than another, it was that they had taken the initiative in abolishing the abominable system of excessive deck-loading in the winter months. With regard to the operation of the Act at Quebec, of course they had only two years' experience of it, and it would not perhaps be fair to judge of it from the effect during that short time; but he might say, that the result, so far, had been extremely favorable as compared with previous years. At the request of the underwriters in England, he procured statistics with reference to the number of ships which cleared for Europe at Quebec, from the 1st of September until the close of navigation, with the number of men sailing in them, during five years while the old deck load law was in force, and during a similar period after the repeal of that law. These figures were tabulated at Lloyd's by a sub-committee, and in the report drawn up by those gentlemen, they say:—"Every one of these voyages has at last been traced out to its conclusion, and the result is, that the increase in the proportion of losses in the second period as compared with the first, is shown to be no less than 65 per cent., the percentage of the total losses in the first period being 3.7 as against 6.1 in the second. It is further worthy of remark, that this increase does not manifest itself in the month of September, but at an increasing rate through the months of October, and November,—so far justifying the late action of the Dominion Legislature, in making the 1st of October instead of the 1st of September, as in the Act of 1853, the date of the commencement of their deck-loads prohibition. A still greater difference is shown by a comparison of the serious casualties attendant upon the voyages of the two periods. The proportion of these is more than double in the second period what it is in the first." The members of the committee appointed by Lloyd's, to go into the question, not being satisfied with so short a period as five years, subsequently asked him (Mr. Fry) to collect statistics for ten years of each period. He did so; and one of the members of the Committee wrote him, that the statistics having been tabulated at Lloyd's, the result was as follows:—"First, that there has been no real falling off in trade as suggested in the first paper, the total tonnage of the second period being slightly in excess of that of the first, in spite of fewer ships; and secondly, that although 1872 was so bad a year, yet the difference in regard to loss of property, is shown to be not so great in the ten years'

“comparison as in the five years’ comparison; yet that in point of life, one could hardly have a stronger argument against deck loading than the former affords. If the whole number of lives lost be proportioned to the sailings in each period, you will see that we get a loss of life $3\frac{3}{4}$ times as great in the one as in the other; and taking the lives lost in missing ships, only considerably more than four times.” He had the figures before him, and he would give them briefly. In the first ten years, when the old English deck-load law was in force, the number of sailings after the 1st of September to the close of navigation was 3,775; in the second period the number of sailings was 3,064—that was after the repeal of the deck-load law. The number of ships damaged in the first ten years was 154; in the second period the number damaged was 200. The number of missing ships in the first period was 4; in the second period 17; the number abandoned in the first period was 56; in the second 78. The number of total losses, including missing and abandoned ships, in the first period, was 108; and in the second period 129. The number of lives lost in missing vessels in the first period was 65, and in the second period no less than 245. The total number of lives lost in the first period was 130, and in the second period no less than 419. The increase in the number of arrivals damaged over the same period of time was 30 per cent.; the increase in the total losses was 20 per cent.; the increase in the number of lives lost on missing vessels, was 275 per cent., and the increase in the total number of lives lost in the same period was 222 per cent. He had made these statements, now in his hand, before the Royal Commission in England; and the Commissioners in their report to Her Majesty stated:—“Since the appointment of this Commission the Canadian Legislature has prohibited the carriage of deck loads in timber ships, across the Atlantic from the 1st of October to the 16th of March, with an important exception, however, in favor of deals. This exception was reluctantly made, as a concession to certain ship-owners, and materially diminishes the value of the enactment. The evidence of Mr. Fry proves the danger arising from deck loads during the winter months. Although the efficacy of the law depends on its enforcement at the port of departure, yet a similar enactment by the British Parliament would sanction the views of the Canadian Legislature, and might induce other timber exporting countries to consider favorably the propriety of such legislation. The rules of several mutual insurance clubs forbid such cargoes during the winter months; and as those rules are prescribed by the owners themselves, it cannot be supposed that the timber trade would be injuriously affected by the law. The opinion of some witnesses is, that all deck loads should be prohibited. Bales of cotton, it is said, are frequently piled up on the deck, seriously interfering with the working of the ship, and increasing the dangers of navigation. Merchant ships would undoubtedly be safer, if they were lightly laden, and carried no deck cargoes. But we are of opinion that it would be unwise, if the Legislature absolutely prohibited deck cargoes, except in the special case of the timber trade.” He would be told perhaps by Mr. Harding, that these statements only

app
car
exp
yea
Mir
the
was
has
tion
Ger
pro
and
and
was
thir
bad
pres
this
ing

meas
maki
with

of M
thinl
fact
were
appa
seen

of tir

deals

deals
world
advoc
those
to th
and h

Board
after

applied to the Atlantic trade; that the trade with the West Indies is carried on by vessels peculiarly adapted for that trade, and that it did not experience the same risks as the Atlantic trade did. It happened two years ago, shortly after a similar statement was made, that he met the Minister of Marine, who told him that he had just received a letter from the Colonial Office, which he showed to him. Accompanying this letter, was the letter from the British Consul at Havana, to which Mr. Marshall has referred, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies called the attention of the Governor-General to the matter. In this letter of the Consul-General at Havana, attention was called to the lamentable loss of life and property, occasioned by excessive deck loads, in the trade between Canada and the West Indies. He had conversed with a great many ship-masters, and parties connected with the shipping trade, and their universal testimony was, that the deck load law was a great blessing to the sailors. He had, thirty years experience, and previous to the passing of this Act, had seen the bad effects of the abominable system of carrying deck loads; and as the present Act was working satisfactorily, he very strongly deprecated this attempt to interfere with it. He therefore begged to move the following amendment:—

“That the Executive Council do memorialize the Dominion Government to take measures towards securing a convention with the Government of the United States, making the law of the two countries with respect to deck-loads uniform, in accordance with the suggestion of the Royal Commission on unseaworthy ships.”

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), seconded the amendment.

Mr. E. W. SEWELL (Levis), said he quite agreed with the remarks of Mr. Fry with reference to vessels loaded with timber, but he did not think the same objections could apply to vessels loaded with deals. The fact was, that when a storm arose, the deals upon the deck of the vessel were swept away, and therefore no danger arose from them. This fact was apparent from the list of casualties read by Mr. Marshall, for it would be seen that in every instance the vessels first lost their deck-loads.

Mr. FRY: A deck-load of deals is in some instances worse than a load of timber, because in a storm the deals break the sailors limbs.

Mr. SEWELL: There is no necessity for the sailors to go near the deals.

Mr. FRY: They have to, in order to get them overboard.

Mr. SEWELL said that that was not necessary, because in a storm the deals would be swept overboard without any assistance. He thought the world generally owed thanks to Mr. Fry, for the manner in which he had advocated the cause of the seamen leaving in ships from Quebec; but those vessels were quite different from the vessels used in carrying deals to the West Indies. Such vessels were specially adapted for that trade, and he believed were safer when carrying deck loads.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), said that the action taken by this Board two years ago, was taken with a full knowledge of the facts, and after careful consideration. He thought that a sufficiently strong case had

point
deck
lives
ll see
n the
more
l give
d law
close
gs was
ber of
d the
period
period
issing
period
l was
lives
419.
od of
ent.;
5 per
period
before
ort to
Can-
ships,
th an
ption
and
e of
the
a its
t by
adian
tries
es of
inter
es, it
ected
ould
a the
asing
y be
it we
utely
de.”
only

not been made out, to induce the Board to reverse that action now. He would therefore support the amendment of Mr. Fry.

Mr. J. A. HARDING, in reply to the criticism which had been made upon his motion, stated that he was in favor of imposing a restriction upon timber-laden vessels. But the same objections, he held, did not apply to a vessel laden with deals. Taking Mr. Marshall's own statistics he had only placed the number of losses at 31.

Mr. MARSHALL: I stated that this list of losses consisted merely of those which came within my own cognizance, and it is by no means a complete statement of all the losses.

Mr. HARDING proceeded to say that out of the list of 31 which Mr. Marshall had given, only 9 lives and 3 vessels were lost. It might be assumed that they were lost on account of the deck-loads, but he might with equal reason assume that they were lost from some other cause. However, even attributing all the losses to deck-loads, he contended that the number of losses in proportion to the whole trade, was smaller than the proportion of losses in any other ships.

Mr. MARSHALL said that he only had a few hours in which to procure this information, and it was necessarily of a very limited character.

Mr. HARDING observed that he had no objection to the amendment being carried, because if it was possible to get the Americans to agree to such a law, then of course the New Brunswick trade would not suffer in competition with the Americans. But at the present time, their trade was placed at a great disadvantage,—as American craft were not restricted by any law like the one in force in this country. However, he was willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Board, and if Mr. Fry's amendment was carried, he hoped that the suggestions it contained would be given effect to.

The amendment was then put and carried.

The Board thereafter adjourned until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

min

pres

said t
aggre

disch

(Mon

"

Cham
cover
of this
becom
differe
resolu
ment i

" T
Exchan
district
and imp
yields i

THIRD DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

FORENOON SESSION.

THURSDAY, *January 21, 1875.*

The Board met at 10 o'clock, the President in the chair.

The Secretary read the roll of members. By consent, the reading of minutes of previous day was deferred.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton), from the Committee on Credentials presented their final report as follows:—

The Committee on Credentials beg to report, that as all the Delegates may now be said to have arrived, there are present 53 representatives from 22 organizations, with an aggregate membership of 2,355.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed,)

ADAM BROWN,

Chairman.

On motion, the report was received and adopted, and the Committee discharged.

Moved by Mr. ADAM BROWN, seconded by Mr. John McLennan, (Montreal), and *resolved*:

"That speakers be limited to ten minutes."

STAMP DUTIES.

Hon. W. J. STAIRS (Halifax, N.S.): The resolution from the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, which it devolves upon me to submit to this Board, covers a subject which I understand has previously engaged the attention of this body. However, opinions on the subject may by this time have become more matured, and possibly the Board might be prepared to take different action. I shall not say much upon the subject, because the resolution I propose to move, is somewhat lengthy, and is in itself an argument in its favor. It is as follows:—

"That the law requiring stamps to be affixed to Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange, is vexatious in its principle, partial in its operation,—especially in rural districts,—demoralizing in the ease with which it can be evaded, and the difficulties and impossibilities in many instances of fulfilling its provisions; while the revenue it yields is so small as to be of little practical value to the Finances of the Dominion;

and that in the opinion of this Board, the law should be repealed at the earliest practicable day; and further, that the Executive Council of this Board do respectfully bring the resolution to the notice of the Government."

Referring very briefly to the various arguments adverted to in this motion I may say, that the present Act is vexatious in its principle, because it throws a burden exclusively upon a limited portion of the community. All good taxation should fall evenly and generally upon all classes of the people. That the Act is partial in its operation, is felt by merchants and those who are subject to it. Those who are not engaged in trade, are not at all affected by it. It only falls upon those who require, in the course of their business, to make or receive promissory notes. The annoyances caused by the Act, are principally felt in the rural districts, where the business comprises a great many small transactions, every one of which requires stamps. It is not the amount of the tax that is complained of, but it is the trouble and annoyance that it occasions.

Mr. ROBT. BOAK, Jr. (Halifax, N.S.), seconded the motion.

Mr. A. WOODS (Quebec), said he did not intend to go into the discussion of this question, as it had previously been very fully considered by this Board, which had confirmed the necessity of the continuance of the tax. He could not conceive any causes that had since arisen, to induce them to alter that decision. It had been said that the tax was obnoxious; but it would be difficult to find any tax that was not a burden upon the people, and which was not obnoxious to certain classes. If the principle was adopted, that a tax should be abolished simply because it was annoying, where were they to end? Those parties who were subject to the Excise Act, would have equally as strong an argument for the abolition of that tax; and the same reasoning might apply to almost every other tax. It had been also argued that this tax was partial in its operation; but that argument might also be applied to many other kinds of taxation. He thought on this matter we might well be guided by the experience of other countries, which had found this mode of taxation a very convenient and just plan of raising revenue. One thing in favor of this tax was, that it was very easily collected. The same could not be said with reference to many other modes of taxation, as the collection of taxes under other systems, was often very expensive. The collecting of this tax perhaps did not cost the country more than one per cent., which was a mere trifle compared with the cost of collecting other taxes. The revenue arising from stamp duties now amounted to about a quarter of a million dollars, and he thought it would be very injudicious in the Board, at the present juncture, when the demands upon the Government were so great, to recommend the abolition of this tax. The operation of the same tax in England was quite satisfactory, and a very large revenue was there derived from it.

Mr. W. R. MINGAYE (Kingston), supported the motion, and stated that the Act had proved very demoralizing in its operation, especially in the rural districts, where it was sometimes difficult to secure stamps. In England the condition of society was different; and the fact that the Act

had operated satisfactorily there, was no evidence that it was satisfactory to this country. In that country, when a man had any business to do, he usually employed a lawyer, who would of course see to it that the business was done legally; but in this country, every man was his own lawyer, and very often people suffered great injustice and hardship, merely because they had inadvertently or accidentally omitted to put on the proper stamps.

Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (Kings Co., N.B.), said that as an insurance broker and underwriter, he was receiving promissory notes continually, and he found the tax very annoying. It only produced a revenue of some \$200,000, and he thought it ought to be abolished.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), was opposed to repealing the Stamp Act; but he thought it might be improved. He saw no reason why it should not be left to either the receiver of the bill, or the maker, to put on the stamps. It would certainly make no difference to the Government who put them on, so long as they were affixed. With reference to the argument in favor of its repeal, that the provisions of the law were not generally known, he thought that plea should not be entertained for a moment. It was not considered with reference to any other law, and there were no circumstances connected with this case, to justify its being entertained in reference to the imposition of the stamp tax. If the provisions of the law were not generally known now, they would soon be known all over the country. The same objection might be made to the law requiring postage stamps on letters. He would therefore vote against the motion for the repeal of the Act.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), said that on two former occasions he had opposed the repeal of the Stamp Act, and he would do it again. It had been said that the Act was demoralizing in its operation, but it certainly was no more so than the imposition of Customs' duties. He would much rather see the Stamp Act extended, than see the Customs' duties increased. In England, as already stated, the operation of the Act had been very satisfactory; and at the last meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, the following resolution was adopted:—

“That it is very desirable to allow adhesive stamps to be used on all Bills of Exchange drawn in the Kingdom, and that a memorial be presented to the President of the Board of Trade to that effect.”

So it appeared that while some people in this country were calling out for a repeal of the Stamp Act, in England they were demanding its extension. It had been said that it was the thin edge of the wedge in the direction of direct taxation. If that were so, he was glad of it, because he would like to see more direct taxation in this country. He was in favor of requiring stamps upon checks and upon receipts over \$10, and by this means the revenue from this source might be increased to a million; and then he would be glad to see the Government bring back our Customs' duties to the old position. Upon the same principle he was in favor of the legacy duty.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), said the Toronto Board of Trade had also passed a resolution upon this subject; but he was glad that it had been introduced here by the Halifax Chamber of Commerce. When he stated as a fact, that half of the notes now lying in the banks in Ontario were illegal, from want of being properly stamped, he thought he had said enough to justify the Board in asking for a repeal of the Act. He would appeal to the business men of Ontario whether that statement was not correct. In the majority of cases, the notes sent out from wholesale houses in Toronto to their customers, were returned unstamped; and these notes were illegal, because the law required that the maker of the note should affix the stamps. It was true that this illegality might be cured by affixing double stamps; but that did not relieve the party who first passed the note, from the penalty of \$500 as provided in the Act. The very fact that many merchants in the West were at the present moment subject to this penalty, if the law were strictly carried out, was a serious matter, and a very strong argument in favor of the total repeal of the Act. He concluded by reading the clauses of the Act bearing upon the subject.

Mr. G. M. MILLAR (Montreal), observed that the mover of the resolution had spoken of the difficulty of enforcing the Act in the rural districts. He (Mr. Millar) had not much experience in that direction, but he had no doubt Mr. Stairs had fairly represented the facts of the case. With regard to the operation of the Act in Montreal, he had found no difficulty whatever in connection with it, and he could hardly understand how cases could arise, where there would be any trouble in carrying out the law. But even supposing there was a difficulty in some parts in giving effect to it, that could scarcely be considered as a valid argument for the repeal of the Act. He was of opinion that the Government would require all the money they could raise to meet their engagements, and thought this Board could not very well recommend the repeal of this Act, without suggesting some means whereby the revenue, which would thus be lost, could be made good from some other source.

Mr. ROBERT HENRY (Brantford), said the Board he represented was in perfect accord with the motion introduced by the Halifax Chamber of Commerce. He believed no Act in connection with commercial matters, had been so detrimental to the best interests of the trading community as the Stamp Act, and he heartily endorsed the remarks of Mr. Gillespie. He could, from his own personal experience, bear out the statement that at least one-half of the notes sent out from mercantile establishments to their customers in the country, were returned unstamped. It had been said that this was owing to the fact, that the provisions of the law were not generally known, and that as soon as they were known the Act would work more satisfactorily. But that was a mistake. He ventured to say that there was not a trader throughout the Province, who was not fully aware of the provisions of the Stamp Act. But notwithstanding that, it was an almost universal custom to send back notes signed but unstamped, and the wholesale merchant was obliged to stamp them either at his own expense, or to debit his customer for the charges. He hoped the motion would be

carried, and believed that it would meet the approval of the trade throughout the whole county.

Mr. P. R. JARVIS (Stratford), said that in his Board of Trade they had several bankers, and before he left they had all strongly impressed upon him the necessity of voting for the repeal of the Stamp Act. His own views quite agreed with those of these bankers, and he would therefore vote for the recommendation that the Act be repealed. He believed it was originated by the lawyers, in order to create subjects for litigation; and if that was the object of the Act, it would certainly prove very successful. The amount of revenue derived from this source, was a mere trifle compared with the trouble and annoyance it had occasioned; and it would certainly meet with the entire approval of the community if the tax were abolished.

Mr. THOS. COWAN (Galt), said he cordially agreed with the recommendation from Halifax. The revenue derived from the Act was small, and he saw no reason why so obnoxious and annoying a tax should be continued, for the sake of a comparatively trifling amount of revenue. He hoped the resolution would be adopted.

Dr. L. S. OILLE (St. Catherines), said that last year when this subject was up for consideration, he could not see his way clear to vote for the abolition of the tax,—although he was quite aware that it was very annoying in its operation,—because at that time it was said there was a deficit in the revenue, and therefore, the Government would need all the sources of revenue at their command. But that argument could be used no longer. Since then the Government had increased the Customs' revenue $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and he was very happy to say that that increase had been very satisfactory to the public. The result of it was that the Treasury was now pretty full;—in fact, he believed that there was a surplus,—and consequently he saw no reason why this obnoxious Stamp Act should not now be repealed. He believed that in his own section of the country, the opinion was very wide-spread and general that it should be abolished; and for his own part, if it were necessary, he would be glad to see an additional increase in the Customs' duties in order to protect our industries. He totally dissented from the views of Mr. Robertson with reference to direct taxation. In his judgment the best way to raise a revenue was to impose Customs' duties upon foreign manufactured articles, and in that way our own manufactures would be protected, while the country would at the same time be deriving a revenue. His views on this subject were as far removed from those of Mr. Robertson as the poles were asunder. With regard to the remarks of Mr. Gillespie, he must say that in his section of the country, they had not experienced the difficulties which that gentleman had complained of. As a rule, they succeeded in getting the stamps properly placed. But that did not make the tax any less obnoxious, and he was satisfied that a large majority of the business men of St. Catherines, including the bankers, favored the abolition of the stamp duties.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto), observed with regard to Mr. Robert-

son's proposition to extend the tax, that he entirely dissented from it, because it was very troublesome and annoying to be paying taxes in small sums almost daily. He would much prefer to have taxes so imposed, that they could be paid up once a year, and be done with it. He need not repeat the arguments which had already been advanced; but he fully agreed with the statement, that the majority of the customers of merchants throughout the country refused to pay this tax, the result being that it fell upon the wholesale dealers, thus making the tax fall upon one particular class, which he held was a strong argument in favor of its abolition.

Mr. F. M. SPROUL (Kings Co., N.B.), said he came from a Board of Trade that was composed chiefly of agriculturalists, and speaking for them, he could say they had felt this tax to be very annoying in its operation, and were strongly in favor of its abolition. Very often in country places, it was difficult to procure stamps, and the result was that many notes were allowed to pass, although illegal, while the parties were put to a great deal of trouble and annoyance in securing the proper stamps. With regard to the means of supplying the deficiency in case this tax was abolished, he thought that was a question which did not come within the province of this Board. It was one for the Government to decide, and he had no doubt they would be able to find some means of restoring the small amount of revenue that would be lost if this tax was abolished.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), said it was very evident from the course of this debate, that in certain parts of the country the Stamp Act involved a considerable amount of annoyance; but he wished to call the attention of the Board to this fact, namely, that this country was now engaged, or about to engage, in very large public works, and this Board should be very careful about recommending the abolition of any taxation, unless there were strong grounds for it, or unless they could substitute some other source of revenue in its place. He was sorry to hear that this Act had worked so unsatisfactorily in Upper Canada. The experience of the Stamp Act in England had been entirely different, for there it had worked very satisfactorily. His object, however, in rising on this occasion, was to suggest the propriety of adopting the plan now in force in England, of requiring stamps upon checks. He hoped that the Board would not consent to recommend the abolition of this tax.

[At this stage the Premier, Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, and the Hon. A. J. Smith, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, entered the room, and were received with loud applause, the members standing. They were invited by the President to a seat at the head of the table.]

Mr. ED. MCGILLIVRAY (Ottawa), agreed with all that had been said with reference to the obnoxious character of this tax, especially in the back parts of the country. If it were necessary to provide some substitute for this tax, he would suggest that it be imposed upon whiskey and tobacco. (Laughter).

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), said he had always taken the position

that this stamp duty was a legitimate source of revenue. If it was annoying, that was a feature that was connected with every tax. He heartily approved of the suggestion of Mr. Fry, of placing stamps upon checks. He hoped the resolution would be rejected, and that suggestion carried out.

Hon. JAS. SKEAD (Ottawa), said he had a good deal of experience of the operation of the Stamp Act, and his opinion was, that it ought to be abolished. As to the means of supplying the deficiency which would thus be created, he thought that might very well be left to the decision of the Government.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN (Montreal), thought that he could suggest a plan by which the views of those who desired the repeal of the Act, and those who approved of it, might be harmonized. He fully agreed with the remarks of Mr. Fry, respecting the necessity of this Board exercising great judgment and carefulness in recommending the abolition of the tax, in view of the extensive public works which were to be undertaken. The suggestion that he had to make, he would put in the form of an amendment, as follows :

"That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following substituted :— That the Stamp Act should be so amended, that the drawer of a promissory note or draft, or the person in whose favor a note is drawn, or its holder, may place the single stamps on the notes or drafts, at any time before they are used."

Mr. WM. DARLING seconded the amendment.

Hon. Mr. STAIRS said that he did not regard this Act as the thin edge of the wedge in the direction of direct taxation. If he thought it would have that effect, he would not oppose it, because he was in favor of direct taxation. This tax was not a direct one, but it fell indirectly upon the trading community. As the arguments in favor of the repeal of the Act had been pretty well gone over in the course of the debate, he would say nothing more, but leave the matter in the hands of the Board.

The amendment was then put, and declared lost.

Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND (Montreal), moved in amendment to the motion "that the Stamp Act be not interfered with."

The PRESIDENT: That is not an amendment, strictly speaking. The same object may be attained by voting down the resolution.

Mr. HENRY FRY moved, seconded by Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON, the following amendment :—

"That all the words after 'that' be omitted, and the following substituted : That in lieu of the present stamps on notes, the Government impose two cents on cheques."

The amendment being put to the vote, was declared lost. The question being then on the adoption of Mr. Stairs' main motion, it was carried on the following division :

Ayes.—Messrs. Boak, Brown, Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Gillespie, Henry, Hope, Jarvis, King, Marshall, Mingaye, McGillivray, MacPherson, Oille, Rowland, Skead, Sproul, Stairs, Tourville, Waterman, Wylie.—25.

Nays.—Messrs. Clemow, Cramp, Darling, Dougall, Drummond, Fry, Harding, Joseph, Magor, Millar, McDougall, McLennan, Pennock, Robertson, Routh, Sewell, Shorey, Shehyn, White, Woods.—20.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, JR., from the Committee on Order of Business presented their fourth report as follows :

Your committee have learned that the Delegate from the National Board of Trade, has been instructed by the Board of Trade of Detroit to bring to the attention of your Board the subject of canal enlargement. Recognizing the courtesy which has induced the National Board to be again represented at your Annual Meeting, and the importance of the freest interchange of sentiment on questions of international importance, your Committee recommend that the question of canal enlargement, numbered 22 and 23 on the amended programme, be fixed for the first order of the day for the afternoon session of the Board.

As the subjects numbered 28 and 29, on the amended programme, are of a similar character, in their international interest, your Committee recommend that they be taken up next in order after the subject of canal enlargement.

The question of a resolution on the subject of Statistics, the Committee recommend shall be numbered 35 on the official programme.

The subject, Government Deposits in Banks and the establishment of a Treasury Department, they recommend to be fixed as number 36 on the official programme.

The subject of the "Condition of Legal Tenders issued prior to 1874," from the Quebec Board of Trade the Committee recommend to be numbered 37 on the official programme.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed,) THOS. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

On motion, the Report was adopted.

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Insolvency, submitted the following report :—

OTTAWA, January 20, 1875.

The Committee on Insolvency beg to present their Second Report, and to state that they have had a long and satisfactory interview with the Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. Fournier, who has signified the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill next session of Parliament. He favorably entertains, and has promised to give due consideration to, the suggestions made by your Committee, as contained in the January and July Reports of 1874, of the Dominion Board of Trade.

Your Committee would suggest, that they be continued to watch the nature and progress of the Bill when introduced.

The whole respectfully submitted.

(Signed,) ANDREW ROBERTSON,
Chairman

On motion, the Report was adopted.

EXCESSIVE RATES CHARGED BY EXPRESS COMPANIES.

Mr. FRANCIS CLÉMOW (Ottawa), introduced this subject from the Ottawa Board of Trade. He said it was a notorious fact, that the charges by Express Companies were now so high, that it was almost impossible to do business with them. The subject had been taken up by the Ottawa Board of Trade, and they requested that it be considered by the Dominion Board. As the express business was now conducted, the companies were nothing less than monopolies. He thought that the evil might be best met, by asking the Government to undertake the express business themselves. They could do so without very much trouble, because they had already all the necessary means for doing it. It might be carried on in connection with the Post Office Department; and one advantage of this plan would be, that every post office would become an express office. Of course it might be objected to this proposition, that it would throw too great a responsibility upon the Government; but he thought if the express companies could bear the responsibility, that the Government might very well undertake to bear it also. Of course, it was well known that at present the express companies did a great deal of business that would otherwise be done through the post office department. If, for instance, a man had a note to pay in any part of the Dominion, it was very common for him to send the money through the express office, and in this way the post office department was deprived of a considerable source of revenue. However, he did not object to express companies doing this kind of business, if it were not for their excessive rates. He had occasion, the other day, to bring an amount of stuff from Philadelphia; and when he stated that he had to pay express charges at the rate of five cents a pound, he thought it would be seen that his demand for some remedy for this state of affairs was based upon good grounds. If the Government refused to undertake the responsibility of carrying on the express business, then he would suggest that they be urged to take such steps as may be necessary, in order to secure on all the railways of the Dominion equal privileges to all express companies. We could then have competition in the express business, and that would undoubtedly result in a reduction of the rates. He repeated that the rates were now so very high, that ordinarily one was precluded from doing business with the express companies. As an instance of this he might mention, that he had occasion some time ago to inquire what the rates were for transporting bonds to England, and he found that it would be cheaper to send them by four or five special messengers than to send them by express. He therefore begged leave to submit the following resolution:

"That the Government of the Dominion be urged to assume the business now conducted by Express Companies, and that in the event of its declining to do so, it be requested to so direct future legislation that Railway Companies be compelled to allow competing Express Companies facilities for conducting business over their lines."

Mr. WM. PENNOCK (Ottawa), seconded the motion.

Mr. W. R. MINGAYE (Kingston), said, he desired that the Board should understand before he made any remarks upon the subject, that he was a large proprietor in express companies, and therefore it might be held that he had some interest in favoring them. Having said this much, so that the Board might understand his position, he proceeded to remark, that he was in favor of the fullest competition in the express business, and he had no doubt that such competition would bring down the rates to the lowest possible limit. Yet the idea of asking the Government to become common carriers, he considered was absurd; and he did not believe that the gentleman who made the motion, really appreciated, to the full extent, what it was he asked the Government to do. It was well known that the express companies carried everything, including a great many perishable as well as very valuable articles, and, of course, as common carriers, they were responsible for the safe keeping of these articles, while it occasionally happened that they suffered considerable loss. He was happy to say that the express companies in Canada, had not lost very large sums of money in this way. But he knew of one case where \$30,000 was lost, by an officer of an express company running away, and the company paid the amount within 48 hours. He would like to ask the Board if they were prepared to recommend that the Government would take responsibilities like these upon its shoulders. It had been suggested that the railway companies should take the express business into their own hands. How was it that they had never hitherto done that? He was aware that some time ago the officers of the Grand Trunk contemplated taking that step; but subsequently, nothing being done in the matter, he inquired the reason, and was told that the railway company could not do it. No doubt it was found that there were serious obstacles in the way. Another objection to the Government undertaking this business is, that they could not very well manage the carriage of goods outside the country; the consequence would be, that when they reached the border, the goods would have to be handed over to another company,—a state of things which he thought would not be desired by any one.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton), said he was willing to support the latter part of the resolution, but hoped the mover would withdraw the first part. He entirely disapproved of the proposition that the Government should undertake the express business of the country; but he certainly approved of the second proposition, namely, that equal rights upon our railways should be given to all express companies. He did not know what might be the reason, but he knew that on the Great Western Railway, they did not hear anything at all about the Canadian Express Company, and he presumed that it was on account of the existence, or pretended existence, of one of those outrages called vested-rights. Probably the American Company had made some bargain with the Great Western Railway, and therefore claimed the right of excluding Canadian Companies. However that might be, he thought the Government should inquire into the matter, and, if possible, remove any obstacle there was in the way of free competition among express companies all over the Dominion.

B
W
to
or
pa
or
th
fr
As
of
of
by
Go
th
the
ing
wa
cor
tak
to t
wei

ask
held
way
that
soor

had
cour
busi

carr.
the
Stat
Ame
busin
monc

willin
had i
by th
was,
free

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL (Windsor), said that probably no person in the Board required to send more perishable goods by express than he did. At Windsor, there was only the American Express Company, and if he wanted to send a package to Sarnia, for instance, he had to pay double charges,—one charge to the American Company, and another to the Canadian Company. The same difficulty was experienced in sending goods below Toronto, or any place where there was a different express company. He thought that these double rates might be abolished. He had no doubt they would be, if free competition was allowed on all our railways to every express company. As an instance of these excessive rates, he might mention, that the package of reports which was sent to the Windsor Board of Trade, by the Secretary of this Board, cost 80 cents by express, whereas they could have been sent by post for 30 cents. He did not approve of the proposition, that the Government should conduct the express business of the country; but he thought the railway companies should do it. Mr. Mingaye had stated, that there was some difficulty in the way of the railway companies undertaking it. But if he was correctly informed, the real difficulty in the way was, that almost all the railway officials were interested in the express companies. He was quite satisfied that if the railway companies would take hold of the express business, they would find it very profitable stock to the holders, although perhaps not so profitable to railway "rings," which were interested in the express companies.

Mr. ISAAC WATERMAN (London), agreed that it would be unfair to ask the Government to undertake the business of common carriers, and he held that the only proper way of meeting the difficulty was, to open the way for the freest competition. If this was provided for, he had no doubt that new express companies would spring up, and the rates would very soon be reduced.

Mr. THOS. COWAN (Galt), was of opinion that the less the Government had to do with express business, the better both for themselves and the country; but he very heartily approved of the proposition to open up the business to the free competition of rival companies.

Mr. P. R. JARVIS (Stratford), believed the railway companies could carry on the express business much more cheaply than anybody else; but the difficulty in their way was, the large express monopolies in the United States. If our express companies did not run in connection with the American companies, of course they could not very well carry on the business, and, therefore, to a very great extent, the American express monopolies controlled the business.

Mr. WM. PENNOCK, as the seconder of the motion, expressed his willingness to withdraw the first part of it. He believed the object they had in view would be attained by the discussion that had taken place, and by the adoption of the second part of the resolution. What they desired was, that in all future railway charters, a provision should be made for the free competition of all express companies over their lines.

The PRESIDENT observed that he had just been informed by the Pre-

mier, that according to a provision in the existing Railway Act no railway company could give a monopoly of the express business to any company.

It was then agreed to strike out the first part of the resolution,—making it read as follows:—

“That the Government of the Dominion be requested to so direct future legislation, that Railway Companies be compelled to allow competing Express Companies facilities for conducting business over their lines.”

The motion, as thus altered, was then put to the vote, and adopted.

DISALLOWED BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

Mr. A. JOSEPH from the Quebec Board of Trade, brought up the subject of the very high damages charged on protested bills of exchange. In the case of a foreign protested bill of exchange, the damage charged was 10 per cent., and as between this country and the United States, the charge was 4 per cent. He thought that in view of the increased means of communication that were now enjoyed, these charges might very well be abolished. He therefore submitted the following resolution:—

“That with the improved modes of communication now existing, it has become unjust and inexpedient to subject disallowed bills of exchange to the heavy damages they are subject to, and that the Executive Council of this Board draw the attention of the Dominion Government to articles 2336 and 2337 of the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec, and ask for a modification, if not the total repeal of such damages.”

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), said that the motion was too general. It should state what modifications were desired. He was in favor of the modification of the law, but not in favor of its total repeal. He thought if the rates were reduced to 2½ per cent. on foreign bills, and entirely abolished on bills in the Dominion, that it would be a very satisfactory arrangement. If Mr. Joseph would amend his resolution in that sense, he would support it.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto): Why not apply the resolution to the whole Dominion?

Mr. JOSEPH: I am willing to do that.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), said it was very questionable whether there should be any damages charged on protested bills of exchange. It was for parties buying bills of exchange, to judge whether they were likely to be paid or not. Sometimes it happened that a bill was protested by accident, and in such a case it would be very unjust to charge the high rates that the law now allowed. Whatever might be said with regard to foreign bills of exchange, he thought certainly the charge now imposed upon protested bills of exchange between Upper and Lower Canada should be done away with.

Mr. A. WOODS (Quebec), said he hoped Mr. Robertson would withdraw his opposition, and allow the resolution to pass unanimously; it would then be left to the discretion of the Government as to what modification

should be adopted. For his own part, he did not see any reason for abolishing the charge in the Dominion, which did not equally apply to foreign bills of exchange.

Mr. JOSEPH favored the total abolition of the charges, and contended now that we had the telegraph cable, that there was no necessity for them, —because if a bill was protested, word to that effect could be at once sent across the Atlantic, and means could be taken for the prompt payment of the bill.

The motion was then put and carried.

DUTIES ON NATIVE TOBACCO.

Mr. E. W. SEWELL (Levis, Q.), said that in the absence of his colleague, who had charge of this subject, the duty devolved upon him to introduce it to the Board. The whole amount of revenue derived from duties on native Tobacco only amounted to \$12,000, while it took \$11,000 of this sum to pay for the collection, so that the Government were actually only better off by \$1,000. This fact of itself, he thought, was sufficient warrant for abolishing the tax altogether, more especially as it had a very demoralizing effect among the French Canadians, who were in the habit of raising tobacco on a small scale. The resolution which had been submitted by the Levis Board of Trade was as follows :

“ That in the opinion of this Board, the abolition of the duty on Tobacco the product of Canada, would be a benefit to national industry, and that the Government be requested to take this matter into its favorable consideration.”

Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.), seconded the motion, which was negatived on the following division :—

Ayes.—Messrs. Dougall, Elder, Findlay, Gillespie, Hope, Hughes, Jarvis, Marshall, McLennan, MacPherson, Rowland, Sewell, White.—13.

Nays.—Messrs. Boak, Clemow, Craig, Cramp, Fry, Joseph, King, Magor, McDougall, Miller, Routh, Shorey, Shehyn, Sproul, Stairs, Tourville, Woods.—17.

DUTIES ON SHIP BUILDING MATERIALS.

Mr. E. W. SEWELL (Levis, Q.), submitted the following resolution upon this subject, seconded by Mr. JAMES MCPHERSON (St. Johns, Q.)

“ That the Executive Council be requested to petition the Dominion Government to abolish all duties levied on ship-building materials.”

Motion carried.

GAUGING LIQUIDS.

Mr. HENRY CUNNINGHAM, from the Kingston Board of Trade, brought up this question. He said that last year the Board had adopted a resolution on the subject, but no action had been taken in the meantime, that he was

aware of, and he therefore brought it up again. He moved the following resolution :

"Whereas the sale of liquids by gauging, as practised, is highly unsatisfactory, and in different parts of the country represents different quantities ; therefore be it *resolved*

"That this Board memorialize the Government, to enact such legislation as will compel the adoption of the uniform standard throughout the Dominion ; and that in the opinion of the Board, sales by weight would be preferable."

Mr. F. CLEMOW (Ottawa), seconded the motion.

Mr. ISAAC WATERMAN (London), said that an Act had been passed, which would carry out the suggestions of the Kingston Board, namely, that sales of liquors should be regulated by weight instead of measure. This Act was to have gone into force on the 1st of January last, but had been delayed on account of the non-arrival of the standards from England. As soon as they arrived the Act would be enforced, and therefore there was no necessity for this resolution.

The motion was withdrawn.

THE IRON INTEREST.

Mr. FRANCIS CLEMOW (Ottawa), read a paper * upon this subject, and thereafter moved the following resolution :—

"That the Executive Council urge upon the Government such a line of action as shall conduce to the development of the great iron deposits of the Dominion, by Royalty or otherwise."

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec) : I object to all the opinions expressed in that paper being presented to the Government as the views of this Board. I would therefore move in amendment :—

"That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following substituted :—
'That the paper now read, be received and placed on the minutes.'"

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), seconded the amendment.

Hon. JAS. SKEAD (Ottawa), seconded Mr. Clemow's resolution. He said that when it was considered that fifteen million dollars' worth of iron was imported into this country during the past year, the importance of this question would be conceded. It was also to be borne in mind, that extensive railway operations were in progress in Canada, and that for the next few years immense quantities of iron would be required. In view of this fact, and also of the fact that we have an unlimited quantity of iron ore in the Ottawa district, he thought the Government would do well to give some slight encouragement to the development of our iron interests, in the way of protection, though in general he was in favor of free trade. If there were four smelting works established in this Dominion, they would be able to manufacture iron to meet the wants of this country

* The text of the paper referred to had not been furnished to the Secretary up to the time of this sheet going to press, (15th Feb.)—W. J. P.

for the next five years ; and he was strongly of opinion that the Government should consider the propriety of giving some practical encouragement to the establishment of such works.

Mr. FRY'S amendment was then put, and carried on the following division :—

Ayes.—Messrs. Boak, Cunningham, Darling, Elder, Findlay, Fry, Harding, Hope, Joseph, Magor, Marshall, McDougall, McLennan, MacPherson, Millar, Mingaye, Robertson, Routh, Shehyn, Sproul, Stairs, Tourville, White, Woods.—24.

Nays.—Messrs. Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Craig, Elliott, Gillespie, Henry, Hughes, Jarvis, King, Pennock, Rowland, Sewell, Shorey, Skead, Waterman, Wilkes, Wylie.—18.

The Board then adjourned, to accept the invitation of the Ottawa delegates to lunch at the Rideau Club.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

THURSDAY, *January 21, 1875.*

The Board resumed at 3 o'clock, Hon. JAMES SKEAD, vice-President, in the chair.

WINTER NAVIGATION OF THE LOWER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. E. W. SEWELL introduced this subject from the Levis Board of Trade. He observed that it was a matter in which every one in the Dominion was deeply interested. We had a river from Quebec to the ocean, which he might say was unaffected by the frosts of winter. It was true that there were large masses of ice in it, but this ice was a protection to the navigation of the river rather than otherwise, because it was the means of moderating the temperature, and of protecting the river from the effect of storms. He could establish by testimony which could not be questioned, that the river St. Lawrence below Quebec was open during the Winter months, and free from the only danger in connection with its navigation, namely, fogs. It was a well-known fact, that 19-20ths of the shipwrecks on the St. Lawrence were caused on account of fog ; but in the winter months fogs were of very rare occurrence. It was true that there was a mist sometimes, but it did not retard navigation, from the fact that it only extended to the height of some 12 or 15 feet. The condition of the river during winter was something like this : When the wind was from a northerly direction, the ice lay along the south side of the river, while the upper side was entirely clear and as smooth as glass ; the result was, that a vessel could run close to the ice, which really afforded a protection, so that actually there was less danger than in the summer-time. Then when the wind changed, the

ice was carried across to the other side of the river, and the south side was then clear. So that during the whole winter, one side of the river was always free from ice, and fit for navigation. In order to establish the truth of these statements, he would, with the permission of the Board, read a few telegrams which had appeared in the *Quebec Chronicle*, which afford a representation of the condition of the river at various times during the winter.

"Father Point," February 11, 9 A.M.—Weather clear, bright and pleasant; *south wind*; river clear of ice.

"Father Point," February 21.—Weather overcast and mild; stiff south-west wind. *No ice* on river. Therm. 35.

"Fox River," February 21.—Weather pleasant and mild. No wind. *Ice all gone*.

"Father Point," February 25.—Light air from the *south*. *Not the least ice to be seen on the river*. Therm. 31.

By these telegrams, it will be seen that when the wind was from the south shore, the ice moved over to the north side, and left the south side clear. The telegrams stated that on such occasions the river was clear of ice; but such was not the case; the ice had merely gone over to the other side, out of sight of the operator. The following telegrams would demonstrate quite as clearly, that whenever the wind was from the north shore the ice was taken over to the south side:

"Fox River," February 20, 6 P.M.—Weather hazy and mild; strong N.W. wind. *Plenty of ice* on the river.

"Cape Rosier," February 24.—Weather clear, bright and cold; light N.W. wind. *Gulf full of ice*.

"Father Point," February 27.—Weather clear; strong wind blowing from the N. N.W. *River full of ice*.

"Cape Rosier," February 27.—Weather cloudy and stormy; N.W. wind. *Gulf full of ice*.

"Fox River," February 27, 7 P.M.—Weather cold; *North wind*. *Gulf full of ice*.

"Cape Rosier," February 29, 7 P.M.—Weather clear and cold; stiff N.N.W. *Gulf full of ice*.

These telegrams, he considered, sufficiently established the statements he had made with respect to the condition of the ice on the St. Lawrence,—not that he attached very much importance to the presence of the ice in the river. People frequently talked loosely of the ice being 20 or 30 feet in thickness; these large masses of ice were not to be found in the river, but came down from the Arctic regions through the Straits of Belleisle. As an illustration of the safety of the St. Lawrence in winter, he would mention one instance. A vessel constructed in Quebec, left that port on the 5th of November. She encountered ice at Riviere du Loup, and her commander not being accustomed to ice, abandoned the ship. Now, it is a fact on record, that this ship passed five months in the ice of the river St. Lawrence, and did not even get water-logged. In the month of April she got clear, floated down the river, and was boarded by some French fishermen, near the island

of St. Pierre. Another vessel was abandoned about 15 miles above Riviere du Loup, and subsequently picked up by some Gaspé fishermen, taken to Prince Edward Island, and is running to-day. What was the reason that these ships did not get lost? It was from the fact that the ice prevented them from getting into shallow water. He proceeded to advert to the great importance to this Dominion of establishing the fact, that the St. Lawrence was capable of navigation during the winter months. Everybody was aware of the enormous tax imposed upon the carrying trade of this country, on account of land carriage from Portland to Quebec or Montreal. He referred to the evidence which had been taken before the Committee of the Quebec Legislature upon this subject, and concluded by moving the following resolution:—

“That this Board petition the Dominion Government to render such aid as will secure the establishing of a line of steamers between Quebec and the Lower Ports, during the winter months, [if the Government deem it practicable.]”

Mr. JAMES WYLIE (Hamilton), seconded the motion.

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL (Windsor), expressed his conviction that the navigation of the St. Lawrence in winter was perfectly feasible. He came to this conclusion, by noticing the condition of Lake St. Clair during the winter months. That lake was only about 15 feet deep, and the ice on it froze to a considerable thickness. Nevertheless, they had succeeded in constructing a ferry boat, which should cross the river at all times of the year. That boat could cut through the ice as if it were a mere egg-shell; and the other day, when the ferry boat of the Canada Southern Railway got aground further down the river, the proprietors of the Windsor boat engaged to take their boat down the river, through the ice, in order to take the other boat off. They bound themselves to perform this task, and they had no doubt of their ability to do it; but, luckily for the Canada Southern, a change of weather set in, and they got their boat off without assistance. Judging from these facts, he had no doubt whatever, but that boats could be constructed, that could navigate the Lower St. Lawrence during the whole of the winter months.

Mr. SEWELL observed that it had been suggested to add to his resolution the words, “should it be found practicable.” He might state, in reference to that, that he was not asking the Government to assume the slightest responsibility in connection with this great undertaking. He was so thoroughly convinced of the feasibility of navigating the St. Lawrence in the winter, that he and his associates were quite willing to run vessels up and down the St. Lawrence, and not ask a single cent from the Government, until they had demonstrated, by actual experiment, that the river could be navigated at all seasons. However, if the Board was of opinion that it would advance the matter at all by adding these words to his motion, he was quite willing to do so. But he wished the Board to understand, that nothing would be asked from the Government, until they had run boats up and down the St. Lawrence for six winter months, and had thereby proved that the navigation of the river was quite practicable.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., said there could be no two opinions as to the desirability of accomplishing the object Mr. Sewell had in view, provided it could be done. There was, however, one very important point which should be considered in reference to this matter, and that was, not merely whether it was practicable to navigate the St. Lawrence in the winter, but whether, supposing it to be possible, that route would be used. It was quite true that last year there were very serious blocks of freight at Portland, simply because there was only one steamer a week to take it away; and the reason why there was only that one steamer, was because Portland was not a good distributing point for freights inward. Some difficulty might be experienced with regard to using Quebec as a winter port; and even though it were possible for vessels to come up to that port in winter, it was a question whether they would find Quebec a sufficiently good point for distributing freights inward, to make it worth while to come there during that season. Then, even if that difficulty were overcome, it was doubtful whether Mr. Sewell and his associates could induce insurance companies to insure their cargoes coming up the St. Lawrence in the winter, at anything like reasonable rates. Until that was secured, merchants would be very slow to ship their goods by that route. For these reasons he thought it would be a mistake for this Board, without more information than they had at the present moment, to ask the Government to subsidize a line of steamers to navigate the St. Lawrence during the winter. If this Board is to have any influence with the Government, they must be very careful how they ask them to subsidize enterprises of this kind; and he thought that they were not in a position at the present time, to ask the Government to give a subsidy to a line of steamers running the St. Lawrence in the winter,—even though it was physically possible to so navigate that river. Therefore, however much he sympathized with Mr. Sewell, in his anxiety to establish that the lower St. Lawrence was navigable in the winter, he would be obliged to vote against his proposition.

Mr. J. A. HARDING (St. John, N.B.), agreed with the views expressed by Mr. White. While it might be possible for a vessel to leave Quebec and go to England during the winter, the question still remained whether that route would be found sufficiently profitable, to make it pay in the winter months. The high rates for insurance would be one considerable difficulty in the way. Then, too, it was to be remembered, that after leaving Quebec there was not a single harbor between that city and the Gut of Canso that was not closed during the winter with a mass of solid ice, so that vessels could not go in or come out. While, therefore, it might be quite possible to run a steamer down the St. Lawrence in the winter, it was quite probable that it would be impossible to turn trade in that direction,—at any rate, as between Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. If trade could be established at all by that route in the winter, it would be between Great Britain and Quebec. He thought if Mr. Sewell succeeded in establishing, by actual experiment, the practicability of safely navigating the St. Lawrence in winter, that then the Government would not hesitate in assisting his enterprise.

b
d
h
p
w
e
to
ki
ba
nc

ta
pr
ta
co
it
sur
cal
cou
me
sch
tra
It
nev
esta

inse
thus

Finc
Mac
Wyl

Dou

of re
conce
E
been
was ir
Board
to urg

Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND (Montreal), said that no doubt vessels might be constructed that could navigate the St. Lawrence in the winter ; but he did not believe it was possible for ordinary merchant ships to do so. Still, holding that opinion, he wished to direct the attention of the Board to the position which it occupied, as simply an advisory body, without any powers whatever. Its entire influence depended on the good judgment which they exercised in rendering advice to the Government, and therefore they ought to be exceedingly careful as to what advice they gave upon matters of this kind ; so far, the Board was not in possession of any facts proving the probability of the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence ; [and therefore he did not think they should make any recommendation upon the subject.

Mr. SEWELL, in closing the debate, again adverted to the great importance of establishing that the navigation of the St. Lawrence in winter was practicable. In order to arrive at anything like a correct idea of its importance, he asked the Board to consider what would be the effect upon this country, if the St. Lawrence was closed all the year round. Certainly, if it was found profitable to this country to use the St. Lawrence route in summer-time, and it was demonstrated that the same route could be practically used in the winter-time, it would be found equally profitable to the country in the latter season. He repeated that he did not ask the Government for any assistance whatever, until he had demonstrated that the scheme was practicable. When that was once done, he had no doubt that trade by that route would follow, and soon grow to very large proportions. It was stated when the Gulf Ports' steamers first started, that they would never pay for the oil and coal they consumed. Now, we had two lines established on that route, and they were both paying handsome dividends.

At the suggestion of Mr. White, the resolution was altered by the insertion of the words, "if the Government deem it practicable," and as thus changed, the motion was carried on the following division :—

Ayes.—Messrs. Cowan, Craig, Cunningham, Dougall, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Fry, Gillespie, Grist, Harding, Hughes, Joseph, King, Magor, MacPherson, Millar, Mingaye, Rowland, Sewell, Shehyn, Stairs, Woods, Wylie.—24.

Nays.—Messrs. Brown, Clemow, Darling, Drummond, Hope, McDougall, McLennan, Pennock, Robertson, Routh, Shorey, White.—12.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE WELLAND CANAL.

Dr. L. S. OILLE (St. Catherines), had put his views on the subject of reconsidering the enlargement of the Welland Canal, so far as depth is concerned, in writing, and read them as follows :—

He stated that in reopening the question after a definite scale of enlargement had been determined upon, and the work was in actual progress, no doubt some responsibility was incurred. It was necessary to show strong reasons for such a course of action. The Boards of St. Catherines and Windsor thought there were such reasons, and it was his duty to urge them on the favorable consideration of this Board. The recommendations of the

Canal Commission, adopted by Government for the enlargement now in progress, may have been valid (although he did not think so) according to the information available when they made their Report, in 1871. But since that time a flood of additional light has been thrown upon the subject, by the experience and observations of the years 1872-3-4 in connection with the carrying trade of the Great West. It would be madness to ignore the additional information supplied by those years, and especially the last, and obstinately adhere to the scale of 12 feet draft of water for the canal, when it was made clear that at least 2 feet additional draft were certainly required to secure the result aimed at in making the enlargement. The necessary alteration in the plans could now be made, without the necessity of undoing any work already completed, with the exception of the foundation of one lock already laid, and one culvert completed. To show the folly of adhering to a plan for a public work, when subsequent information furnished a much better one, he mentioned the case of the Intercolonial Railway as an illustration. The usefulness of this road was fatally impaired, and the probability of its being made to pay, prevented by a refusal on the part of the Government of the day to change the original gauge decided upon, to the standard gauge of the continent, viz.: 4 ft. 8½ inches, at a time when the alteration could have been made without difficulty. All parties now agree, that a great and costly error was committed by the Government at that time, in the matter of the proper gauge for the Intercolonial Railway, and the lesson it conveys ought not to be lost in connection with the still more important subject now under discussion. With reference to the enlarged canal, anything less than a sufficient depth of water, to allow the largest class of vessels employed on the Upper Lakes to pass downward to Lake Ontario, would not bring the result aimed at by this country, in making the enormous investment of \$9,000,000 in the enlargement. This object, as every one knew, was to secure for the St. Lawrence route an absolute and permanent superiority, over all other routes whatsoever, leading from the Great West to the Atlantic seaboard. The Public Accounts show that the old Welland Canal has cost the country \$7,600,000; now it is proposed to invest in it \$9,000,000 additional, making the enormous aggregate of \$16,600,000. Nothing less than success in giving Canada the command, certain and undoubted, of the grain carrying trade by the St. Lawrence route, can justify this enormous outlay; and no consideration of such comparatively small additional outlay as may be necessary to secure this absolute certainty should be allowed to stand in the way of its accomplishment for a single moment.

The following are some of the more important reasons for increasing the depth of the enlarged Welland Canal at least two feet beyond that recommended by the Canal Commission and adopted by Government:

First.—The extensive and increasing introduction of both steam and sail vessels into the carrying trade of the Upper Lakes, of a capacity from sixty to eighty thousand bushels of grain, while with twelve feet draft of water the enlarged Welland Canal will not pass vessels of a greater capacity than fifty thousand bushels at the utmost, forty thousand bushels being much nearer the actual fact.

Second.—The successful adoption of steam as a motive power, on the Erie Canal, which, with the immediate completion of a double set of locks will reduce the length of time and cost of transportation one-half on that canal.

Third.—The active competition of railways for the carrying trade of the great West to the Atlantic seaboard, at Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and to the port of Montreal on the River St. Lawrence.

Fourth.—The serious disadvantage under which the St. Lawrence route labors

relatively to the railways leading from the seaports before-mentioned towards the great West, and to the Erie Canal and the lake route from Buffalo to ports on Lakes Huron, Michigan and Superior, in the deficiency of return freight from the East towards the West by the St. Lawrence route. This deficiency imposes on the cargoes of grain the burden of meeting the entire expense of the round trip, and hence the vital necessity of securing for the St. Lawrence route at least an equal counterbalancing advantage in favor of that route. According to the maxim, the larger the vessel the cheaper the transport, this advantage is to be obtained from an increased draft of water in the enlarged Welland and the St. Lawrence Canals.

Fifth.—The difficulty of constructing vessels that will class A 1, for a reasonable number of years, to carry a paying cargo on the comparatively small draft of 12 feet water, and the extra cost of running vessels with very full bows and great breadth of beam in proportion to length, such as they must necessarily be, would prove a constant drain on the profits of transport, and by so much lessen the ability of the St. Lawrence route to compete with that by the Upper Lakes, Erie Canal, and Hudson River.

• *Sixth.*—The advisability of providing for the future grain trade of the Canadian Northwest Territory, at rates that will be remunerative to the producers and carriers of the cereals of that portion of the Dominion. This can only be done by resort to every possible means for promoting cheapness of transport, and thereby affect the distance to be traversed in bringing those cereals to a market, and the cost of railway transport from the Red River Valley to Thunder Bay on Lake Superior, the point of transhipment.

With regard to the first reason before mentioned, it is requisite to state, that vessels, both steam and sail, drawing 14 feet of water, have been engaged in the carrying trade of the Upper Lakes, for at least two years past; others are now building of similar draft. Well informed authorities state, that with the same length of keel and breadth of beam, if a vessel loaded with 50,000 bushels of grain, draws 12 feet of water, it will require 16,000 bushels additional to sink her to 14 feet draft. Now, the extra cost of carrying a cargo of 66,000 bushels, over one of 50,000, is very trifling. For the route from, say Chicago to Kingston, it will comprise tolls on the Welland Canal, on 16,000 bushels, and extra tonnage of vessel, about

	\$108.00
Shovelling at Kingston, \$2.50 per thousand bushels	40.00
Extra fuel, say	84.00
	<hr/>
Total	\$232.00
	<hr/>
Extra freight on 16,000 bushels, at say 8c. per bushel	\$1,280.00
Less	232.00
	<hr/>
Clear profit on the extra cargo of 16,000 bushels	\$1,048.00

A propeller easily makes 14 round trips between Kingston and Chicago during the season of navigation; this will give \$14,672 profit on the season's work, with a vessel drawing 14 feet, and a carrying capacity of 66,000 bushels over that of one of same breadth of beam and length of keel, of a capacity of 50,000 bushels only.

If 30 vessels of this capacity were engaged in the trade,—and the St. Lawrence route will not meet the views of its advocates with any less number,—the extra profits of the entire fleet, over one of 12 feet draft of water only, will be no less a sum than \$440,160 annually. Now, \$1,000,000 will amply suffice to secure two feet additional depth to the Welland Canal, and the harbors of Port Dalhousie and Port Colborne. The annual charge entailed on the revenue of the Dominion by this investment, will not exceed \$60,000. Deduct this amount from \$479,220, and the respectable sum of

\$419,220 remains as clear annual profit to this country, from giving employment, by this increased depth of water in the Welland Canal, to such a fleet of Canadian ships as has been mentioned.

It is also clear, that unless this additional depth shall be obtained in the Welland Canal, the Buffalo route will constantly enjoy an advantage of at least 25 per cent. over the St. Lawrence route, so far as size of cargo in lake vessels is concerned. The advantage of the grain-laden vessel being enabled, by means of the Welland Canal, to proceed 170 miles further, *i.e.*, to Kingston, before discharging, is also more than counterbalanced by the deficiency of return freight from that port, (the same remark applies to Montreal, if the vessel proceeds onward to that port,) while return freights from Buffalo are always certain. Consequently, the Buffalo route will continue to enjoy a decided advantage over the St. Lawrence route, which is certainly not contemplated by the Dominion in promoting canal enlargement.

The bearing which the successful introduction of steam as a motive power on the Erie Canal, has on the question of transportation by rival routes, may be inferred from official authority and the testimony of facts. The New York State Engineer computes the cost of transporting freight by canal steamer, at 4 mills per ton per mile, between Buffalo and New York, including all tolls. The cost by lake vessels is 2½ mills. During the year 1874, steam canal boats on the Erie Canal made profits carrying grain at 8 cents, tolls included, between Buffalo and New York, the time made between those ports being from 5 to 6 days. All must agree, that the successful adoption of steam on the Erie Canal, gives a new phase to the question of the carrying trade, which it would be folly to ignore.

As to the share railways are taking in the grain-carrying trade of the Great West, the following comparative statement may be of use in forming an opinion. The authority is the Buffalo Board of Trade:—

Comparative Statement of the Receipts of Grain at the following ports for the years 1866 and 1873:

	1866. Bushels.	1873. Bushels.
Montreal.....	10,394,454	19,713,529
Boston.....	4,147,752	8,468,658
New York.....	57,809,105	90,731,523
Philadelphia.....	7,260,515	24,949,157
Baltimore.....	8,197,130	19,099,717
Total.....	87,808,956	162,962,584

Of the above sums all the receipts at Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, were by rail, and 29,288,829 bushels were the railroad receipts at New York in 1873. In four years the receipts of grain by rail at New York, have risen in round numbers from 14,800,000 to 29,200,000 bushels. For the first eleven months of 1874 the receipts by rail at New York were 37,165,646 bushels. During the same time the amount carried by canal remained almost without change. These few facts show how enormous a transfer of trade to railways has occurred, and the importance of securing every possible advantage for trade by the Welland Canal in order to recoup the Dominion for the expense it has incurred, or is about to incur, in connection with that work. Fourteen feet draft of water at the very least on the mitre-sills should be the watermark on our great water highway of the Welland Canal.

Dr. OILLE concluded by moving the following resolution:

"That the magnitude of the commercial interests involved, and the amount of

capital invested and to be invested in the Welland Canal, require that the enlargement of that work now in progress, should be on a scale sufficient to place the St. Lawrence route in a position of undoubted and permanent superiority, as to the all-important elements of cheapness and speed of transport over all other routes whatsoever from the great West to the Atlantic seaboard; and that for this purpose it is essential that the largest class of vessels in actual or prospective employment on the Upper Lakes, those, viz., of 14 feet draft of water and a capacity of 75,000 bushels of grain, should be enabled to pass downward to Lake Ontario. That concurrent enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals should be proceeded with on a scale as nearly similar to that of the Welland Canal as possible; and that this subject be urged upon the serious consideration of the Government of the Dominion."

Mr. E. W. SEWELL (Levis, Q.), said, as a practical shipbuilder he cordially endorsed the remarks of Dr. Oille. It was utterly impossible to construct a vessel to draw only 12 feet of water, and yet to be of the enormous length of 240 feet. It was necessary to get a certain amount of depth in the hold, in order to secure the proper navigation of the ship. He trusted that the Board would unanimously support the proposition to deepen the Welland Canal to 14 feet.

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL (Windsor), said that his Board had been convinced all along that the Welland Canal should be deepened to 14 feet at least. He thought it would be a great mistake, now that the Government were deepening the canal, not to do the work fully, because if the canal was only deepened to 12 feet, within a few years the work would only have to be gone over again, and the canal made two feet deeper in order to meet the demands of trade. He begged to second the motion.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN (Montreal), opposed the resolution, and stated that he did not believe the chief harbors of Lakes Michigan and Erie had a depth of more than 12 feet, and therefore, it would be useless to deepen the canal beyond that depth. Then there was the question of cost, which he did not think this Board was competent to enter into. We had been told by the Canal Commissioners, that various things could be done for four millions; but the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department, had expressed his opinion that the same things would cost some ten millions. Of course there was great diversity of opinion as to what the cost would be, and this Board was scarcely in a position to come to any conclusion upon that point, nor to make any recommendation respecting it. It had been stated that it would not cost more than a million, to increase the depth of the Welland Canal by two feet; but, while thinking that the opinions of amateur engineers go for very little, he would venture to suggest that the cost might as likely be five or ten millions as one million of dollars. He fully admitted the importance of improving our water communication, but at the same time, we could not do impossibilities. While he took this position, he wished it to be understood that the Montreal Board of Trade, as representing the commercial men of that city, were anxious for the greatest possible improvement in our means of water communication, and in the consequent increase of the volume of trade by the Canadian route.

Mr. JAMES WYLIE (Hamilton), suggested that Dr. Oille add to his

resolution some stronger recommendation to the Government, urging them to push on the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals simultaneously with that of the Welland. He spoke of the importance of the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals, and thought that they could not too strongly press the matter upon the Government.

Mr. SEWELL observed that it would cost 50 per cent. less to deepen the canal two feet extra now, while the work was going on, than it would 10 or 12 years hence. There was no doubt that vessels of 12 feet draft were not adapted for ocean navigation; but a vessel drawing 14 feet was adapted for almost any trade in the world. He therefore thought it would be a great benefit to this country, if our canals were deepened to 14 feet, so that vessels could start from the Upper Lakes and discharge their cargoes in Liverpool if necessary.

Mr. FRANCIS CLEMOW (Ottawa), considered that it would not be wise to undertake this additional enlargement of the Welland Canal, especially as, in his opinion, before very long it would be found advisable to open up a much shorter route between the West and the East, namely by the Ottawa Valley.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), said he thought it might be well if Dr. Oille would tell them which ports of Lake Ontario would admit a vessel of 14 feet, and what would be the probable expense of making the ports on that Lake capable of admitting craft drawing 14 feet, because that was a very important question to be considered. His own opinion was that the expense of deepening these harbors, in addition to deepening the canal, would be found to be a most serious objection to undertaking the work.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), said that Dr. Oille had brought up the subject at a very opportune time, now when the enlargement of the Welland Canal was being commenced, as it would be much cheaper to deepen it to the fullest extent required, than to wait a number of years, and have to do the work over again. He was of opinion, that whether the St. Lawrence Canals could be deepened to 14 feet or not, the deepening of the Welland Canal would be a very great boon. If it was really true, that by a moderate additional expenditure a depth of 14 feet could be obtained in the Welland Canal, it certainly would be well for the Government to consider the propriety of undertaking that work now while they were about it.

Mr. G. M. MILLAR (Montreal), said the idea of the mover of the resolution evidently was, that while we were doing the work, it ought to be done thoroughly. That was certainly a very good idea; but at the same time, there might be some modifying circumstances in this case. The theory seemed to be, that to deepen the Welland Canal to 14 feet, would enable vessels of any class that are now sailing, or likely to sail between Chicago and the Western ports, to come through the Welland Canal and thence to the ports below. He sympathised with that view of the question, and would like to see the Welland Canal capable of admitting vessels that could be accommodated in the harbor of Buffalo, so that they

might come through to Kingston, and thus secure a very large share of the carrying trade by the St. Lawrence route. At the same time, there were objections to the proposition which he thought were entitled to considerable weight; and one was, that the harbors on Lake Ontario were not capable of accommodating vessels having a draft of 14 feet. Then the question of expense was also a very serious one; but he was not in a position to offer any opinion upon it; still, he certainly thought the amount would be considerably greater than Dr. Oille had indicated. It was known to everyone, that the deeper a canal was made, the more it would cost per square yard. But even supposing that we had the money to carry out this improvement, and supposing that the harbors of Lake Ontario were made capable of accommodating vessels drawing 14 feet of water, there was still another difficulty in the way. He wished to draw special attention to this point, namely, that we had never yet employed our canals to one-half of their capacity. The greatest amount of grain that passed through the St. Lawrence Canals, was somewhere about 14 millions, whereas Mr. Shanly had stated, our canals, as they at present stood, were capable of passing through them 75 million bushels of grain in one season. He thought that this fact should be carefully considered in connection with the proposition now before the Board. There were some other observations which he could have made regarding the existing capacity of the St. Lawrence Canals,—his (Mr. Millar's) opinion being that their enlargement was not a matter of such immediate necessity as some gentlemen appeared to imagine; but in deference to the time-call from the Chair, he would conclude by stating that, all things considered, he could not vote for Dr. Oille's motion.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto), stated that the gentlemen who had opposed the motion, appeared to have overlooked the fact, as stated by Dr. Oille, that if the Welland Canal was now enlarged, while the work was going on, it would cost some 25 per cent. less than if the work was done at a subsequent period. The present was the third time the Welland Canal had been enlarged, and it would be a pity to have to do the work over again at a later time. He was therefore disposed to support the resolution.

Mr. JAMES MCPHERSON (St. Johns, Q.), said he had referred to statistics; and found that out of thirty-two harbors on the Upper Lakes, not including Lake Superior, there were only eight that had a depth of twelve feet. He was in favor of deepening all our canals. He thought we should look to the future as well as the present, and believed that the increase in the carrying trade from the West, would demand increased facilities in the way of water communication. He had looked into the statistics respecting the growth of the Western trade, and found that during the past twenty years the increase of production in nine of the western States, was no less than 472,000,000 bushels of grain. If the West went on increasing at that rate, he was satisfied that we would require all our water communications, both by the Welland Canal and the Ottawa, within the next twenty years. However, while our harbors could

only accommodate vessels of twelve feet draft, he did not see the utility of deepening our canals to fourteen feet.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto), said the chief objection to this great undertaking, which was admitted by all to be desirable, if practicable, was the expense; but, as the work would have to be done sooner or later, and at no time cheaper than now, he hoped the motion would be allowed to pass.

Mr. R. T. ROUTH (Montreal), said he would support the motion. He believed the Government would make a very great mistake if they did not now, while they were commencing the work, deepen the Welland Canal to fourteen feet. At the present time, vessels running from Chicago and Milwaukee to Buffalo, were drawing fourteen feet of water; and, therefore, we could not hope to compete for the carrying trade, until the Welland Canal was sufficiently enlarged to admit the passage of these vessels.

Dr. L. S. OILLE adverted to the objection which had been raised to his motion, to the effect that we had not sufficient harbor accommodation at the ports on Lake Ontario. He had a statement which showed, that the settled policy on the American side was to deepen all their harbors so as to accommodate vessels drawing 14 feet. As he understood the question, the great object in deepening the Welland Canal, was to secure the carrying trade in grain from Chicago and Milwaukee, through to Kingston, Prescott, and Montreal. As to Kingston harbor, it could very easily be deepened to accommodate vessels drawing 14 feet; but even if that was not done, vessels could go down to Prescott, where there were already 14 feet of water, and there tranship or lighten their cargoes,—so that he thought the objection that the Ontario harbors were not deep enough, was not to the point. However, he was of opinion that the chief harbors of Ontario could, without very great expense, be deepened to 14 feet. Hamilton, for instance, could be made that depth at a very trifling cost.

Mr. ADAM BROWN (Hamilton): It has that depth now.

Dr. OILLE said he thought that was the case, and proceeded to say that Toronto harbor might also very easily be improved to the same depth. It certainly would be a great mistake, if this country should go to the expenditure of 9 millions in enlarging the Welland Canal, and then find in the course of a few years that it was too small, and that we would then have to enlarge again, in order to obtain anything like our share of the carrying trade. At the present time a propeller on the upper lakes drawing two tow-barges, was capable of carrying a cargo from Chicago to Buffalo of upwards of 200,000 bushels of grain. Under such a state of things, it would be impossible to compete with the trade between Chicago and Buffalo, as a propeller towing two barges running between Chicago and Buffalo could carry 100,000 bushels more grain than a propeller and two barges could that passed through the Welland Canal. He thought, therefore, that all the facts which had been stated should induce the Board to urge upon the Government, the advisability of enlarging the Welland Canal to 14 feet.

The PRESIDENT : Before putting the question, I will, by your permission, call upon our guest, Mr. Parsons, to make some remarks upon this matter.

Mr. PHILIP PARSONS (Detroit, Mich.), said he was very much obliged to the members of the Board for their courtesy. Although he appeared here as a representative of the National Board of Trade, yet the Detroit Board had asked him to present the question of deepening the Welland Canal. He proceeded to say, that the position of Canada was one eminently adapted to secure for her a very large share of the carrying trade of the West. Just so soon as the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals were enlarged, so as to accommodate the same class of vessels as run between Chicago and Buffalo, then the St. Lawrence route would have an immense advantage over any other route. There was another point which it was well to consider, and that was the competition of the railways, which was increasing every year, and it was necessary to furnish increased accommodation by water, or the railways would take away the trade from us. At the present time they were building vessels that would carry 60,000 bushels of wheat, and propellers to hold from 60,000 to 75,000 bushels; and the moment the Welland Canal was deepened so as to admit the passage of these vessels, they would very soon show the people of Canada that they could deliver wheat at the seaport cheaper than it was possible for any railway to do it. In view of these circumstances, he was strongly of opinion that as a matter of economy, the Canadian Government would find it to their interest, now that they had begun the work, to make the canal two feet deeper than they contemplated. If that was not done now, it would be very difficult to do it hereafter, as in the case of the gauge of railways. If, when railways on this continent had first been constructed, they had all adopted the uniform gauge now in use, an immense saving would have been effected. So it was the case in the Welland canal. There could be no doubt that it would cost a very much larger amount to increase the depth of the canal at a subsequent period, than it would cost now while the work was in operation. He concluded by again thanking the Board for the courtesy they had extended to him, and resumed his seat amid loud applause.

The resolution was then put and carried.

MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. F. M. SPROUL (King's Co., N.B.), submitted a paper on this subject,—it being received and ordered to be placed on record,—as follows:—

The vast importance attached in the present age not only in this Dominion, but in all the civilized countries of the world, to the construction, equipment and proper management of railways, will, I trust, relieve me from the necessity of offering an apology upon introducing a question of vital importance to many sections of this "Canada of Ours."

I may here state that the object of this paper is simply to bring before this Board a knowledge of the practical results proceeding from the owning and running of Railways by Government in the Province of New Brunswick.

Under the terms of Confederation, New Brunswick, upon entering into the Union, gave up to the Dominion Government the Railway in New Brunswick, which had been owned and operated by the Government of that Province.

From that time until the present that road has been owned and operated by the Dominion Government, and no very serious cause of complaint has arisen until after the consolidation of the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia roads, when an increase in the freight tariff has caused a cry of dissatisfaction to be raised, which has resounded throughout the entire length and breath of the Maritime Provinces.

This excessive freight tariff may be traced, like everything else, to a prime cause, which is: A desire on the part of the Government to make the road productive during their term in office.

A Government depends for its existence on political questions, and as the issues of such questions are very uncertain, an Administration can have no absolute certainty as to the length of its term of office, and, therefore, the Railways and other Public Works under Government control must be made productive in the present without regarding the interests of the future.

If extraordinary repairs are needed upon the road, resulting from the wear and tear of years, and the expenditure is thereby increased, the rate of freight must also be increased, in order to exhibit a favorable financial statement, and thus in many instances the very object of our Railroad system is defeated.

The practical results of the Government management of Railroads in New Brunswick have been an extravagance of expenditure, as shewn by the Reports of Mr. Brydges, in making the price paid for articles supplied by contract too high; and a consequent increase in the freight tariff which bears very severely upon the people, who are compelled to use the Railways in order to transport their goods to market.

The progress of a country depends in no small degree upon the facilities for travel and the transportation of goods, and while in this Dominion we are abundantly blessed with water communication, it is still upon the great Railway system of our country that our future welfare must to a very great extent depend.

Railways are constructed for the purpose of developing the latent resources of the country, increasing commercial facilities and affording a speedy and cheap means of travel; and I respectfully submit that the results of the Government management of the Railroads in New Brunswick have been such as to defeat the efforts put forth for the accomplishment of the above object.

Under Government control the receipts on the line of Railway in New Brunswick have not been so largely in advance of the expenses as have the receipts of some lines of much less length operated by Companies.

For instance, in 1869 the net earnings of the New Brunswick road were \$56,000.00, while the Northern Railroad, having 12 miles less track, made a net gain of \$168,000.00, and from that time to the present, while the net revenue of the former has been decreasing, that of the latter has been increasing.

It is not with a desire to exaggerate our local grievances that this paper is submitted, but simply because we wish to explain the cause of complaint moderately and truthfully, trusting that public opinion, that great corrective, will remedy the defects of the present management.

The chief cause of complaint is the great and excessive increase in the rate of freight upon the Intercolonial Railway, whereby persons engaging in agricultural, lumbering or manufacturing pursuits, are placed under discouraging circumstances, as the present management of the road in New Brunswick instead of increasing commerce and giving an impetus to manufacturers, really lessens the amount of traffic, and actually pro-

hibits
depend
T
and as
made t
which
ways t
A
pointin
require
I
by Cor
est onl
therefo
in the
trade a
A
will be
lead to
to a gr

mitte

T
Boards
it unne
that it
T
annun
amount
for the
to be d
T

T

M
attent
Secre
The s
"I
"aly o
"vario

hibits persons from engaging in many branches of business upon which they heretofore depended to a great extent for the means of subsistence.

The cost of goods must to a great extent depend upon the cost of transportation; and as soon as the rates of freight are increased on any line, the people who purchase are made the victims of the management, while loss also accrues to the seller,—to the truth of which a long line of country teams, laden with produce, toiling wearily along the high-ways towards some commercial centre, will daily attest.

And the Government also has not exercised wisdom in the selection of officers, appointing men to important positions who have little or no knowledge of the local requirements of the road.

I will, before closing, draw a distinguishing line between the managements of roads by Company and by Government. Government has an uncertain and perishable interest only, while a Company has a perpetuity of interest in the line, and their actions, therefore, will be widely different. The former will labor to make the road productive in the present only, while the latter will endeavor so to promote commerce and increase trade and travel that the road in the future, as well as in the present, will be profitable.

And, in concluding this document, permit me to express a hope that such changes will be made in the present management of Government Railways in Canada, as will lead to a more wise and judicious control of that part of our Public Works, upon which to a great extent the future welfare of our Dominion depends.

FINANCE.

Mr. HENRY FRY presented the second report of the Finance Committee, as follows:—

The Finance Committee beg to report:—

That it having been reported to this Committee that a considerable number of new Boards are about to be affiliated to the Dominion Board, your Committee therefore deem it unnecessary to increase the assessment as proposed in their first report, and suggest that it remain at 75 cents per capita.

The Committee also recommend that the Secretary's salary be increased to \$750 per annum from 1st October last, owing to the fact that he has had to pay more than the amount of his allowance for the assistance required, and that the sum of \$100 be voted for the cost of copies of the pamphlet entitled "The Water Highways of the Dominion" to be distributed at the discretion of the Executive Council.

The whole respectfully submitted.

(Signed,)

HENRY FRY,
Chairman.

The Report was, on motion, received and adopted.

AN EXPLANATION.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec), said he had been requested to draw the attention of the Board to a statement contained in the paper read by the Secretary, upon the subject of a Dominion Department of Commerce. The statement was to the following effect:—

"Had there been a Minister of Commerce in the Canadian Cabinet, the anomaly could not have been allowed to exist, of thousands upon thousands of car-loads of various kinds of Produce passing through Canada from one United States port to

"another, without let or hindrance,—while punctilious obstructiveness was observed relative to merchandise passing through the United States from one Canadian port to another."

He was requested to state, "upon high authority," that there were no such restrictions imposed upon goods passing through the United States from one Canadian port to another, and that the paragraph was incorrect.

Mr. PATTERSON (the Secretary), said, with the permission of the Board, he would read an extract from a letter that was sent by order of the Executive Council to the Minister of Finance, in March last:—

"I am directed by the President and Council of the Dominion Board of Trade, to solicit your early attention to the circumstance, that a very large difference has uniformly, for a number of years, appeared to exist between the official totals representing the import and export trade of the country. They have reason to believe that much, if not all, of that apparent discrepancy may arise from imperfect returns, or from want of returns, especially of shipments by Railway Companies. Indeed, the President and Council have some evidence at present before them, tending to show that much of the Commerce on Railways (especially *through* traffic) is carried on without the Government's having any definite knowledge of its variety and quantity. They believe especially that a great deal of *through* traffic in bond, on United States account, passes unchecked or unregistered, (so far as the interests of Government are concerned), and unmolested by Customs or other official charges; while the traffic in bond passing through the United States from one part of Canada to another is onerously and vexatiously hampered and impeded."

To this communication, the only reply that was received, was the merely formal one from the Minister's Secretary, that many of the matters stated in that communication were under consideration. He begged to state for the information of the Board, that he had all the documents here upon which the statement made in his paper was based. These documents were obtained from Custom House Collectors; and he suggested that the best way would be to refer them to the Committee on Order of Business. This would save the time of the Board, because the examination of the papers would involve a number of statistics, which would occupy some time. He begged further to state, that this circumstance was brought to his knowledge several years ago, through the kindness of a gentleman in an official position; and in corresponding with certain collectors of customs, he was informed that they had no record of business that he had asked for, but if he would wait, they would get the information from the Great Western Railway. He was careful not to make any statement that could not be substantiated, and he had with him, as he said before, the documents upon which his statements were founded.

Mr. JOSEPH observed that it was at the request of Hon. Mr. Burpee that he had made the correction. At any rate, it ought to be satisfactory to know that at the present time there was no such obstruction as had been complained of.

Mr. PATTERSON said that the statement in his paper did not imply any censure upon the present Minister, or upon his conduct of the Department. It was a general statement having reference to a state of affairs which, it is gratifying to hear from Mr. Joseph, does not now exist.

The matter was then referred to the Committee on Order of Business, to thereafter inform the Board as to the result of their examination.

M
to this
were
the sa
report
seeme
Canad
especi
someti
gained
but th
sugges
Cather
" T
using e
from th
en route
M
M
Regul
in pref
of such
more t
were c
time o
the req
were f
sixty-f
were
vessels
official
with g
of 14
in goir
with a
He th
" T
Order i
Canals
the inle
M
M

OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION.

Mr. JAMES WYLIE (Hamilton), in calling the attention of the Board to this matter, stated that vessels sailing from Canadian ports to Chicago were obliged to report at Duncan City, in the Straits of Macinac, while the same object might be attained quite as readily if they were allowed to report at the Custom House at Chicago or Milwaukee. This regulation seemed to have been an obstacle thrown in the way of trade between Canada and the United States some years ago. In rough weather especially, it was a very great inconvenience to have to call there, and sometimes it occasioned very serious delay. If any advantage was to be gained by vessels calling at that place, there might be some excuse for it; but the same object could quite as easily be attained in the manner already suggested. He would therefore move, seconded by Dr. L. S. OILLE (St. Catherines), the following resolution:

"That this Board urge upon the Dominion Government, the advisability of their using every endeavor to have the United States Government relieve Canadian vessels from the necessity of calling at Duncan City, in the Straits of Macinac, to report *en route* to Chicago or Milwaukee."

Motion carried.

PREFERENCE OF ENTRY IN CANALS.

Mr. W. R. MINGAYE (Kingston), directed attention to the Canal Regulations, which required that propellers should have the right of way in preference to barges. Of course, he was aware that the argument in favor of such a regulation was, that the propeller would by delay lose a great deal more than a barge; but frequently it happened that as many as five barges were detained, and the loss of time of five barges was at least equal to the time of one propeller. He had prepared a few statistics to show the way the regulation operated in the case of the barge-owners of Kingston. There were forty-five barges at Ottawa, fifty-five at Kingston, one hundred and sixty-four at Quebec, and one hundred and thirty-five at Montreal. There were also in the Province of Ontario two hundred and ninety sailing vessels, with a tonnage of 45,519 tons. He had ascertained from the official statistics that the number of sailing vessels that came to Kingston with grain, and passed on through the canals, was 1,189, with a tonnage of 143,261 tons. And yet all this trade was obliged to give way in going through the canals, to one hundred and fifty-eight steam vessels with a tonnage of 19,212 tons. He thought that this was a great hardship. He therefore proposed the following resolution:

"That representations be made to the Government, asking for the revocation of Order in Council of date September, 1873, giving preference of entry into Canadian Canals to propellers over barges and sailing craft, such preference being detrimental to the inland shipping interest at large."

Mr. WM. CRAIG (Port Hope), seconded the motion.

Mr. JAMES WYLIE (Hamilton), strongly urged upon the Board to

vote down the motion, as it was very unfair and unjust. The question of tonnage was not the only question to be considered, as time was also an important consideration. It would probably take half or three-quarters of an hour, for a barge to go through the locks, whereas a propeller could go through in ten minutes. Another point which ought to be considered was, the difference in the expense of the different kinds of vessels. The daily expense of a barge was very small in comparison with that of a propeller, the latter averaging from \$100 to \$110 per day. Therefore, every five minutes of a propeller's time was more valuable than half-a-day to a barge.

Mr. CRAIG said his Board of Trade had discussed this question, and had urged some change in the present regulations. It was very unfair that a sailing vessel, after waiting perhaps for several hours to get through the lock, should be compelled, just when the lock was vacant to stand aside a second time in order to let another propeller through.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal) : How is it to be with passenger vessels ?

Mr. MINGAYE : Passenger vessels are not interfered with. I merely refer to freight propellers.

Dr. OILLE (St. Catherines) : Will you apply your resolution to the Welland Canal also ?

Mr. MINGAYE : I refer only to the St. Lawrence Canals.

At the request of several members, Mr. Mingaye consented to withdraw his motion, which was accordingly done.

CUSTOMS' REGULATIONS.

Mr. WM. DARLING, from the Montreal Board of Trade, introduced the subject of the examination of goods at the various ports of the Dominion. He stated that a similar motion to the one he was about to propose, was discussed last year and approved of ; but as nothing had been done in the matter in the meantime, he brought it up again, with the view of requesting that it be referred to some committee, whose duty it would be to urge it upon the Government. Under the present system, charges were made at some ports of entry on examination of the goods, while other places were exempted. In his opinion, no charges should be made at any of the ports, because he thought the duties which had been put upon the goods should cover such charges ; and the examination was not for the benefit of the importer but for the satisfaction of the Government, in order to ascertain whether the goods had been properly entered and the duties fully paid. At the same time, if the charges were uniform all over the Dominion, there would not be so much to complain of. But this was not the case. As he had occasion to state before, there did not appear to be any authority in the Customs' Act for the imposition of these charges. He referred to the clause of the Act, which had been cited in justification of levying them, and pointed out that it really gave

no authority for them whatever. He begged to submit the following resolution:—

“That all charges for the examination of goods be discontinued, or if found necessary, that the same rate of charges be exacted at every port of entry in the Dominion; and further,—

That at such of the large ports of entry as require additional Appraisers, only such persons be appointed, as are competent from long experience in the branches of trade to which they are appointed.”

The motion was seconded by Mr. L. TOURVILLE (Montreal), and carried.

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS' ASSOCIATION.

A motion on this subject having been made by Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto), seconded by Mr. ISAAC WATERMAN (London),—in reply to a question,

The PRESIDENT said that the Association numbered more than 1,200 members, their object being mutual improvement, and the securing of such advantages for themselves in connection with their business, as they might be able to obtain. They felt that they would like to have some expression of sympathy from the Dominion Board of Trade, in the way of the recognition of their body among the business men of the community, and he presumed that was the object Mr. Gillespie had in bringing forward this motion.

It having been deemed inexpedient on the part of this Board to pass a resolution simply of recognition, the motion was withdrawn.

VOTE OF THANKS.

Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.), moved, seconded by Mr. ISAAC WATERMAN (London):

“That the thanks of this Board be tendered to the Manager of the Dominion Telegraph Company, for courtesies extended to representatives, he having granted free social messages to all points over the wires of his Company.”

Carried unanimously.

The Board thereafter adjourned until 9.30 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FOURTH DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

FINAL SESSION.

FRIDAY, *January 22, 1875.*

The Board resumed business at 9.30 o'clock, the President in the chair.

The Secretary having called the roll, the minutes of sessions of the two preceding days were taken as read.

DUTIES AND LIABILITIES OF COMMON CARRIERS.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal), from the Committee on the Rights and Liabilities of Common Carriers, presented the following report :

Carriers by Land.—That at present railway companies in the Dominion of Canada will not receive and carry freight, unless a contract is signed containing so many exceptions to the liability of the carrier in case of loss or damage, that the goods may be said to be carried almost entirely at the risk of the owner.

The Committee therefore recommend that the Executive Council of the Dominion Board of Trade take measures to have an Act passed by the Dominion Parliament, similar to the Imperial Act now in force in Great Britain regulating the rights and liabilities of common carriers by land.

Carriers by Water.—That carriers by water be insurers of the traffic by them received for transportation, and be liable for all loss or damage to such traffic while in their possession and until delivery is made, save when such loss or damage is caused by the Act of God, the Queen's enemies, fire and all and every other dangers and accidents of the seas, rivers, and navigation of whatever nature and kind soever excepted; and that the delivery of goods by any vessel from foreign parts be made under similar regulations to those contained in the Merchants' Shipping Act of Great Britain.

The Committee therefore recommend that the Executive Council of the Dominion Board of Trade take measures to have an act passed by the Dominion Parliament with similar provisions as are contained in the Merchants' Shipping Act for the "delivery of goods by vessels from foreign parts, and lien for freight."

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT (Toronto), said the whole commercial community was very much indebted to the Montreal Board of Trade for having brought this subject up. It was one which every merchant was deeply interested in, and he thought this Board could not do wrong in adopting the report.

On motion of Mr. DARLING, seconded by Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL, the report was adopted.

APPOINTMENT OF AVERAGE ADJUSTERS.

Mr. WM. DARLING said the question of the appointment of Average Adjusters had come before the Board on two former occasions, and each time it had approved of their appointment by the Boards of Trade. However, no steps had been taken in that direction. The representatives of the Insurance Companies in Montreal, had sent a very strong recommendation to the Montreal Board of Trade, calling upon them to take immediate action for the appointment of such officers for the port of Montreal. The position in which they were in Montreal just now, so far as the adjustment of averages was concerned, was that the owner of a vessel had the power to demand any amount of deposit he pleased from the owners of goods, and sometimes demands have been so exorbitant, that the owner of the goods preferred to abandon them. The effect of this was, that the goods were practically under the entire control of the agent or owner of the ship. It must be apparent from this state of affairs, that the latter parties were interested in delaying the adjustment as long as possible, because every day they had large sums of money in their possession, subject to interest. The report of the Committee appointed on this subject, was as follows:—

That Boards of Trade in the principal ports of the Dominion of Canada have power to appoint average adjusters, and that they make all general average adjustments on vessels and cargo consigned to such port, unless the owners of the cargo and the owners or agents of the vessel unanimously agree to have the adjustment made by a person not having such appointment.

That the adjuster have the power to fix the amount of deposit to be made in cash by the consignees of the cargo in case of a general average, as well as the power to order the sale of unclaimed and unidentified goods in such quantities and in such a manner, at public auction, as appears to him to be likely to produce the largest sum of money.

That the cash received for general average, as well as the cash received for unclaimed and unidentified goods, be deposited at interest in a chartered Bank in the Dominion, in the joint names of the average adjuster and the agent or owner of the vessel, and disbursed by their joint cheques, the interest being apportioned to the parties entitled to it.

That the Executive Council of the Dominion Board of Trade take measures to have an Act passed by the Dominion Parliament, giving power to Boards of Trade to appoint such average adjusters at the principal ports in the Dominion.

Mr. DARLING then moved the adoption of the Report.

Mr. ROBT. MARSHALL, in seconding the motion for adoption, said that he cordially endorsed the remarks of Mr. Darling, and heartily approved of the appointment of Average Adjusters by the Boards of Trade. At the same time, he must say that in St. John, at present, the underwriters were entirely unrepresented in the Board of Trade, and if the power of appointing these adjusters was to be given to Boards of Trade, he thought it would be necessary that underwriters should be represented at such Boards.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN (Montreal), said he was sorry to be obliged to differ from his friend Mr. Darling, as to the remedy he proposed for what was probably an inconvenience. The duties of an Average Adjuster required considerable professional knowledge; and a good deal of

injustice might be perpetrated, if the party exercising that office did not possess the proper qualifications or experience. The difficulty in his mind was, that even though the appointment was in the hands of so respectable a body as the Board of Trade, yet it might happen that parties would be appointed who were not competent for the work. In England the services performed by an Average Adjuster were left to the owner, generally speaking, of the ship, who was a competent party to deal with the subject. If any safeguards were required for the protection of other parties, he would be very glad to see them provided,—but not by taking the work out of the hands of the parties to whom, by the consent of the largest shipping nation in the world, it properly belonged.

After some remarks from Mr. Darling, the motion was carried on the following division :

Ayes. — Messrs. Brown, Clemow, Cowan, Cunningham, Darling, Elder, Elliott, Findlay, Harding, Hughes, Jarvis, Marshall, McDougall, MacPherson, Pennock, Robertson, Rowland, Shorey, Skead, Sproul, Tourville, Waterman, White.—23.

Nays.—Messrs. Cramp, Fry, Joseph, Magor, McLennan, Millar, Oille, Woods, Wylie.—9.

EXEMPTION FROM MUNICIPAL TAXATION.

Mr. A. WOODS (Quebec), in calling the attention of the Board to this subject, said that in a previous discussion it had been stated, that it was not desirable any class should be subject to special taxation. The point he wished to urge on the present occasion was, that no class should be exempt from taxation. He maintained that the active business portion of the population had heavier burdens imposed upon them, in consequence of the large class of real estate that was entirely exempt from taxation. He begged to submit the following resolution :—

“ That exemption from municipal taxation of any class of real estate, is vicious in principle ; and this Board expresses the opinion, that Government should discourage such, particularly by the abrogation of such Act or Acts as may establish a right to exemption on the part of the Government for property owned by it.”

He would merely say, in explanation of his resolution, that the result he contemplated was, that the Government would allow the various municipalities to tax Government property. That course had been followed in England, by the statute recently passed ; and now the property owned by the Government in the different municipalities throughout the United Kingdom, was subject to the same municipal taxation as all other property. He thought the justice of this arrangement was apparent. The Government property, of course, enjoyed the benefit of all the expenditure made by municipalities for public improvements, and therefore it was only right that the whole country, as represented by the Government, should pay the ordinary tax upon such property. For instance, in the city of Quebec, they had a custom house, which would be almost inaccessible, if it were

not for the improvements that the Corporation had effected. The city of Quebec especially suffered very severely from the great number of exemptions from municipal taxation. At least 17½ per cent. of the whole taxable property of the city, was owned by ecclesiastical corporations, and consequently exempt from taxation; and he was satisfied that about 15 per cent. more was also exempt, in consequence of its being owned by the Government. The result was, that about one-third of the real estate within the city was entirely exempt from taxation, and of course, the remaining two-thirds had to bear all the heavier burden.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), seconded the motion.

Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto), said he hoped the Board would not for a moment allow such a resolution to pass. It was bringing up a matter which had created considerable irritation and discussion throughout the country. This Board of Trade was not organized for the purpose of inquiring directly into ecclesiastical or political matters. He thought that the question should be left to the municipalities to deal with as they deemed fit, but should not be touched by this Board at all.

The PRESIDENT said if this matter was to be discussed at all, it must be done from a purely business point of view. If questions of religion or politics were to be introduced, it would be better not to discuss the question.

Mr. ROBT. MARSHALL (King's Co., N.B.), cordially supported the resolution.

Mr. P. R. JARVIS (Stratford), also supported the resolution, and observed that the amount of property now exempt from taxation throughout the country was enormous, and of course the more property that was exempt, the greater was the burden upon the taxable property. He hoped an Act would be passed without delay, giving municipalities the right to tax Government property.

Mr. G. M. MILLAR (Montreal), said he did not consider this was the place for the discussion of a question of this sort, and would therefore vote against the resolution.

Mr. HENRY CUNNINGHAM (Kingston), supported the resolution. He said he had the privilege of attending the Assessment Convention in Toronto some two years ago, and at that meeting, which was composed of representatives from the various municipalities throughout the Province, a resolution was unanimously adopted, requesting the Government to enact such legislation as would empower the municipalities to subject all property within their limits to taxation. This was a question of vital importance, because of the large amounts of property that were now exempt, and the taxes which should be paid on them had to be paid upon other property.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr. (Montreal), said he proposed to vote against the resolution without expressing any opinion at all about it. It seemed to him that the questions which should properly come before this Board, were

those which might with propriety come before the Dominion Parliament. This was a purely municipal matter, and he thought the municipalities should be left to deal with it as they pleased.

Mr. WOODS wished to explain that at present the municipalities had no power to tax Government property of any kind, whether it belonged to the Local or the Dominion Governments.

Mr. WHITE : If you confine your resolution to property owned by the Dominion Government, I will go with you.

Mr. HUGHES : So will I.

Mr. WM. ELLIOTT desired to say one word in justification of the proposition to tax Government property. Take, for instance, a city where there was a large amount of Government property, which required a continual outlay from the city authorities, in the way of providing streets and other necessary accommodation. Was it fair that the people of that city should be taxed for the benefit of property which belonged to the whole country? He thought the only fair way would be, for the Government to pay the usual tax upon all their property wherever situated.

The resolution was then modified in accordance with Mr. White's suggestion, and made to read as follows :

That the Government should abrogate such Act or Acts as may establish a right to exemption, on the part of the Government, for property owned by it.

The motion, as modified, was carried.

TONNAGE DUES.

Mr. JAMES WYLIE, (Hamilton), moved the following resolution :—

"That this Board urge strongly upon the Dominion Government the advisability of taking immediate action with a view to inducing the Government of the United States to remove the present yearly tax levied upon Canadian tonnage trading to American ports."

He observed that American vessels trading to Canadian ports, were not required to pay any tonnage dues; and he thought it was unfair that Canadian vessels, when they went to American ports, should be obliged to pay 30 cents a ton, as was the case now. It was not merely the amount of the tax that was objected to, but the master of a vessel was very often put to a great deal of annoyance. In some ports of the United States, they demanded that the vessel should be re-registered, because they would not accept a certificate of registration from Canada, as they measure vessels in a different way from what we do. In such cases a fee of \$20 was frequently charged for re-measuring the vessel; and in addition to this, of course tonnage dues had to be paid. He did not approve of this country placing itself in a begging position towards the United States; but he thought it was only fair that we should have a little reciprocity in this matter.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), seconded the resolution, which was carried.

UNIFORM INSURANCE POLICIES.

The PRESIDENT suggested that in conformity with the recommendation in the report made at a previous session, the Executive Council be instructed to appoint a Committee for continuing the correspondence with Insurance Companies,—the Secretary of this Board to be Convener of such Committee, as Montreal was the most convenient point from which to conduct correspondence.

Agreed to.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Harding has presented some figures respecting the Imports and Exports from the United States, as indicating the values according to American and Canadian returns respectively, which I think would be very valuable in our report. Is it your pleasure that they be incorporated in the report of the proceedings of this Board?

Agreed to.

The following is the statement:

FISCAL YEAR ENDING 30TH JUNE, 1874.

Goods entered for consumption in Canada, imported from the United States, per Canadian Returns.....	\$54,279,749
Goods exported to Canada from United States, per United States Returns..	47,095,157
Difference in favor of Canada.....	\$7,184,592
Goods imported from Canada per United States Returns.....	\$38,158,004
Goods exported to United States per Canadian Returns.....	34,316,128
Difference in favor of United States.....	\$3,841,876
Aggregate trade between Canada and United States, per Canadian Returns.	\$88,595,877
Aggregate trade between Canada and United States, per U. S. Returns.....	85,253,161
Difference in favor of Canada.....	\$3,342,716

AN EXPLANATION.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., from the Committee on Order of Business, presented their fifth report, as follows:

A question having arisen as to the accuracy of a paragraph in the paper submitted by the Secretary, on the subject of the establishment of a Department of Commerce to be presided over by a Cabinet Minister, and the subject having been submitted to your Committee, they have examined the evidence upon which the statement was made, and beg to report as follows:—

The paragraph the accuracy of which is challenged, is as follows:—

“(4.) Had there been a Minister of Commerce in the Canadian Cabinet, the anomaly could not have been allowed to exist, of thousands upon thousands of car-loads of various kinds of Produce passing through Canada from one United States port to another, without let or hindrance,—while punctilious obstructiveness was observed relative to merchandise passing through the United States from one Canadian port to another.”

Your Committee are disposed to think that a misapprehension has arisen from assuming the paragraph to have a special and present application. It is, on the contrary, a general statement referring to the past, and covering a number of years.

Thus in Mr. Patterson's report on the Home and Foreign Trade of the Dominion for 1869, occurs the following :

"A shipment of 500 barrels of flour is taxed—1st for frontier charges,—2nd for bond at Portland,—and 3rd, for cancelling the bond at port of destination." * * * * *

"While, on the one hand, the United States Government ever has been and is earnest in its endeavours to protect itself from possible detriment, by fettering and obstructing the transit trade—it is on the other, a proof of the liberality of the Government of Canada, that not the slightest hindrance has been heretofore offered to the freest transit *via* railways or canals. It appears that millions of barrels of flour, millions upon millions of bushels of wheat and other grain, and millions upon millions of feet of lumber have, within the past four years, passed from the Western states, through Canada to the Eastern states, as freely as if the much abused reciprocity treaty were unrepealed and Canadian produce had, as aforesaid, free access to the United States. No keen revenue officer watching to collect an impost of any kind, or so much as making a note of what is passing through for even the casual information of the Government."

In 1872, Mr. Patterson had occasion to apply to a collector of customs for information in relation to goods in transitu from points in the United States to other points across Canadian territory, and after much delay he obtained the information, but only through the freight office of the Railway Company, no statistics on the subject being kept by the customs' officer, and none, therefore, being returned to the Department for compilation among the official statistics.

On the 30th March last the Secretary, by direction of the President and Executive Council, addressed a letter to the Minister of Finance, calling his attention to a number of subjects. In this letter was the following statement :—

"Indeed, the President and Council have some evidence at present before them, tending to show that much of the Commerce on Railways (especially *through* traffic) is carried on without the Government's having any definite knowledge of its variety and quantity. They believe especially that a great deal of *through* traffic in bond, on United States account, passes unchecked or unregistered, (so far as the interests of Government are concerned) and unmolested by customs or other official charges; while the traffic in bond passing through the United States from one part of Canada to another is onerously and vexatiously hampered and impeded."

In the reply to this letter, the Minister through his Secretary, did not in any way challenge the accuracy of this statement, but on the contrary impliedly acknowledged its correctness by saying that some of the subjects mentioned in the letter were already engaging the attention of the Government.

Your Committee have ascertained that the charge of "punctilious obstructiveness" by the United States on goods passing *in transitu* through their territory, unfortunately is still only too true.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed,) THOMAS WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

On the subject of a proposal to amend the Constitution of this Board, Mr. G. A. DRUMMOND (Montreal), moved, seconded by Mr. THOS. CRAMP, (Montreal), as follows :

"That a Special Committee consisting of Messrs. Henry Fry, Wm. Darling, John

Mc
to
Tr
a v

Jo
otl
in
Of
Sc

Se

A.
the
room
atte

McLennan, Wm. Pennock, W. F. Findlay, with the mover and seconder, be appointed to revise Articles 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, of the Constitution of the Dominion Board of Trade, and to propose such amendments to the same in accordance with Article 10, with a view of their being considered and dealt with at next annual meeting."

Motion carried.

ELECTION OF OFFICE-BEARERS.

The PRESIDENT: I received a letter from Mr. Fairweather, of St. John, stating that illness in his family prevented him from leaving home, or otherwise he would have been present at this meeting. The next business in order, and the last to be transacted at this meeting, is the election of Office-bearers. I will request Mr. Harding and Mr. Darling to act as Scrutineers of Elections.

Nominations having been made, and ballots taken in each case, the Scrutineers reported the following as duly elected:—

President.

C. H. FAIRWEATHER, Esq., St. John, N.B.

Vice-Presidents.

ADAM BROWN, Esq., Hamilton, Ont.
 ANDREW ROBERTSON, Esq., Montreal, Q.
 ROBERT MARSHALL, Esq., King's Co., St. John, N.B.
 Hon. W. J. STAIRS, Halifax, N.S.
 Hon. G. W. HOWLAN, Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Executive Council.

HENRY FRY, Esq., Quebec, Q.
 W. H. HOWLAND, Esq., Toronto, Ont.
 WM. DARLING, Esq., Montreal, Q.
 WM. PENNOCK, Esq., Ottawa, Ont.
 J. A. HARDING, Esq., St. John, N.B.
 JOHN MCLENNAN, Esq., Montreal, Q.
 A. JOSEPH, Esq., Quebec, Q.
 HENRY CUNNINGHAM, Esq., Kingston, Ont.

RESOLUTIONS OF THANKS, &c.

Moved by Mr. THOMAS WHITE, Jr., (Montreal), seconded by Mr. A. JOSEPH, (Quebec), and unanimously resolved:

"That the thanks of the Dominion Board of Trade be conveyed to the Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons, for his courtesy in allowing the Board the use of rooms for its meetings; and also to the Sergeant-at-arms for many acts of kind attention."

Moved by Dr. L. S. OILLE (St. Catherines), seconded by Mr. P. HUGHES (Toronto), and carried unanimously :—

“That this Board expresses the gratification it has derived from the presence at its deliberations of Philo Parsons, Esq., of Detroit, Mich., as the representative from the National Board of Trade of the United States, to this Board.”

Mr. Parsons acknowledged the compliment in a few well-chosen remarks

Moved by Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec), seconded by Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), and carried :

“That the President be authorized to nominate delegates to the forthcoming meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain.”

Mr. Henry Fry having temporarily taken the chair, it was moved by Mr. ADAM HOPE (Hamilton), seconded by Hon. JAMES SKEAD (Ottawa), and carried by acclamation :

“That the cordial and hearty thanks of the Dominion Board of Trade are hereby tendered to W. H. Howland, Esq., for the admirable and impartial manner in which he has discharged the duties of President.”

Mr. Howland briefly returned thanks to the Board.

Moved by Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.), seconded by Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (King's Co., N.B.), and carried unanimously :

“That the thanks of the Dominion Board of Trade are heartily due, and are hereby tendered to the delegates of the Ottawa Board of Trade, for their cordial hospitality extended to the members of this Board.”

Hon. Mr. SKEAD acknowledged the compliment in the name of his co-delegates.

Dr. OILLE asked whether it would be in order to introduce a complimentary vote respecting the Secretary. Being answered in the affirmative, he moved as follows :

“That the thanks of this Board are due to the Secretary, Mr. Wm. J. Patterson, for his efficient services in connection with the arduous duties of his office.”

The PRESIDENT said: I feel very great pleasure, Mr. Patterson, in conveying to you the thanks of this Board, for your very great services; and I can say with entire truth, from my own experience, that the success of the Dominion Board of Trade is mainly due to the unselfish energy and real ability which you have brought to bear on its interests in your capacity of Secretary.

The Secretary acknowledged the great kindness of the Board.

The President then declared the Fifth Annual Meeting adjourned.

Act
Adc
Affi
Am
App
App
Ass

Ave
Aye

Bay
Bell

Boal

Boar
Brov

By-I

Cans
Cans
Cans
Cans
Char
Char
Chie

INDEX.

	PAGE.
Action of Government on Important Questions - - - - -	10
Address (Opening) of President Howland - - - - -	34
Affiliated Boards, a word to - - - - -	19
Amendments to Constitution - - - - -	174
Appointment of Standing and Special Committees - - - - -	21
Appointment of Inspectors,—a change needed - - - - -	111
Association of Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain, Delegates to Autumn Meeting - - - - -	37
Average Adjusters, Appointment of, - - - - -	169
Ayes and Nays on Questions:	
Average Adjusters - - - - -	170
Extradition Treaty, proposal to extend - - - - -	101
Iron Interest - - - - -	149
Past Presidents, status of - - - - -	41, 42
Reciprocity Treaty, Draft - - - - -	77, 81, 82, 88, 97, 98
Stamp Act, proposed Repeal of - - - - -	141, 142
Telegraph Monopolies - - - - -	68, 69
Tobacco, Duties on Native - - - - -	147
Winter Navigation of River St. Lawrence - - - - -	153
Bay Verte Canal, progress respecting - - - - -	12
Belleau, I. N., remarks on:	
Fire and Life Insurance - - - - -	104
Inspection of Fish - - - - -	108, 109
Reciprocity Treaty - - - - -	97
Boak, Robert, Jr., remarks on:	
Inspection of Fish - - - - -	110
Repeal of Stamp Duties - - - - -	136
Boards of Trade, General Law to Establish - - - - -	18
Brown, Adam, remarks on:	
Excessive Charges by Express Companies - - - - -	144
Harbor Charges at Montreal - - - - -	126
Inaccuracy of Official Statistics - - - - -	20
Reciprocity Treaty - - - - -	71, 76, 89
Report on Credentials - - - - -	108
Telegraph Monopolies - - - - -	59, 63, 68
Tribunals of Commerce - - - - -	51
Welland Canal Enlargement - - - - -	161
By-Laws, Committee on - - - - -	20
Canadian and U. S. Statistics, differences in, - - - - -	173
Canadian Tonnage and Mr. Plimsoll's Bill - - - - -	12
Canadian Waters, Wrecks in - - - - -	115
Canal Enlargement - - - - -	10, 12
Canals, Preference of Entry to certain Vessels - - - - -	165
Charges (Excessive) by Express Companies - - - - -	143
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Chamber of Commerce, Letter from - - - - -	33
Chief Engineer's (Mr. Page) Circular on Canal Enlargement - - - - -	11

	PAGE.
Clemow, Francis, remarks on :	
Excessive Charges by Express Companies - - - - -	143
Gauging Liquids - - - - -	148
Iron Interest - - - - -	148
Welland Canal Enlargement - - - - -	159
Coasting Trade, International Arrangements for - - - - -	12
Commerce, Tribunals of, — Paper on - - - - -	49
Commercial Travellers' Association - - - - -	167
Committee on Insolvency—Report - - - - -	142
Common Carriers, Duties and Liabilities of - - - - -	167
Considerations in Favor of a Dominion Department of Commerce - - - - -	42
Constitution, Amendments to, - - - - -	174
Cowan, Thomas, remarks on :	
Excessive Charges by Express Companies - - - - -	145
Harbor Charges at Montreal - - - - -	126
Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade - - - - -	57
Past Presidents, status of - - - - -	41
Reciprocity Treaty - - - - -	77, 81
Repeal of Stamp Duties - - - - -	139
Craig, William, remarks on :	
Fire and Life Insurance - - - - -	108
Preference of Entry in Canals - - - - -	165, 166
Reciprocity Treaty - - - - -	74, 82, 89
Cramp, Thomas, remarks on :	
Harbor Charges at Montreal - - - - -	123, 125
Credentials, Committee on - - - - -	22, 34, 135
Cunningham, Henry, remarks on :	
Exemption from Municipal Taxation - - - - -	171
Gauging Liquids - - - - -	147
Past Presidents, status of - - - - -	41
Telegraph Monopolies - - - - -	67
Customs Regulations - - - - -	166
Darling William, remarks on :	
Appointment of Average Adjusters - - - - -	169
Customs Regulations, - - - - -	166
Disallowed Bills of Exchange, - - - - -	146
Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	123
Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade, - - - - -	56
Preference of Entry in Canals, - - - - -	166
Repeal of Stamp Duties, - - - - -	137, 141
Rights and Liabilities of Common Carriers, - - - - -	58, 59, 168
Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	52
Welland Canal Enlargement, - - - - -	158
Deck Loads, - - - - -	126
Defect in the Pilotage Law, - - - - -	17
Delegate from U. S. National Board of Trade, - - - - -	70
Department of Commerce in Dominion Government, - - - - -	42
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Letter from, - - - - -	17
DeVeber, R. S., Delegate to Newcastle-on-Tyne, - - - - -	37
Disallowed Bills of Exchange, - - - - -	146
Discussion on Draft Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	70—99
Dominion Telegraph Company, Letter from, - - - - -	33
" " " Vote of thanks to, - - - - -	167
Dougall, James, remarks on :	
Excessive Charges by Express Companies, - - - - -	145
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	81, 90
Welland Canal Enlargement, - - - - -	157
Winter Navigation of River St. Lawrence, - - - - -	151
Draft Reciprocity Treaty, Text of the, - - - - -	28

INDEX.

179

PAGE.		PAGE.
	Drummond, George A , remarks on :	
	Amendment of Constitution, - - - - -	174
	Conditions in Insurance Policies, - - - - -	106
143	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	78
148	Repeal of Stamp Duties, - - - - -	141
148	Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	60, 63, 68
159	Winter Navigation of River St. Lawrence, - - - - -	153
12	Dufresne, A., remarks on :	
49	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	88, 92, 95
167	Duties and Liabilities of Common Carriers, - - - - -	168
142	Duties on Native Tobacco, Repeal of, - - - - -	147
167	Duties on Ship-building Materials, - - - - -	147
42	Duties, Stamp, Repeal of, - - - - -	135
174	Elliott, William, remarks on :	
	Appointment of Inspectors, change needed, - - - - -	112
145	Duties and Liabilities of Common Carriers, - - - - -	168
126	Exemption from Municipal Taxation - - - - -	172
57	Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	121, 124, 126
41	Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	110
77, 81	Past Presidents, Status of, - - - - -	39, 40
139	Stamp Duties, Repeal of, - - - - -	139
108	Uniformity of Conditions in Insurance Policies, - - - - -	105
165, 166	Welland Canal, Enlargement of, - - - - -	159
4, 82, 89	Elder William, remarks on :	
	A Dominion Department of Commerce, - - - - -	46, 49
123, 125	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	76, 77
34, 135	Election of Office-Bearers for 1875 - - - - -	175
	Enlargement of Canadian Canals, - - - - -	10, 153
171	Entry, Preference of, in Canals, - - - - -	165
147	Excessive Rates charged by Express Companies, - - - - -	143
41	Exchange, Disallowed Bills of, - - - - -	146
67	Executive Council, Report of, - - - - -	9
166	Executive Council, replies to Queries on Canal Enlargement, - - - - -	11
	Exemption from Municipal Taxation - - - - -	170
169	Explanation of a Statement by the Secretary, - - - - -	163, 173
166	Extradition Treaty, Extension of, - - - - -	100
146	Finance Committee appointed, and their Reports, - - - - -	21, 86, 163
123	Findlay, W. F., remarks on :	
56	Conditions of Insurance, Uniformity in, - - - - -	107
166	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	98
137, 141	Report of Delegation to Newcastle-on-Tyne, - - - - -	39
59, 168	Fish, Inspection of, - - - - -	108
52	France, Department of Commerce in, - - - - -	45
158	France, Direct Trade with, - - - - -	18, 19
126	Free Postal Delivery in Cities and Towns, - - - - -	10
17	Friendly Relations with Great Britain, United States, and France, - - - - -	18
70	Fry, Henry, remarks on :	
42	Appointment of Inspectors, - - - - -	112
17	Deck Loads, - - - - -	131-133
37	Exemption from Municipal Taxation - - - - -	171
146	Extradition Treaty, Extension of, - - - - -	100
70-99	Finance Reports, - - - - -	86, 87, 163
33	Inaccuracy of Official Statistics, - - - - -	20, 21
167	Inquiry into Marine Disasters, - - - - -	112
	Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	110
145	Iron Interest, - - - - -	148
81, 90	Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade, - - - - -	55
157	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	74
151	Stamp Duties, Repeal of - - - - -	140, 141
28	Tonnage Dues in U. S. Ports - - - - -	172
	Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	53

	PAGE.
Gauging Liquids, - - - - -	147
General Law for facilitating the Establishment of Boards of Trade, - - - - -	18
Gillespie, John, remarks on :	
Commercial Travellers' Association - - - - -	167
Extension of Extradition Treaty, - - - - -	100, 101
Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	124, 125
Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade, - - - - -	55
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	79, 81
Repeal of Stamp Duties, - - - - -	138
Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	62
Welland Canal Enlargement, - - - - -	159
Government Railroads, Management of, - - - - -	161
Great Britain, Department of Commerce in, Proposed, - - - - -	42
Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	121
Harding, J. A., remarks on :	
Deck Loads, - - - - -	126, 134
Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade, - - - - -	56
Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	64
Winter Navigation of Lower St. Lawrence, - - - - -	152
Henry, Robert, remarks on Proposed Repeal of Stamp Duties, - - - - -	138
Hope, Adam, remarks on :	
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	71, 77, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89, 90
Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	52
Howland, W. H. (President) :	
Appointment of Inspectors, - - - - -	111
Opening Address, - - - - -	34
Paper on Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	49
Hughes, Patrick, remarks on :	
Disallowed Bills of Exchange, - - - - -	146
Exemption from Municipal Taxation - - - - -	171, 172
Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	123
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	80, 82, 93
Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	67
Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	51, 53
Welland Canal Enlargement, - - - - -	160
Important Questions, Action of Government on, - - - - -	10
Inaccuracy of Official Statistics, - - - - -	13, 20
Inquiry into Marine Disasters, - - - - -	112
Insolvency, Committee on, - - - - -	22, 142
Insolvency, Legislation respecting, - - - - -	14, 58, 142
Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	108
Inspectors, Appointment of by Boards of Trade, - - - - -	111
Insurance Policies, Uniformity of Conditions in, - - - - -	101, 173
International Arrangements for Coasting Trade, - - - - -	12
Iron Interest, the - - - - -	148
Jarvis, P. R., remarks on :	
Exemption from Municipal Taxation, - - - - -	171
Excessive Rates charged by Express Companies, - - - - -	145
Stamp Duties, Proposed Repeal of, - - - - -	139
Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	54
Joseph, A., remarks on :	
Deck Loads, - - - - -	133
Disallowed Bills of Exchange, - - - - -	146, 147
Extradition Treaty, Extension of, - - - - -	101
Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	124, 126
Insolvency Legislation, - - - - -	58, 59
Iron Interest, The, - - - - -	148
Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade, - - - - -	57

Jos

Leg
Let
Lia
Lig
Liq
Loa

Mag

Mar
Mar
Mar
MarMee
Men
Men
Men
Mill

Ming

Monc
Mont
MorisMuni
Muni
McDe
McGiI
F
I
P
S
T
T

PAGE.		PAGE.
147	Joseph, A., remarks on,— <i>continued</i> :	
18	Question as to Accuracy of a Statement made by the Secretary, -	163, 164
	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	80
167	Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	61, 66
00, 101	Uniformity of Conditions in Insurance Policies, - - - - -	106, 107
24, 125	Legislation on Insolvency, - - - - -	58
55	Letter from Chairman of the Special Committee on Draft Reciprocity Treaty, -	22
79, 81	Liabilities and Duties of Common Carriers, - - - - -	168
138	Light Dues, - - - - -	16
62	Liquids, Gauging of, - - - - -	147
159	Loads, Deck, Dangerous Nature of, - - - - -	126
161		
42		
	Magor James, remarks on :	
121	Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	123
	Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	110
	Management of Government Railways, - - - - -	161
26, 134	Marine Disasters, Inquiry into, - - - - -	112
56	Marine and Fisheries Department, Letter to, regarding Defect in the Pilotage Law	17
64	Marshall, Robert, remarks on :	
152	Appointment of Average Adjusters, - - - - -	169
138	Deck Loads, Dangers arising from, - - - - -	127, 134
	Exemption from Municipal Taxation, - - - - -	171
89, 90	Stamp Duties, - - - - -	137
52	Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	52
	Uniformity of Conditions in Insurance Policies, - - - - -	101, 104, 108
111	Meeting, (Summer) at St. John, N.B., - - - - -	15
34	Memorial to Her Majesty the Queen regarding Light Dues, - - - - -	16
49	Memorial relating to Canadian Tonnage, - - - - -	12
	Memorials, Resolutions, and Reports, disposed of, - - - - -	10
146	Millar, G. M. remarks on :—	
11, 172	Exemption from Municipal Taxation - - - - -	171
123	Proposed Repeal of Stamp Duties, - - - - -	138
82, 93	Welland Canal Enlargement, - - - - -	158
67	Mingaye, W. R., remarks on :	
51, 53	Excessive Rates Charged by Express Companies, - - - - -	144
160	Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	126
	Preference of Entry in Canals - - - - -	165, 166
10	Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	90
13, 20	Stamp Duties, Repeal of, - - - - -	136
112	Telegraph Monopolies - - - - -	67
2, 142	Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	52
8, 142	Monopolies (Telegraph) on Railway Lines - - - - -	59
108	Montreal Harbor Charges - - - - -	121
111	Morison, John, remarks on :	
11, 173	Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	109
12	Municipal By-Laws Obstructing Trade, - - - - -	57
148	Reciprocity Treaty - - - - -	74, 78, 79, 83, 88, 90
	Report of Delegates to Newcastle-on-Tyne, - - - - -	39
	Tribunals of Commerce - - - - -	53
171	Municipal By-Laws Obstructive of Trade, - - - - -	55
145	Municipal Taxation, Exemption from, - - - - -	170
139	McDougall, James—Wrecks in Canadian Waters, - - - - -	120
54	McGillivray, Edward, remarks on :	
	Dominion Department of Commerce, - - - - -	-46
133	Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	124
3, 147	Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	110
101	Past Presidents, Status of, - - - - -	41
4, 126	Stamp duties, - - - - -	140
58, 59	Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	62
148	Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	51
57		

	PAGE.
McLennan, Hugh, Letter from, as Chairman of Reciprocity Committee,	22
McLennan John, remarks on :	
Appointment of Average Adjusters	169
Draft Reciprocity Treaty,	82, 84, 98
Harbor Charges at Montreal,	125
Proposed Repeal of Stamp Duties,	141
Welland Canal Enlargement,	157
Wrecks in Canadian Waters,	120
MacPherson, James, remarks on :	
Reciprocity Treaty,	89, 90, 93
Welland Canal Enlargement,	159
Navigation, Obstruction to, in U. S. Water,	165
Obstruction of Navigation by Delays at Duncan City,	165
Obstruction of Trade by Municipal By-Laws,	55
Office-Bearers for 1875, Election of	175
Official Statistics, Inaccuracy of,	20
Oille, Dr. L. S., remarks on :	
Extension of Extradition Treaty,	101
Preference of Entry in Canals,	166
Reciprocity Treaty	75, 76, 82
Stamp Duties, Repeal of,	139
Welland Canal Enlargement,	153—160
Wrecks in Canadian Waters,	121
Opening Address of the President,	34
Opening of the Sessions,	9
Order of Business, Committee on, and their Reports,	21, 33, 58, 86, 142, 173
Parsons, Philo, (from U.S. National Board of Trade), Reception of,	70
Remarks on Reciprocity Treaty,	98
Do. Welland Canal Enlargement,	161
Vote of Thanks to,	176
Past Presidents, Status of,	39
Patterson, Wm. J., Secretary :	
Paper on Department of Commerce,	42
Paper on Lessening of Liability to Wrecks,	115
Statement Relating to an Alleged Inaccuracy,	164
Pennock, Wm., remarks on :	
Appointment of Inspectors	112
Deck Loads	133
Dominion Department of Commerce	47, 48
Excessive Rates Charged by Express Companies	143, 145
Insolvency Legislation	58
Inspection of Fish	109
Past Presidents, Status of	39
Proposed Repeal of Stamp Duties	140
Reciprocity Treaty	73, 74
Telegraph Monopolies	62, 63 66
Tribunals of Commerce	53
Uniformity of Conditions in Insurance Policies	107
Pilotage Law, Defect in	17
Plimsoll's Bill and Canadian Tonnage	12
Postal Delivery, Free, in Cities and Towns	10
Preference of Entry to certain Craft in Canals	165
Proceedings of First Day	9—69
" Second Day	70—134
" Third Day	135—167
" Fourth Day	168—176
Prussia, Ministry of Commerce in	45

Que
Rat
Rea

Reci
Reci
Regi
Rela
Repl
Repc
Repc
Repo
Reso
Rive
Robe
1
1
1
1
1
1
I
S
T
Rout

Sewel
D
D
D
I
W
W
Shehy
Ship B
Shorey
Skead,
Iro
St
Special
Special

Sproul,
Do
Ma
Sta
Tel
Tri
Stairs, F
Stan
Statistic
Summer

Telegrap
Text of l
Thanks,
Tobacco,

PAGE.		PAGE.
22	Queries by Chief Engineer Page about Canal Enlargement	11
	Rates of Postage, reduction in,	10
169	Read, Hon. Robert, remarks on :	
84, 98	Inaccuracy of Official Statistics	21
125	Reciprocity Treaty,	91
141	Telegraph Monopolies,	63, 68
157	Tribunals of Commerce,	52
120	Reciprocity, Special Committee on	15
	Reciprocity Treaty, Draft, Text of,	28, 70
90, 93	Regulations, Customs,	166
159	Relations with Great Britain, United States, and France	18
	Replies to Mr. Page's Queries	11
165	Report of Executive Council to the Board	9
	Report of Delegates to Newcastle-on-Tyne,	37
165	Report of Special Committee on Draft Reciprocity Treaty,	- 22, 23
55	Resolutions, Memorials and Reports disposed of,	10
175	River St Lawrence, Lower, Winter Navigation of,	149
20	Robertson, Andrew, remarks on :	
	Delegation to Newcastle-on-Tyne	37, 39
101	Disallowed Bills of Exchange	146
166	Harbor Charges at Montreal,	124
76, 82	Insolvency Legislation	58, 59, 142
139	Inspection of Fish	108
3-160	Municipal By-Laws obstructing Trade	56
121	Reciprocity Treaty	80, 89
34	Stamp Duties	137
9	Telegraph Monopolies	66
2, 173	Routh, R. T., remarks on Welland Canal Enlargement,	160
	Sewell, E. W., remarks on :	
70	Deck Loads,	123
98	Duties on Native Tobacco, Proposal to Repeal,	147
161	Duties on Ship-building Material,	147
176	Inspection of Fish,	108, 109
39	Welland Canal Enlargement,	157, 158
	Winter Navigation of the Lower St. Lawrence,	149, 151, 153
42	Shehyn, Joseph, Reciprocity Treaty,	79
115	Ship Building Materials, Proposal to Repeal Duties on,	147
164	Shorey, H.,—Tribunals of Commerce,	51
	Skead, Hon. James, remarks on :	
112	Iron Interest, the,	148
133	Stamp Duties, Proposal to Repeal,	141
47, 48	Special Committee, Report of, on Draft Reciprocity Treaty,	15, 23
3, 145	Special Committee on Questions of Rights and Liabilities of Common Carriers,	
58	and Average Adjusters,	58, 168, 169
109	Sproul, F. M., remarks on :	
39	Dominion Department of Commerce,	48
140	Management of Government Railways,	161
73, 74	Stamp Duties, proposal Repeal of,	140
63 66	Telegraph Monopolies,	61, 66
53	Tribunals of Commerce,	54
107	Stairs, Hon. W. J., remarks on :	
17	Stamp Duties, Proposal to Repeal,	135, 141
12	Standing and Special Committees,	21
10	Statistics, Official, Inaccuracies of,	13, 20
165	Summer Meeting at St. John, N.B.,	15
9-69	Telegraph Monopolies,	59
-134	Text of Draft Reciprocity Treaty,	28-32
-167	Thanks, Various Votes of,	39, 167, 175, 176
-176	Tobacco,—proposed Repeal of Duties on Native,	147
45		

	PAGE.
Tonnage Dues in U. S. Ports, - - - - -	172
Tourville, L.,—Customs Regulations, - - - - -	167
Trade with France, - - - - -	18, 19
Trade with the West Indies, - - - - -	10
Travellers (Commercial) Association, - - - - -	167
Treasurer's Statement for Past Year, - - - - -	19
Treaty, Extension of Extradition, - - - - -	100
Tribunals of Commerce, - - - - -	49
Uniformity of Conditions in Insurance Policies, - - - - -	101
United States Government, Proposed Department of Commerce in, - - - - -	44
United States and Canadian Statistics, difference in, - - - - -	173
Various Votes of Thanks, - - - - -	89, 167, 175, 176
Waterman, Isaac, remarks on :	
Excessive Rates charged by Express Companies, - - - - -	145
Gauging of Liquids, - - - - -	148
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	72
Welland Canal, Enlargement of, - - - - -	153
West India Trade, - - - - -	10
Winter Navigation of Lower St. Lawrence, - - - - -	149
White, Thomas, Jr., remarks on :	
Delegates to Newcastle-on-Tyne, - - - - -	39
Dominion Department of Commerce, - - - - -	47
Exemption from Municipal Taxation, - - - - -	171, 172
Extension of Extradition Treaty, - - - - -	100 101
Harbor Charges at Montreal, - - - - -	125
Past Presidents, Status of, - - - - -	40
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 80, 87, 88, 94
Reports on Order of Business, - - - - -	22, 33, 58, 86, 142, 173
Telegraph Monopolies, - - - - -	64, 66, 67, 68
Winter Navigation of the Lower St. Lawrence - - - - -	152
Woods, A., remarks on :	
Disallowed Bills of Exchange, - - - - -	146
Exemption from Municipal Taxation, - - - - -	170, 172
Extension of Extradition Treaty, - - - - -	101
Inspection of Fish, - - - - -	109
Reciprocity Treaty, - - - - -	78, 79, 80, 97
Stamp Duties, - - - - -	126
Word to Affiliated Boards, from the Executive Council - - - - -	19
Wrecks in Canadian Waters - - - - -	115
" occasioned by Deck Loads - - - - -	129—131
Wylie, James, remarks on :	
Obstruction to Navigation by enforced calling at Duncan City - - - - -	165
Reciprocity Treaty - - - - -	83
Tonnage Dues in U. S. Ports, - - - - -	172
Welland Canal Enlargement - - - - -	157

PAGE.
- - 172
- - 167
- - 18, 19
- - 10
- - 167
- - 19
- - 100
- - 49

- 101
- - 44
- - 173

167, 175, 176

- 145
- - 148
- - 72
- - 153
- - 10
- - 149

- 39
- - 47
171, 172
- 100 101
- - 125
- - 40
1, 87, 88, 94
16, 142, 173
66, 67, 68
- 152

- 146
170, 172
- 101
- 109
79, 80, 97
- 126
- 19
115
129—131

165
- 83
172
157