

096
HK 82
e 212

PROCEEDINGS

AT THE

SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE

HELD AT SAINT JOHN, N.B.,

ON 16th and 18th JULY, 1874.

1G1159 31096

MONTREAL :

GAZETTE PRINTING HOUSE, NEARLY OPPOSITE THE POST OFFICE.

1874

BIBLIOTHEQUE DE LA
VILLE DE MONTREAL



COLLECTION
GAGNON

JK82
C212

31096

29

Forme 1580-1-20

DOM

GAZ

PROCEEDINGS

AT THE

SEM-ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE

HELD AT SAINT JOHN, N.B.,

ON 16th and 18th JULY, 1874.

MONTREAL :

GAZETTE PRINTING HOUSE, NEARLY OPPOSITE THE POST OFFICE.

1874

BI
VI

7K
C:

OFFICE-BEARERS OF THE DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE,
FOR 1874.

President :

W. H. HOWLAND, Esq., TORONTO, ONT.

Vice-Presidents :

- C. H. FAIRWEATHER, Esq., ST. JOHN, N.B.
- HON. G. W. HOWLAN, CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.
- CATCAET THOMSON, Esq., HALIFAX, N.S.
- HUGH McLENNAN, Esq., MONTREAL, QUE.
- HON. JAMES SKEAD, OTTAWA, ONT.

Executive Council :

- ANDREW ROBERTSON, Esq., MONTREAL, QUE.
- HON. T. R. JONES, ST. JOHN, N.B.
- WM. PENNOCK, Esq., OTTAWA, ONT.
- WM. HARTY, Esq., KINGSTON, ONT.
- ADAM BROWN, Esq., HAMILTON, ONT.
- HOSPICE LABELLE, Esq., MONTREAL, QUE.
- WILLIAM THOMSON, Esq., TORONTO, ONT.
- A. JOSEPH, Esq., QUEBEC, QUE.

Treasurer :

C. H. GOULD, Esq., MONTREAL.

Secretary :

WILLIAM J. PATTERSON, MONTREAL.

In s
recent m
St. John,
care in r
hope I ha
The
the Repor
view of
Meeting.
The
reprinted
by the H

MONTREAL

OF TRADE,

PREFATORY NOTE.

In submitting the accompanying REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS at the recent meeting of the DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE, held in the City of St. John, N.B., it need only be remarked that I have exercised the utmost care in reproducing the various speeches delivered on the occasion,—and hope I have succeeded in furnishing a faithful record.

The several affiliated Boards are requested to consider carefully the Report of the Special Committee on Insolvency Legislation,—in view of such further action as may be necessary at next Annual Meeting.

The proposed Reciprocity Treaty, as given in the Appendix, is reprinted from a copy most kindly furnished me, since the meeting, by the Hon. George Brown,—for which I beg thus publicly to thank him.

WM. J. PATTERSON,

Secretary Dominion Board of Trade.

MONTREAL, 10th September, 1874.

LIST OF DELEGATES.

PLACE	NAMES OF DELEGATES.
Brantford, Ont.....	George H. Wilkes. A. Hardy. A. Watts.
Charlottetown, P.E.I.....	Hon. G. W. Howland. George Peake.
Galt, Ont.....	Thomas Cowan. Robert Scott.
Hamilton, Ont.....	S. E. Gregory. W. F. Findlay. A. Jamieson.
Joliette, Quebec.....	George Baby, M.P. E. Guilbeault.
Kingston, Ont.....	Wm. Hart. James Shannon.
King's Co., N.B.....	James Donville, M.P. Robert Marshall.
London, Ont.....	Isaac Waterman. Thomas Churcher.
Montreal, Que.....	Wm. Darling. Andrew Robertson. Thomas White, Jr. W. W. Ogilvie. Robert Spratt. Henry A. Budden.
Oshawa, Ont.....	J. S. Larke.
Ottawa, Ont.....	Hon. James Skead. Francis Clemow.
Port Hope, Ont.....	William Craig.
Quebec, Que.....	Henry Fry. A. Joseph. R. B. Dobell. W. J. Keays. F. W. Holmstead.
Sarnia, Ont.....	Wm. Gordon.
Stratford.....	W. H. Murray.
Strathroy, Ont.....	Irving Pool.
St. John, N.B.....	C. H. Fairweather. James A. Harding. Hon. T. R. Jones. Wm. Elder.
Three Rivers, Que.....	John Baptist.
Toronto, Ont.....	W. H. Howland. John Gillespie. W. B. Hamilton. J. M. Trout. James Young. James Dougall. Donald Cameron.
Windsor, Ont.....	

The
 After
 of Membe
 Toronto,)
 I fee
 on this oc
 tion from
 what dou
 the result
 merchants
 so far per
 hear.) I
 John peop
 only to bri
 acter. Th
 parts of t
 assisting t
 the want
 together i
 reference
 out to be
 of the late
 telling us t
 our meetin
 important
 been adopt
 commercia
 the discuss
 happy to s
 right thing
 in case of a

PROCEEDINGS.

BOARD OF TRADE ROOM,
ST. JOHN, N.B., 16th July, 1874.

The DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE met at 12 o'clock, noon.

After the calling of the Roll by the Secretary, so far as the presence of Members had been reported, the PRESIDENT, (W. H. HOWLAND, Esq., Toronto,) rose and said :

I feel great pleasure in noticing the number of Representatives present on this occasion. When the Board determined to accept the kind invitation from St. John to hold an extra Summer Session here, we were somewhat doubtful as to its success,—the distance being so great ; but I am sure the result is gratifying to all of you, and it makes it quite possible for the merchants of Canada in the future, to take trips to other places,—even so far perhaps as British 'Columbia,—and hold a Session there. (Hear, hear.) I think I cannot speak too highly of the invitation which the St. John people have given us to meet them here. Their motives were not only to bring us hither for a summer trip, but were of a higher public character. They thought that by bringing together the merchants from all parts of the Dominion they were doing a great deal towards practically assisting Confederation—removing any differences which may arise from the want of meeting—getting rid of our Provincial lines, and bringing us together in the end as one country and one people. I may say, with reference to the Dominion Board of Trade, that its usefulness has turned out to be much greater than was anticipated. We find on the part both of the late and of the present Government many of its influential members telling us that, without the assistance of the discussions which take place at our meetings, they would have been very much at a loss to determine many important questions ; and the number of the Board's suggestions which have been adopted, proves conclusively that this is the proper method to influence commercial legislation in the interests of the whole country. In regard to the discussion which we had with reference to Commercial Agencies, I am happy to say that Messrs. Dun, Wiman & Co. have commenced to do the right thing, by instructing their agents to accept service all over Canada in case of a suit. I may mention one matter to our friends in the Maritime

Provinces, which I am sure they will attend to,—their representation in the Board is not sufficient. Only St. John, Charlottetown, and Halifax are represented; but, now that we have succeeded in securing the passage of a General Board of Trade Act, enabling every place with over 2,500 population to get a Board of Trade incorporated without any expense whatever, there will be no excuse for any important place in Canada being unrepresented at this Dominion Board at its annual or other meetings. It may be observed here, that hitherto the Executive Council have not rigidly construed that part of the Constitution of the Dominion Board which requires affiliated Boards or Chambers to be incorporated,—in consequence of the expense which might thereby be entailed upon the smaller bodies. I now expect that such of the constituent organizations as are not incorporated or established under special legislation, will be requested to register under the new law. On the part of the Executive Council, I have to give notice of motion that the ex-Presidents shall in future be full members of the body. There are such men as the Hon. John Young, Mr. McGiverin, and Mr. Fry, of Quebec, to whom this would apply. I took the liberty to send an invitation to Mr. Fry, and to try to get one to Mr. Young. It seemed to be very necessary that Mr. Young should be here, as, in the discussion of Reciprocity, the Caughnawaga Canal will probably have the fewest friends; and it is only right that those who have an interest in it should be heard. Another notice of motion will have reference to a Department of Commerce in the Dominion Government. Now, very frequently, we are sent from pillar to post, and from department to department,—and sometimes it is very difficult to have anything fully carried out, just for want of such a portfolio in the Cabinet. I think there should be a department devoted to the interests of commerce, and that there should be men connected with it, able to fully comprehend matters which are brought up. Another notice of motion will relate to Tribunals of Commerce,—considered to some extent at the annual meeting in February last. I may briefly describe them as a system of dealing with commercial cases according to facts and usage of trade. Of course, when we come to test a business transaction at law, if any technical legal point should arise, which interferes with the usage of trade, that usage has no effect; and it is most important that when so large a number of transactions are based upon usage of trade, we should have a ready and cheap method of determining them, instead of the present tedious, and often vexatious process through the courts. I am very happy to inform you that we have received from the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain, a most hearty invitation to send delegates to their Autumnal Meeting in September next, and also a promise that they will endeavor to send delegates to us. I think it extremely important,—in view of the fact that, in some things, we are rather misunderstood on the other side of the Atlantic, and that there are many things in which people are not well acquainted with our circumstances here,—that we should by Delegates be able to represent Canada at the large commercial conventions which they hold every year. We would be able to understand each other better; and

the prop-
be your
to be hel
you instr
how far
could by
us in ind
interests
is likely
the quest
country
discussion
of the n
generally
regarding
necessary
the Dom
influence
with tru
concerns
side of
important
destructiv
character
deal with
feeling, t
before us
generation
term of
treaty wil
away, we
nected wi
sion of its
the news
assumed
of the cas
is, the en
to by the
that as so
should tal
Welland
is the en
treaty,—i
out. Anot
the constr
ment and
conditions

representation in
and Halifax are
the passage of a
over 2,500 popula-
expense whatever,
la being unrepres-
ectings. It may
have not rigidly
Board which re-
—in consequence
e smaller bodies.
as are not incor-
be requested to
re Council, I have
ture be full mem-
John Young, Mr.
ld apply. I took
to get one to Mr.
; should be here,
nal will probably
; who have an in-
ill have reference
ent. Now, your
tment to depart-
fully carried out,
there should be
that there should
atters which are
als of Commerce,
February last. I
commercial cases
we come to test a
ould arise, which
effect; and it is
actions are based
cheap method of
often vexatious
rm you that we
merce of Great
their Autumnal
will endeavor to
a view of the fact
other side of the
ple are not well
by Delegates be
itions which they
ther better; and

the proposed interchange would be most desirable in every sense. It will be your duty, therefore, to appoint delegates to the forthcoming meeting to be held at Newcastle-on-Tyne two months hence. I would suggest that you instruct your delegates to sound the Chambers of Commerce, and see how far they would co-operate with us as to a Canadian Lloyd's. We could by this means at once ascertain practically whether they would assist us in independent action of that kind, whenever we find it necessary in the interests of the country. I shall deal lightly with a question which is likely to be of very considerable importance before you this Session—the question of Reciprocity. There is no doubt that the people of this country are looking with a great deal of attention and anxiety to the discussion at this Board on that subject. There has been no public discussion of the matter, nor public meeting in regard to it, so far; and people generally have not made up their minds definitely one way or another regarding the proposed Treaty which has been made public. It will be necessary for you to remember that whatever action may be taken by the Dominion Board of Trade at this time, is likely to have an important influence in shaping the action of the country on that question. I can say with truthfulness that, as far so the Dominion Board of Trade is concerned, up to this time it would be impossible to tell to what side of politics members belong (bear, bear); and it is especially important that we continue to keep up that character. It would be destructive to the influence of the Board in the future to lose that valuable characteristic; and it is more of a duty at the present moment to see that we deal with this question on broad public grounds, and free from political feeling, than probably in regard to any other question which could come before us. This is a national question, and we are legislating for another generation than that which is here. When, therefore, we consider the term of years which is involved, and that the men who are framing this treaty will, probably, before it can come fairly into operation, have passed away, we should not allow any feeling as to whoever may be officially connected with the making of the treaty, to interfere with the fairest discussion of its terms. I may correct an error which has crept into some of the newspapers as to the price to be paid for the treaty. It is generally assumed in the Maritime Province newspaper press that the enlargement of the canals is something which is being given for the treaty. The fact is, the enlargement of the St. Lawrence and Welland Canals was agreed to by the Provincial delegates before Confederation. It was understood that as soon as the circumstances of the country allowed, the enlargement should take place; and the contracts have already been all let on the Welland Canal and partially on the St. Lawrence Canals, so that not only is the enlargement of the canals not a part of the price paid for the treaty,—it was agreed to before Confederation and is now being carried out. Another point on which misunderstanding has arisen is in reference to the construction of the Baie Verte Canal, which has been ordered by Parliament and must also be carried out. There are some points in the conditions of the treaty as we have them which, I think, it is very necessary

for us to consider most seriously and to deal with carefully. For instance, there is the fact as it seems to stand at present, that Great Britain has agreed to this treaty, and I believe our people have also agreed to it as it stands,—while the Americans have the right to amend and alter. I think it should come from this Board in the strongest and most definite terms, that any right of that kind should be mutual, and that we should have as much right to alter or amend the treaty (if it is to be subject to alteration) as the United States of America. (Hear, hear.) There is another point also which, if it came to amendment, could be properly altered, and which on the face of it is unfair; that is, the reduction of the duties in the proportion of a third every year. When their duty is over 50 per cent. and ours 17½ per cent., in two years they will practically be entering Canada free, while we shall be paying almost as much as they have ever been paying. Another point on which I think this Board ought to speak strongly, is the postponement of the arbitration on the value of the fisheries during these negotiations. There is no reason why it should not go on, and every reason why it should not be stopped. There may, possibly, never be a treaty; and the result of a postponement of proceedings for a year or a year and a half may be serious. Arrangements have been made for an arbitration; and I think it should come as an emphatic opinion from this Board, that arbitration should be proceeded with without reference to the contemplated treaty. You have in your hands this session most serious important work. You have, therefore, the power of influencing the country to the largest extent on a question in which the greatest interest is taken. In conclusion,—with reference to this subject, I must remind you that this Board has again and again declared in favor of Reciprocity covering the old treaty, and anything to the contrary would be stultifying the deliberate action taken in the past. The shape in which this matter will probably come before you will be the consideration of any additions to or alterations of the old treaty—the principle being already acknowledged. I hope you will avoid generalizing on the question, and that you will be particular, and direct, and positive, on the points to which you speak; and I am sure that in that way we will be able to arrive at a fair and impartial decision on the question, which will probably be accepted by the country at large as the true one. (Applause).

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., (Montreal), moved :

"That during the present adjourned session of the Dominion Board of Trade, no written papers be received or read on any subject."

Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL, (St. John) seconded the motion.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto)—I hope the portion of the resolution proposing not to "receive" will be struck out, because the receiving of papers will not take up any time; and it might be discourteous to refuse to receive them, when it would not occupy the time of the Board, or militate against its proceedings.

Mr. V
The princ
encourage
discussion
in the form
time was t
space in c
character,
Mr. MARSH
vailing in l
ber that we
whelming k
practice m

Hon.
viding that
the Secrets

Mr. W

Hon. M
kind when y

The P

The res

Mr. C.
occupying s

"That ot
tering upon th

Motion

The PR
had just ad
been printed

Reciprocal
Trade—Canals.

Trade betw
The Manuf

The Baie V

The propos

Uniformity

Intimate I

Appointment of

General La

Dominion Boar

of Parliament.

carefully. For
 present, that Great
 have also agreed
 amend and alter.
 and most definite
 l that we should
 to be subject to
 hear.) There is
 properly altered,
 n of the duties in
 over 50 per cent.
 entering Canada
 have ever been
 to speak strongly,
 a fisheries during
 go on, and every
 ibly, never be a
 gs for a year or a
 een made for an
 opinion from this
 out reference to
 sion most serious
 ing the country to
 rest is taken. In
 nd you that this
 covering the old
 of the deliberate
 tter will probably
 s to or alterations
 ledged. I hope
 will be particular,
 ; and I am sure
 impartial decision
 untry at large as

Mr. WHITE—I think we had better adopt the resolution as I moved it. The principle of written papers in a deliberative body is not one we should encourage at any time. We have the opportunity of stating in ordinary discussion the views of members; and it is far better that they should come in the form of ordinary debate. Last Session at Ottawa, a great deal of time was taken up in the reading of papers. They take up too much space in our published reports; they are generally theoretical in their character, and very few are of practical value, though there was one from Mr. MARSHALL which was of interest to the Board. I think the rule prevailing in Parliament should be the rule at our meetings. When we remember that we have very little time for discussion at all,—owing to the overwhelming kindness of our friends of St. John,—we should discourage the practice more than ever.

Hon. G. W. HOWLAN (P. E. Island)—Is there not a by-law providing that no paper shall be read without a specified notice being given to the Secretary?

Mr. WHITE—It has been generally disregarded.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—I do not see how you can put a resolution of this kind when you have a by-law which covers the same ground.

The PRESIDENT—The motion is strictly in order.

The resolution was then carried.

Mr. C. H. FAIRWEATHER (St. John)—The question of reciprocity occupying so much attention, I move

“That other questions on the notice paper be taken up and disposed of before entering upon the discussion of the proposed Reciprocity Treaty.”

Motion seconded, and carried.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT said, in giving effect to the resolution which the Board had just adopted, he would first read the notices of subjects which had been printed in the official circular, as follows:—

Reciprocal Trade Relations with the United States—The Fisheries—Coasting Trade—Canals.

Trade between the Dominion and the West Indies, &c.

The Manufacturing, Mining, and Commercial Interests of the Maritime Provinces.

The Baie Verte Canal.

The proposed New Bankruptcy Law.

Uniformity of Conditions in Insurance Policies.

Intimate Relations with the British Association of Chambers of Commerce—

Appointment of Delegates to the Autumn Meeting at Newcastle-on-Tyne.

General Law for organizing Boards of Trade in Canada. Boards affiliated with the Dominion Board of Trade to be registered under that Law, or instituted by special Act of Parliament.

Board of Trade, no

tion.

of the resolution
 the receiving of
 urteous to refuse
 of the Board, or

The question of "Trade between the Dominion and the West Indies," was then called.

The PRESIDENT—If there is no gentleman who has come specially to discuss this subject, or any other one I may read, they can be passed.

Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr.—With the understanding that they may be gone back to?

The PRESIDENT.—Certainly.

This question, and "The Manufacturing, Mining, and Commercial Interests of the Maritime Provinces," were passed over for the time.

THE BAIE VERTE CANAL.

The Baie Verte Canal was the next question open for discussion.

Mr. C. H. FAIRWEATHER, (St. John, N.B.)—I beg to move, seconded by Hon. T. R. JONES, this resolution—

"That this Board reaffirms its previously expressed opinion in reference to the great importance of the Baie Verte Canal, and is of opinion that it should be proceeded with without delay."

The question having been so fully discussed at previous meetings, and further, in view of the fact that I have not been able to give sufficient attention to the matter to enable me to express myself properly upon the question, I shall say but a very few words respecting it. You have just remarked, Sir, that in the articles of Confederation,—or rather in the understanding which was arrived at among the parties who promoted Confederation,—the finishing of the enlargement of the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals was a part of that understanding. I am of opinion that the shape which matters have subsequently taken may enable you,—at all events may enable this Board, to estimate the Baie Verte Canal to stand precisely in the same list, and in the same relation. The Canal Commission which was appointed, and upon which the present action of the Government of Canada is based, as I understand it, adopted, after mature consideration, the Baie Verte Canal project as a part of the Canal scheme of the Dominion,—as the complement of the other canals,—as rendering the work perfect and complete; and that having been so, I feel that this Board is justified in giving a strong expression of opinion on this subject—an expression of opinion which would not be necessary were it not that we see delays in making a commencement. It is true the appropriation has been made of half a million of dollars to begin the work; but no commencement has been made,—and why it has not been made we are not informed. There can be no reason apparent to us,—to those who are friends of the measure,—why it should not be set in motion. There may be reasons, and there may be good reasons. I will not impugn the motives of any man in speaking of the subject; but we desire here that steps should be taken at once to commence the work, in order that by

water as w
the Domini

The r

Mr. W
of the sugg
porated in t
Minister of
of changes
Boards of T
taken into c

"That th
Dominion Boe
in the Insolve
of the Boards of
made by Boar
vency Act, sh

After s
suggestions
equally valu
alterations p
larly so,—ne
in Council in
other propos
to them now
committee.

Hon. T
the motion.
duous-task at
Dominion wa
legal talent i
ined, and I
Committee, a
new Act. A
matters agair
induced to ac
opinion of the
sary, whereas
ing law. The
once; and is it
ally to have
ly new act?

At the st
placed on the

water as well as by rail we may be in communication with the other parts of the Dominion.

The resolution was carried.

THE PROPOSED NEW INSOLVENCY LAW.

Mr. WM. DARLING (Montreal)—It will have been noticed, that many of the suggestions made by this Board at its last meeting have been incorporated in the bill introduced at the recent session of Parliament by the Minister of Justice; other suggestions have been omitted, while a number of changes have been made which were not asked for by any of the Boards of Trade. These alterations and omissions ought, I think, to be taken into consideration, and I therefore submit the following motion:—

“That the Committee who made the report on Insolvency at the last meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade be again appointed to take into consideration the alterations in the Insolvency Law proposed by the Minister of Justice, and not suggested by any of the Boards of Trade; and also to consider whether any of the suggestions that were made by Boards of Trade, and which have not been introduced into the proposed Insolvency Act, should be again pressed upon the notice of the Government by this Board.”

After a good deal of reflection, I feel convinced that many of the suggestions of this Board which were not incorporated in the Bill are equally valuable with those which have been adopted,—while some of the alterations proposed in the bill are objectionable. One of them is particularly so,—namely, the appointment of Official Assignees by the Governor in Council instead of by Boards of Trade (hear, hear). There are many other proposed changes that require consideration, but I need not advert to them now, because they will receive the attention of the proposed committee.

Hon. T. R. JONES (St. John)—I have great pleasure in seconding the motion. The special Committee on this subject performed a most arduous task at the recent annual meeting of this Board. Every section of the Dominion was represented, and it also had the benefit of some of the best legal talent in the country. Every clause of the Act was carefully examined, and I am sorry to find so many of the suggestions made by that Committee, and endorsed by the whole Board, not embodied in the proposed new Act. At the same time, if the Committee is re-appointed, and these matters again brought under the notice of the Government, they may be induced to accept many, if not all of the suggestions. It seems to be the opinion of the present Administration that a *new* Bankruptcy Act is necessary, whereas this Board, last winter, was in favor of amending the existing law. The fact is that bankruptcy legislation cannot be perfected at once; and is it not much better to improve our law gradually, than periodically to have everything turned upside down by the adoption of an entirely new act?

At the suggestion of Mr. HARTY, Mr. James Shannon (Kingston) was placed on the Committee instead of Mr. Carruthers, who was absent. Mr.

Keays (Sarnia) was, at the suggestion of Hon. Mr. Jones, added to the Committee.

The motion was then carried,—the Committee being as follows :—

ANDREW ROBERTSON, Montreal, *Convener*.
 HON. T. R. JONES, St. John, N.B.
 FRANCIS CLEMOW, Ottawa
 JAMES SHANNON, Kingston
 J. M. TROUT, Toronto
 W. F. FINDLAY, Hamilton
 ISAAC WATERMAN, London
 GEORGE BABY, Joliette, Q.
 A. JOSEPH, Quebec
 CATHCART THOMSON, Halifax, N.S.
 WM. DARLING, Montreal.
 JAMES A. HARDING, St. John, N.B.
 W. J. KEAYS, Sarnia.

INTIMATE RELATIONS WITH THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION OF CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE.—APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES TO THE AUTUMN MEETING AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

The PRESIDENT announced that this subject was next in order on the programme, and thereafter the Secretary read a most cordial letter received by Mr. Fry, from S. S. Lloyd, Esq., M.P., Chairman of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, on the subject of international commercial delegations.

The following extract was also read from an official circular issued by the Secretary of the British Association of Chambers of Commerce :

"I have received a communication from WM. J. PATTERSON, Esq., Secretary of the Dominion Board of Trade, Montreal, stating that a Summer Meeting of their Association will be held at St. John, N.B., commencing probably on Thursday, 16th July, and inviting the attendance of a Deputation from our Chambers of Commerce. I am directed by the Executive Council to enquire whether any gentleman connected with your Chamber is likely to be in Canada about that time, and would be willing to attend as a representative of the Association, and, if so, I shall be obliged by your favouring me with his name. I may add that it is the intention of the Dominion Board of Trade to send a Deputation to our meeting at Newcastle in September, with the view of promoting more intimate relations between the two Associations."

HON. T. R. JONES, (St. John, N.B.,) moved :

"That the President and Executive Council of this Board have power to appoint one or two Delegates, as they may think judicious, to attend the meeting in September next of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain."

The motion was seconded by Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr., (Montreal), and carried.

GENERAL LAW FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF BOARDS OF TRADE.

The PRESIDENT said it was desirable that the provisions of the Act recently passed for the organization of Boards of Trade should be more

generally known for Boards mention its

The Secretary frequently because it is expensive to erect the sub-bill which has taken up a makes provision Dominion has required for members of the original There is no powers of a registered un-Delegates to

The President and Mr.

"The Lieut. of the President accompanying them,—

An invitation Trade, to an Both invi-

On motion

"That the government that when the morning?"

The Board

generally known, so that advantage might be taken of the facilities it affords for Boards to become incorporated; the Secretary would therefore briefly mention its main provisions.

The SECRETARY said it had been found that Boards of Trade had been frequently organized without becoming incorporated; in the first place, because it involved a good deal of trouble; and secondly, because it was expensive to procure a special act of incorporation. The Board had considered the subject on several occasions; and at the February meeting the bill which had failed to pass through Parliament at the previous session was taken up and carefully amended. It has now become law. This act makes provision for the incorporation of Boards of Trade in any place in the Dominion having a population of not less than 2,500. All that is now required for any Board to become incorporated is to appoint Officers and members of Council, and have their names,—together with the names of the original members of the Board,—registered with the Secretary of State. There is no expense involved, and that registration gives the Board all the powers of a specially incorporated body. The act also provides that Boards registered under it may become affiliated with the Dominion Board, and that Delegates to this Board must be appointed at a general meeting.

INVITATION FROM THE LIEUT.-GOVERNOR.

The PRESIDENT announced the following invitation from Lieut.-Governor and Mrs. Tilley:—

"The LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR and Mrs. TILLEY request the pleasure of the company of the President and Members of the Dominion Board of Trade,—and Ladies accompanying them,—at LUNCHEON, on Friday, the 17th inst., at 1 o'clock, p.m."

An invitation had also been received from the St. John Board of Trade, to an excursion to Fredericton to-morrow.

Both invitations were accepted.

RECIPROCITY.

On motion of Mr. THOS. WHITE, Jr. (Montreal), it was resolved:

"That the question of reciprocity be the first order of the day for Saturday; and that when the Board adjourns to-day the adjournment be until 10 o'clock Saturday morning."

The Board was thereafter adjourned.

ETING
 Jones, added to the
 ing as follows:—
 ner.
 OF CHAMBERS OF
 THE AUTUMN MEET-
 next in order on the
 ordial letter received
 an of the Associated
 d commercial delega-
 ial circular issued by
 of Commerce:
 sq., Secretary of the Do-
 of their Association will
 th July, and inviting the
 I am directed by the
 i with your Chamber is
 attend as a representative
 ng me with his name. I
 is to send a Deputation
 romoting more intimate
 ave power to appoint one
 meeting in September
 Jr., (Montreal), and
 RDS OF TRADE.
 provisions of the Act
 trade should be more

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

SATURDAY, 18th July, 1874.

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

The roll was called, and corrected; and the minutes of last meeting were read and confirmed.

MERCANTILE AGENCIES.

The SECRETARY read the following communication from Messrs Dun, Wiman & Co.:

THE MERCANTILE AGENCY,
DUN, BARLOW & Co.,
New York, June 30, 1874.

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

DEAR SIR,—In accordance with a resolution of the Dominion Board of Trade, at its meeting in Ottawa last February, we have authorized the gentlemen whose names we annex, being our managers at the various places in Canada where we have offices, to accept service of legal documents for us, in accordance with a form which all our partners have signed, and which is deposited and open for inspection at our offices in Montreal and elsewhere.

The following are the names of the gentlemen thus authorized to accept service:—

William W. Johnson, Montreal, Que.
Wilbur C. Matthews, Toronto, Ont.
Geo. J. Williams, Hamilton, "
Wm. Hedley, Halifax, N. S.
Augustus P. Rolph, St. John, N. B.

We beg that you will communicate to the Board at its forthcoming meeting in July, our action in this matter.

We are respectfully yours,

DUN, BARLOW & CO.
For Dun, Wiman & Co.

P. S.—We have advised the Secretary of each local Board in the cities where we have offices, of the above facts, and have requested them to satisfy themselves as to the accuracy of the authorization to accept service.

The PR
Board, asked
two matters:

Leave h

Mr. HE
I was very k
Chairman of
deliberations
questions whi
remarks poin
The Committ
in securing th
this Board si
could take str
and charged
matter before
ship-owning p
the facts of t
memorial on t

"That the
ment of the Co
and the Ballast
Trade, to levy d

"That the l
are in the opinio
unjust in principl
borne commoditi
manner.

"That a Roy
referring in thei
reported that—

"The govern
construction, are
which necessaril
branches of scienc

"The Princi
being highly im
entrusted to pers
be centralized;

"That the c
memorialists, be g
Government depts
establishments al
lighthouses in th
collected, is abou
£1,269 per lightc

LIGHT DUES.

The PRESIDENT said that Mr. FRY, (Quebec,) late President of the Board, asked, before the orders of the day were called, to bring forward two matters which it was desirable should be acted upon at this meeting.

Leave having been granted,—

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec) said—When I was in London last winter I was very kindly invited by Mr. Lloyd, the member for Plymouth, and Chairman of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, to take part in the deliberations of that body at the Annual Meeting in London. One of the questions which came up was that of Light Dues, upon which I made a few remarks pointing out the hardship of these dues to Canadian shippers. The Committee appointed by the Associated Chambers were not successful in securing the removal of these dues, and they were very anxious that this Board should take some action in the matter. They thought that we could take stronger ground than they could, as we supported our own lights and charged British shipping nothing for them. I promised to bring the matter before this Board, and it is one that particularly interests so large a ship-owning port as St. John. In order that I may lay before the Board the facts of the case in a concise form, I will read some extracts from a memorial on the subject submitted to the President of the Board of Trade :

“ That the Lighthouses on the coasts of the United Kingdom are in the management of the Corporation of the Trinity House, the Commissioners of Northern Lights and the Ballast Board of Dublin, with powers, subject to the supervision of the Board of Trade, to levy dues on shipping for the maintenance of such lighthouses.

“ That the Light Dues, as at present levied, amount to £406,000 per annum, and are in the opinion of your memorialists unequal in operation and unjust in principle—unjust in principle by reason that, as a tax falling ultimately on the consumers of sea-borne commodities, they are levied indirectly, and in the most expensive and prejudicial manner.

“ That a Royal Commission sat in 1858-61 on the subject of Lighthouses, and after referring in their report to the constitution of the various boards of management, reported that—

“ The government of Lighthouses in the United Kingdom, their management and construction, are all confided to bodies of gentlemen of various employments, none of which necessarily afford them an opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of those branches of science which bear upon Lighthouse illumination.

“ The principal in all foreign countries seems to be that Lighthouse illumination, being highly important, and requiring special knowledge of certain subjects, should be entrusted to persons acquainted with these subjects, and that the government should be centralized;

“ That the cost of maintaining the lighthouses would, in the opinion of your memorialists, be greatly reduced, were they placed under the direct control of one of the Government departments, instead of as at present having separate and expensive establishments almost entirely occupied with their administration. The number of lighthouses in the United Kingdom, for the maintenance of which light dues are collected, is about 230. The expenditure on these in 1870 was £291,872, or equal to £1,269 per lighthouse.

ETING

S.

18th July, 1874.

o'clock A.M., the

tes of last meeting

from Messrs Dun,

& Co.,

York, June 30, 1874.

a Board of Trade, at its
lemen whose names we
ere we have offices, to
orm which all our part-
ction at our offices in

zed to accept service:—

forthcoming meeting in

BARLOW & CO.

or Dun, Wiman & Co.

l in the cities where we
fy themselves as to the

"That in France the lighthouses number 330, and are under the control of the Department of Commerce. The estimated expenditure for the year 1872 was about £187 per lighthouse.

"That in the opinion of your memorialists the comparison of the relative cost of the English and French lighthouses shows clearly the economical advantages derivable from having the lighthouses directly under the control of a Government department.

"That other countries, amongst them America, France, Prussia, Russia and Spain, have ceased to charge shipping for the maintenance of lights. British shipping is not, therefore, taxed in this respect when trading to the ports of those countries; but the imposition of this tax in this country forms an argument made use of by foreign nations against admitting British vessels to other privileges.

"That in 1845 a select committee of the House of Commons, appointed on the motion of the late Mr. Joseph Hume, recommended 'that all expenses for the erection and maintenance of lighthouses, floating lights, buoys and beacons on the coast of the United Kingdom be henceforth defrayed out of the public revenue.'

"That in 1860 a select committee, appointed to enquire into the state of the merchant shipping, recommended 'that the nation generally should pay the cost of maintenance of lights.' That your memorialists have the strongest conviction:—

(1). "That the transfer of the powers exercised by the Trinity House and other bodies to one properly-constituted governmental department, would not only be attended by a very large saving in the cost of maintaining the lights, etc., but would tend greatly to increased efficiency and uniformity of system.

(2). "That defraying the cost of maintaining and erecting lighthouses, buoys, beacons, etc., out of the consolidated fund, instead of by a direct tax on shipping, is equitable and just in principle, and would effect a material saving to the nation."

I may state that the late Lord Palmerston entertained a similar opinion to that expressed by Mr. Hume's committee; and even Mr. Lowe, who refused the request year before last, intimated that, probably as a matter of economy as well as of justice, the shipping of the world would have to be relieved from this tax. It may seem a small impost, but \$150 a trip on a vessel of 1000 tons making three or four trips a year became a very considerable burden, in addition to the taxes imposed by the Dominion. There are a great many anomalies connected with this tax. For instance, if a Canadian vessel goes to New York and loads for London she pays heavy light dues; but if she loads for Antwerp or any other continental port, she passes the same lights but pays no light dues. The tax is, therefore, virtually a premium in favor of continental trade as against trade with Great Britain. I therefore move:—

"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."

The motion was seconded, and carried unanimously.

Mr.
we have fr
last session

That

"If s
by breach

(a) l

damage of

(b) l

to be done
damage, or

from dama
guilty of r

exceeding t
shall also b

district for

Hither
pilots, offend

and summa
always obta

found in a r
offences, and

in the ordin
would come

committed v
witnesses the

"That the
practical opera
pilots is taken

The mo

The Pri
of the Halifax

St. John Bo

DEAR SIR,

I am i
by this Chamber

your city on 16t
from attending t

THE PILOTAGE ACT.

Mr. FRY—I wish to call the attention of the Board to the fact that we have found in Quebec that under the 71st clause of the Pilotage Act of last session the punishment of pilots is practically impossible.

That clause reads as follows:

“If any pilot when aboard any ship for the purpose of piloting her, by breach or neglect of duty or by reason of drunkenness, either

‘(a) Does any act tending to the immediate loss, destruction or serious damage of such ship, or

‘(b) Refuses or omits to do any lawful act proper and requisite to be done by him for preserving such ship from loss, destruction or serious damage, or for preserving any person belonging to or on board of such ship from damage to life or limb,—he shall for each such offence be deemed guilty of misdemeanor and be liable to imprisonment for a period not exceeding twelve months with or without hard labour; and, if a licensed pilot, shall also be liable to suspension, or dismissal by the pilotage Board of the district for which he is licensed.”

Hitherto in the Province of Quebec, where we have over two hundred pilots, and summary tried and punished. In England a similar practice has always obtained except in case of loss of life. But under this clause we found in a recent case that the Trinity House had no jurisdiction over these offences, and that pilots committing them could only be prosecuted criminally in the ordinary courts. The result generally was that, before the trial would come on, the Captain and crew of the vessel on which the offence was committed would have to leave the port, and therefore for lack of the witnesses the offender escaped. I move:—

“That the attention of the Hon. 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 motion was seconded by Mr. DOBELL, of Quebec, and carried.

THE HALIFAX DELEGATES.

The PRESIDENT read the following communication from the Secretary of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, addressed to the President of the St. John Board of Trade:—

Office of Chamber of Commerce,

HALIFAX, N. S., July 15th, 1874.

DEAR SIR,

I am instructed by the President to inform you, that the Delegates appointed by this Chamber to attend the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, to be held at your city on 16th, have informed the Chamber, that they regret they will be prevented from attending the meeting, and time will not allow us to make other arrangements.

Should any of the Delegates feel inclined to extend their excursion to our Province, and visit Halifax, I am directed to say, this Chamber will be most happy to meet them, and endeavour to render their stay pleasant and satisfactory.

I have the honor to be

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES M. CREED,

Secretary Chamber Commerce of Halifax.

RECEPTION OF THE AMERICAN DELEGATES.

The delegates from the National Board of Trade of the United States here entered the room, and were greeted with applause.

Hon. G. W. HOWLAN (P. E. Island) moved, seconded by Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (St. John)—

“That the delegates of the National Board of Trade of the United States be admitted to the privileges of the floor during the sittings of this Board.”

Carried by acclamation.

The names of the U. S. delegates are as follows:

- 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: B. Hawley, Esq.
- Buffalo: E. P. Dorr, Esq.

The PRESIDENT (addressing the American delegates):—I have very great pleasure, gentlemen, in welcoming you to this meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade; and I can assure you that it is with very great gratification that we see so deep an interest taken in our affairs by the National Board of Trade. It is a matter of pleasure to us to notice among the delegation on this occasion, gentlemen who have taken a broad and comprehensive view of the Reciprocity question,—and through whom, to a great extent, the action of the National Board favoring reciprocal trade relations with Canada was taken. Whatever may be the fate of the present proposed Treaty, we can at least appreciate the friendship and liberality of the National Board; and I therefore have special pleasure in welcoming you to this meeting. (Applause.)

Mr. T. C. HERSEY, (Portland), Chairman of the American Delegation, rose and said—We are most happy to meet this Board once more. We do not feel, in coming among you, that we are strangers. We have had ratified, time and again, a treaty of friendship with you, and now again has it been ratified most nobly by the St. John people. With regard to the proposed Reciprocity Treaty, this is not the time for me to discuss that question; and I will therefore only say that we are and have been committed to a broad and liberal treaty. (Cheers.)

[At entered t President invited to

The first quest

Mr. S (Port Hop

“That t Carri

Mr. J DARLING, (

“That th views of the

The m Mr. J: I beg to mo

“That th and liberal Th the efforts nov

I have first place, l harmony wi harmony wit occasions. to secure, if it seems to Situated as such a varie convenience other without quantity of would be a g United State State of Chic our purposes, coal into Can we have grea Now, we all: exchange nati lution affirm

[At this stage, His Honor the Lieut.-Governor of New Brunswick entered the room and was received with applause, being invited by the President to a seat at the right of the chair. Senator DEVERS was also invited to a seat near the President.]

DISCUSSION ON THE RECIPROCITY QUESTION.

The PRESIDENT—We will now proceed to the Orders of the Day, the first question being that of Reciprocity.

Mr. S. E. GREGORY (Hamilton) moved, seconded by Mr. WM. CRAIG (Port Hope)—

“That the time allowed for each speaker shall not exceed fifteen minutes.”

Carried.

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL (Windsor) moved—seconded by Mr. WILLIAM DARLING, (Montreal):—

“That the proposed Reciprocity Treaty be read article by article, in order that the views of the delegates on its different provisions may be elicited.”

The motion was lost.

Mr. J. M. TROUT (Toronto)—For the purpose of opening the debate, I beg to move the following resolution:—

“That this Board re-affirms its frequently expressed desire for a just, comprehensive and liberal Treaty of Reciprocity with the United States, and views with deep interest the efforts now being put forth to secure that object.”

I have expressed this motion in these general terms, because, in the first place, I believe it will meet the approval of this body. It is in entire harmony with the history of the Dominion Board of Trade. It is in harmony with the resolutions which this Board has adopted on previous occasions. We have always asserted that it is a necessity of this country to secure, if possible, a treaty of Reciprocity with the United States, and it seems to me that it is scarcely necessary to argue the question. Situated as we are along a long boundary line, and possessing as we do such a variety of natural resources, it would be of the greatest possible convenience and advantage to be able to exchange our products with each other without let or hindrance. For instance, in Ontario we raise a large quantity of barley for which our sole market is the United States. It would be a great advantage to us to be able to take our barley into the United States free of duty and sell it there. On the other hand, in the State of Ohio immense quantities of coal are produced, which exactly suits our purposes, and it is a great convenience to us to be able to bring that coal into Canada free of duty. Coming down to this end of the Dominion, we have great quantities of fish for which the market is the United States. Now, we all agree that it is for the interest of both countries to be able to exchange natural products without hindrance. I therefore propose this resolution affirming the general principles of reciprocity, and think we are bound

to affirm strongly our approval of that principle. Whatever our objections may be to the Draft Treaty now before us, we at least ought to be positive—we ought to give no uncertain sound upon the question of reciprocity (hear! hear!)—we must do that in order to be consistent with ourselves, and in order to be consistent with what is right. This general proposition can be followed by any resolution that may be moved with reference to particular parts of the treaty. I beg to say further, that I hope there will be no backwardness on the part of the representatives present, in expressing their views fully on this subject, and hope there will be no disposition to shirk the question. It is due to the country that the commercial men assembled here, give no equivocal expression to their opinions. The country looks to this body for some information and guidance on this important question.

Mr. WM. HARTY, (Kingston,) seconded the motion.

Mr. WM. ELDER, (St. John)—I could have greatly wished that some gentleman representing larger interests than myself in Trade, Commerce and Manufactures, the matters to be affected by the proposed Treaty, had offered to you a resolution fitted to interpret the sentiments of this Board and of the people of Canada on this great question; but as no such resolution has been placed before you, I shall venture to offer one, and shortly to commend it to your adoption. My objection to the motion before the Board is that it is colorless, and furnishes no indication of the views entertained by the members of this Board as to the character of the proposed Treaty. (Hear, hear.) And in so far as Mr. Trout illustrated his position by reference to facts, would it not be easy to point out a simpler process of meeting the difficulty? He says that Ontario sends barley across the United States frontier, while Ohio sends back coal, and that such exchanges should be encouraged. Undoubtedly they should, Sir; but as Ohio coal comes free into Canada, let the United States just take off the duty placed on Canadian grains, and the whole thing will be settled. [Applause.] But to return: when there was no Treaty before this Board it has frequently expressed a general approval of Reciprocity, in terms similar to those contained in the resolution of my friend Mr. Trout; now that a draft treaty is before the Board, ought we not to do something more than express our interest in the subject? Ought it to go forth to the world that we are perfectly satisfied with every part and parcel of that Treaty, if such is not the case, as I am well satisfied that it is not? (No, no, and cheers.) We rejoice, Sir, in the discussion of the question of Reciprocity, for a fair Treaty of Reciprocity between Canada and the United States cannot but prove mutually beneficial, (hear, hear); but in order to reach provisions that would be mutually satisfactory, the views entertained in both countries must be elicited and subjected to the test of criticism. I express this opinion the more freely, as the President of the United States, in transmitting the Treaty to the Senate, has invited the fullest criticism in regard to it. (Hear, hear.) He said in substance, "Gentlemen of the Senate, this is what the British Plenipotentiaries have agreed to on their part—this is

what they
it is not a c
signed on b
our necessi
Treaty of
contend tha
pro forma,
and that wh
Press of the
this country
word to say
can accept r
in favor of
which would
of the great
case, and th
beg leave to

1st—That
of Reciprocity

2nd—That
desirable provis
tions between t
privileges, it is,
are not nearly s
means of a prop
of Canada, thro
prejudicially to

This Tre
features. It
privileges; w
exchange of
Treaty; is it
(Hear, hear.)
is not an eq
and privileges
lately given
provided for
which makes t
the hypothetic
respect. (Gr
to dispose of
themselves to
leges the more
and if they fail
arising therefr
hand, Sir, the
influence to sec
(Cheers.) An

MEETING
 whatever our objections at least ought to be upon the question of to be consistent with right. This general may be moved with to say further, that I f the representatives t, and hope there will the country that the l expression to their information and guid-

what they have signed. It is not a document to which I am committed; it is not a document which any Plenipotentiary of these United States has signed on behalf of my administration. It is for you to say how far it meets our necessities, or comes short of what we might reasonably expect in a Treaty of this nature." (Hear, hear.) Would any one for a moment contend that even though the British Plenipotentiaries had signed the Treaty *pro forma*, (no doubt expecting reciprocity in signature on the other side,) and that while the Senate of the United States may add or alter, while the Press of the United States will freely discuss it,—this Board, the people of this country, the Parliament of Canada, are not to be permitted to have a word to say in regard to the details of this Treaty? (No, no.) We, Sir, can accept no such doctrine; for, while we rejoice in the growing sentiment in favor of Reciprocity, we should be still more delighted with a Treaty which would be generally acceptable and useful and not prejudicial to any of the great interests of the country. (Cheers.) Feeling that such is the case, and that the so-called Treaty needs some improvement in detail, I beg leave to move as follows:—

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. (Applause.)

on.
 atly wished that some in Trade, Commerce proposed Treaty, had iments of this Board but as no such resolu- one, and shortly to ae motion before the on of the views enter- acter of the proposed illustrated his position out a simpler process ds barley across the d that such exchanges ir; but as Ohio coal ke off the duty placed etted. [Applause.] board it has frequently s similar to those con-; now that a draft ng more than express the world that we are that Treaty, if such (No, no, and cheers.) Reciprocity, for a fair ted States cannot but r to reach provisions ined in both countries ism. I express this ed States, in trans- m criticism in regard to n of the Senate, this on their part—this is

This Treaty, Sir, may be regarded as largely made up of three distinct features. It deals with the reciprocal extension of maritime rights and privileges; with the exchange of natural productions; and with the exchange of manufactured articles. We must ask ourselves is it a fair Treaty; is it even substantially fair in each of these three features? (Hear, hear.) It requires scarcely any argument, Sir, to show that it is not an equal Treaty in regard to the exchange of maritime rights and privileges; for on the one hand certain valuable privileges are absolutely given away, and on the other the proposed return is only provided for in a hypothetical and uncertain manner. It is Canada which makes the absolute disposal; it is the United States which makes the hypothetical return; therefore the Treaty is not fair and equal in this respect. (Great cheering.) The Government of Canada are absolutely to dispose of certain valuable rights and privileges; they are to bind themselves to additional outlay in order to enable them to make the privileges the more valuable; they are to be limited in time in order to do so, and if they fail, to say nothing of the danger of international complications arising therefrom, they are to be subjected to a penalty. But, on the other hand, Sir, the Government of the United States are only to use their influence to secure a portion of the return to which we are deemed entitled. (Cheers.) And if that influence should fail in securing that use of the

several canals named—the Erie, the Whitehall, and the Sault Ste. Marie Canals, and of any enlarged or extended or new canal connecting with the Hudson—then we may find our remedy in refusing our neighbors access to that *one of these canals*, that of Caughnawaga, which, with a view largely to their accommodation, we have built at great expense, and financial risk! A nice remedy, truly, one which no impartial judge can affirm would do justice to Canada! Before, Sir, we agree to surrender, for a long period, if not for ever, some of the few valuable maritime rights which remain to us as a people—(hear, hear)—before we do this, we should require the Government of the United States to place themselves in a position to make an equally absolute transfer to us of whatever we are promised or have agreed to accept in return. (Applause.) But I go further, Sir, and I affirm that if even what we are promised were as certain as it is the reverse, the return would not be adequate. (Hear, hear.) I cannot illustrate this so fully as I could wish, for time will not permit; but look, Sir, at this simple fact, that while Canada surrenders, to the participation of the mercantile marine of the United States, the vast waterways of the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes, and even part of the waters of the North-West; while Canada builds the Caughnawaga Canal, and reciprocally the State of New York is to be asked to deepen the Whitehall Canal and improve part of the navigation of the Hudson, there is not, so far as I can see, any provision in the Treaty which would enable a single Canadian schooner to go down the Hudson to New York; and if she did go on to that port from Albany, she could not bring back a cargo of any kind. (Cheers.) Then while the mercantile marine of the United States may traverse the Great Lakes, and the St. Lawrence and its canals, and there is an exchange of that coasting trade between the two countries, there is no corresponding exchange of the coasting trade on the Atlantic or Pacific coast, even though the Maritime Provinces of Canada, by the surrender of their fisheries to the participation of the fishermen of the United States, have furnished the key to these negotiations. They have done this; and yet in this extension of maritime rights no provision is made for them—which surely is not fair or equal. (Applause.) It is true that we are to be offered the opportunity of building ships for the United States, a privilege which their people already enjoy in regard to those of Canada; but while I hold that this is a liberal feature of the Treaty, I deny that it is a boon for which we should be called upon to pay a large price. The policy of our people is to build ships and own them, not to furnish cheap ships to the people of any other nation,—not even our own. So long, Sir, as our people merely built ships for an outside market, they were little better than hewers of wood and drawers of water for their distant customers. This is a position which I think our shipbuilders will not desire to occupy in regard to those of any other country, nor even to our own—(applause.) We desire, Sir, to see the mercantile marine of Canada, now so high in rank, still further extended, so that our flag may be seen on every sea and shore; but if this provision were to be largely acted upon by our people, without their being permitted to share in the

coasting trade
Inland, At
ber, and r
fade away
should lose
and our en
adding to
nation, ena
the world.
distinguish
should adm
leges, coast
is done, de
will conten
it as free to
and thus th
and easy ac
has it, their
rence and t
little advan
United Stat
a liberal tr
laughter.)
only glance,
be held, hav
material as
these excha
my friend M
said, the adv
be granted
how does the
magnificent
United Stat
tions are to
into the mar
privilege by
the United S
treaty. Nec
turing indust
rests—upon
and upon na
of Canada, fo
of this Treat
scale, so unfa
take effect,
manufacturin
for them? I

the Sault Ste. Marie
 connecting with the
 neighbors access to
 with a view largely
 e, and financial risk
 can affirm would do
 er, for a long period,
 should require the
 in a position to make
 re promised or have
 further, Sir; and I
 n as it is the reverse,
 cannot illustrate this
 ok, Sir, at this simple
 on of the mercantile
 the St. Lawrence,
 f the North-West;
 reciprocally the State
 Whitehall Canal and
 s not, so far as I can
 e a single Canadian
 she did go on to that
 my kind. (Cheers.)
 zes may traverse the
 and there is an ex-
 countries, there is no
 Atlantic or Pacific
 by the surrender of
 f the United States,
 have done this; and
 is made for them—
 true that we are to
 nited States, a privi-
 se of Canada; but
 I deny that it is a
 e price. The policy
 rnish cheap ships to
 So long, Sir, as our
 ere little better than
 customers. This is
 to occupy in regard
 m—(applause). We
 nada, now so high
 may be seen on
 be largely acted
 d to share in the

coasting trade of the United States, its entire coasting trade—whether Inland, Atlantic or Pacific,—with rapidly decreasing supplies of ship timber, and rapidly increasing rates of wages, then our flag would gradually fade away and disappear from the great waterways of the world; we should lose national prestige; we should incur material loss and damage; and our energies would be ingloriously and unprofitably expended in merely adding to the volume and the prestige of the mercantile marine of another nation, enabling it the better to compete with us in the carrying trade of the world. (Cheers.) Under these circumstances, I would suggest to the distinguished delegates from the United States, that their Government should admit us to their entire coasting trade in return for the great privileges, coasting and otherwise, which we are prepared to grant; and if this is done, despite the burdens to be assumed by our Government, I for one will contend that Canada, when she builds the Baie Verte Canal, shall make it as free to the vessels of the United States as to our own—(hear, hear)—and thus their craft on the Lakes and the St. Lawrence will have a short and easy access to the Atlantic coast,—and “reciprocally,” as the Treaty has it, their vessels on the Atlantic shall have easy access to the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. (Applause.) And if there should then be a little advantage in our favor, would it not be well for the people of the United States to show, for once in their lives, that they can afford to make a liberal treaty with the people of this young Dominion? (Cheers and laughter.) I now come to the second part of the Treaty, at which I can only glance, namely, the exchange of natural productions. I think it may be held, having respect to the value to the United States of such raw material as we can supply on the one hand or require on the other, that these exchanges pretty nearly balance each other, and that at present, as my friend Mr. Trout could readily show, judging from what he has already said, the advantages are chiefly enjoyed by the United States. But let it be granted that the advantages in this matter are on the side of Canada, how does the account stand when our fisheries are thrown in? Does not this magnificent addition from our little four millions to the forty millions of the United States turn the scale? and if it does, how is it that our natural productions are to pay any duty at all? How is it that they are not to go freely into the markets of the United States, as we have paid in advance for the privilege by surrendering a participation in the fisheries to the people of the United States? (Cheers.) Now, a word on the third part of the treaty. Need I say that any sudden change fitted to injure the manufacturing industries of this country must tell prejudicially upon all other interests—upon agriculture, upon shipping, upon population, upon revenue, and upon national prestige. So far as we can learn, the manufacturers of Canada, for reasons which my time will not permit me to state, are afraid of this Treaty, and perhaps still more afraid of the nature of the sliding-scale, so unfair to Canada, under which it is proposed that the Treaty should take effect. If this be so, it is fair to ask—in whose interests are these manufacturing clauses introduced? Did the manufacturers of Canada ask for them? Did the people of this country, in any way, declare that they

were dissatisfied with the skill of our mechanics, or the extent of our productions? Did they suggest this remedy for any evil felt in this respect? Nothing of the kind. The consumer buys in foreign markets when it is necessary; but we are all proud of our rising manufactures, and we would not have them taken by surprise or prejudiced, much less ruined, by sudden fiscal changes, made at the instance of the manufacturers of another nation, or even of our own nation. (Applause.) Now, Sir, as I notice that the President admonishes me that my time is up, I must stop abruptly. I have shown you that the Treaty is not equal in regard to the reciprocal extension of maritime rights and privileges, and will require some amendments in this respect. I have shown you that while, in the exchange of natural productions we have thrown in our fisheries, our natural productions, when sent into the States, are nevertheless to be taxed for a period of years. I have shown you that as regards manufactures, the change cannot be asked, and is not asked, as a boon to Canada. I have thus, Sir, I think, made out such a case for improvements in the details of this Treaty as will warrant the adoption of the amendment I present to you (applause). Now, I will assume that in such diversity of exchanges on all sides, many interests would gain, and that, on our side, the agricultural and other interest might expect great advantages under the Treaty. But I call your attention to this distinction: it is not so great a sacrifice that an interest like agriculture, which is comparatively prosperous, should be deprived of the opportunity of making further gains,—an interest, by the way, the value of whose productions is determined in the markets of Europe, and not in those of this continent; it is not so great a hardship that an interest should be prevented from making a greater gain, as that another interest, that of the manufacturers, we will say, should make a positive loss. The men engaged in this interest have given in many cases, for a great part of their lives, the study of their brain, the labor of their hands, and the surplus capital they have acquired, to the development of this great interest. If the Treaty in itself, or the way in which it is to take effect, should seriously imperil them, ought not the agricultural interest seriously to weigh the fact, and not ask for the destruction of an interest so important to them as producers? I hope, Sir, that it is in this spirit that this Treaty will be studied in British Columbia, in Manitoba, in Ontario, in Quebec, in the Maritime Provinces; that we shall consider it in a patriotic, unselfish, and statesmanlike way, with an eye to all the great interests of our country; and that steps will be taken to secure such amendments and improvements in the Treaty as may make its provisions more just and equal, more worthy of the acceptance of the people of both countries, and of the great interests which they have mutually at stake. (Cheers).

Mr. R. R. DOBELL (Quebec) seconded the amendment.

Mr. JOHN GILLESPIE (Toronto)—I think it is to be regretted that commercial men have had no opportunity before this to express an opinion upon this treaty which has been sprung upon the country. How

it is possible is something I am not informed of. As an illustration of the session of all who, after a deliberation, factoring in of four or five manufacturers—certainly half of the States, interested in the tobacco trade, the *Moneta* only \$14,000, chiefly of a kind it is believed selected as a result of negotiations this. My Empire second third. Not ignorant on circumstances particular some one at the present this country connected with it,—as I presume have been of knowledge of a reciprocity interfering with prudent to leave at the present condition. I think we may have a greater material population, the hesitatingly the boundary future may be years to come States. Fort

the extent of our profit felt in this respect? In markets when it is cutures, and we would less ruined, by sudden ers of another nation, I notice that the Pre-op abruptly. I have a reciprocal extension some amendments in exchange of natural our natural pro- regardless to be taxed egards manufactures, s a boon to Canada. rovements in the de- amendment I pre- such diversity of ex- hat, on our side, the vantages under the it is not so great a comparatively prosper- further gains,—an is determined in the it is not so great a taking a greater gain, we will say, should uest have given in of their brain, the equired, to the devel- or the way in which ; not the agricultural he destruction of an Sir, that it is in this bia, in Manitoba, in ve shall consider it in ye to all the great ken to secure such make its provisions f the people of both mutually at stake.

it is possible for one man to represent the interests of this great Dominion, is something inconceivable to me. Although a person may be well informed upon most of the questions that interest this young country, it is possible for him to be very ignorant upon some most important question. As an illustration of this I may mention that, on my return from the last session of this Board at Ottawa, I had a conversation with a gentleman who, all will admit, was a most influential opponent of the policy deliberately adopted by this Board. Endeavoring to belittle the manufacturing interests of the Dominion, he stated to me that out of a population of four or five millions of people, only ten thousand were interested in manufactures. Now, gentlemen, I do not think I am exaggerating—certainly not exaggerating my own opinion—when I say that one half of the population of this country is directly or indirectly interested in its manufactures (hear, hear). For instance, if we refer to the table of exports as furnished on the very good authority of the *Monetary Times*, we discover that out of about \$90,000,000 of exports only \$14,000,000 are agricultural products; the rest are made up chiefly of articles that form the industry of the country. Now, Sir, would it be believed that the gentleman who made this assertion was the one selected as plenipotentiary on behalf of this country in the present treaty negotiations? Allow me to say that I have no political motives in stating this. My political creed is very short—Canada is first (laughter); the Empire second; and our American neighbours, if they treat us fairly, the third. Nobody ever accused the gentleman to whom I refer of being ignorant on many questions affecting this country, and, I only mention this circumstance to show that the greatest statesmen may be ignorant upon some particular subject. I look upon the industrial question as a very important one at the present time. I think, therefore, it would have been better for this country if our Government had consulted some representative man connected with the interests to be affected by this treaty, before proposing it,—as I presume the Secretary of State at Washington did. If any such have been consulted in this Dominion, it certainly has not come to the knowledge of any of the Boards of Trade, which are to no small extent the representatives of manufacturing and commercial interests. In negotiating a reciprocity treaty, I would implore our statesmen to consider well, before interfering with any industry that is now in a satisfactory condition. It is prudent to let well enough alone; and I certainly think it is most dangerous at the present juncture to interfere with any industry that is in a paying condition. If we compare our position with that of the United States, I think we may congratulate ourselves on the fact that we have made far greater material advancement during the last decade, in proportion to our population, than they have; and if I had to make a choice, I should unhesitatingly cast in my lot with the four millions of people on this side of the boundary line, in preference to the forty millions on the other. What the future may have in store for us, of course we cannot tell; but for many years to come we will probably be in a far better condition than the United States. Forty millions of people, we are told, furnish a large market; but

such a market can be over-done as easily as the market afforded by four millions. If you look at the composition of the population of the United States, it will be observed that a greater proportion are engaged in business than in any other nation; such being the case, it may easily be comprehended how such a country is very hard to compete with. I fully appreciate the importance of increasing our trade with our neighbours; but to go so far in that direction as this treaty proposes, would, I think, be unjust to this country. Many interests, no doubt, will be promoted by it; but unless the country as a whole is to be benefitted, we would not be true to ourselves if we agreed to it. I had intended to advert to the manufacturing power of the United States, and the advantage their manufacturers would have under the proposed treaty, in many branches, over our manufacturers; but as the allotted time has expired, I must stop.

Mr. R. R. DOBELL, (Quebec)—As seconder of the amendment proposed by Mr. ELDER, I rise to advert briefly to one or two practical points relating to the effect the Treaty will have upon Quebec interests. The first is in reference to our manufactures. I believe our manufacturers have no dread of a Reciprocity Treaty, provided we obtain from the United States the same privileges that we give them. But, if we are to receive their goods at a very light duty, while they impose a very heavy one upon ours,—which will be the result of the treaty for the first three years,—then our manufacturers may well object to the proposed arrangement. The next point is that relating to the navigation laws; and I would speak more particularly of one branch of trade in Quebec, namely, the shipping of lumber to New York. American barges can come through and load at Quebec, and return to New York without let or hindrance; but Canadians must tranship at Whitehall. This restriction upon our trade with the United States ought to be removed by the new treaty. In Article 13 there is a provision that the United States government are to urge the State Governments to grant us that privilege; but in a treaty of this kind the United States should at once grant us the privilege, paying to States any loss that might be suffered thereby. There should be no uncertainty on this point. Then, with regard to the loading of ships from Atlantic to Pacific ports, I wish to say a word or two. Last Spring I was offered, in New York, freight from that port to San Francisco; but I could not accept it, because that was regarded as coasting trade! Let us have reciprocity by all means; but it must be a reality, not merely a name.

Mr. WM. CRAIG, (Port Hope)—I am in favour both of the original motion and the amendment. The great mass of the people of Ontario are decidedly in favor of a reciprocity treaty similar to the last one, admitting the natural products of each country into the markets of both. I think I not only speak for myself but for the Board which I have the honor to represent, when I say that we would go heartily for a reciprocity treaty, provided it is, to use the language of one of our American friends, "just, comprehensive, and liberal." There is one important point in the proposed treaty which appears to me to require explanation; namely, whether, under

Article 4, have been should be into our n of Canada to us. F. manufactu imported. We also u shoes, and other obse treaty are Governme finally ad classes, an be exceedi afterwards

Mr. I ing the ef ual reducti be real; If our frie reciprocity reciprocity. clause, allo while we a that before lishments w article,—bu going into t is 17½ per 5 per cent. means that as they plea in favor of reciprocity, Americans. manufacture Considering of the last t ment for twe In 1854 the with the Sta they did use promised th waga Canal,

market afforded by four nations of the United States engaged in business can only be comprehended by those who have fully appreciated the value of the privilege; but to go so far as to say that it is unjust to the manufacturers of the United States; but unless it can be proved to be true to ourselves that the proposed manufacturing power would be in the hands of our manufacturers; but

the amendment proposed touches two practical points of the Quebec interests. The views of our manufacturers are obtained from the same source. But, if we are to impose a very heavy duty for the first three years of the proposed arrangement; and I would not think that Quebec, namely, the views can come through without let or hindrance; restriction upon our trade by a treaty. In Article 4 of the proposed amendment are to urge the same principle, namely, that a treaty of this kind should be no uncertainty to the States from Atlantic to Pacific; but I could not do it. Let us have reciprocity a name.

Both of the original people of Ontario are the last one, admitting of both. I think I have the honor to be a reciprocity treaty, and I believe, "just," as a point in the proposed amendment, whether, under

Article 4, Canadian manufactures, some of the component parts of which have been imported, will be admitted free to the United States. There should be no doubt about this, because foreign material enters very largely into our manufactures; and if only such articles as are wholly the product of Canada are to obtain the privilege, the treaty will be of very little use to us. For instance,—many of our woollen mills use foreign wool in the manufacture of tweeds; the cotton that we manufacture is, of course, also imported. And the same may be said of most of our iron manufactures. We also use foreign leather pretty largely in the manufacture of boots and shoes, and almost all our sole leather is made from foreign hides. The only other observation I will make is that the interests involved in the proposed treaty are so varied and so important, that it is exceedingly desirable our Government should take plenty of time to consider its provisions before finally adopting it. They ought to be willing to obtain the opinions of all classes, and to have the fullest discussion on every feature of it. I should be exceedingly sorry if our Government would do anything that they would afterwards regret.

Mr. I. WATERMAN (London)—I agree with what has been said respecting the effect upon our manufactures of the provision respecting the gradual reduction of duties in three years. If we are to have reciprocity, let it be real; we must not expect to get or give fifty cents for the dollar. If our friends the Americans are not at present in a position to enter into reciprocity, it is not our fault; and if we wait for three years to obtain reciprocity,—and in the meantime by the operation of the three years' clause, allow their goods to come into the Dominion at a very low duty, while we are virtually prohibited from their markets,—we will discover that before the three years have elapsed, many of our manufacturing establishments will have suffered severely. I will not mention any particular article,—but there are plenty of goods that have to pay 60 per cent on going into the United States, while the most we have on any staple article is 17½ per cent.; consequently in the third year, our duty would be about 5 per cent., while their duty would be nearly 20 per cent.,—which simply means that we cannot go there, but that they can come here just as much as they please. (Cheers.) I wish it to be perfectly understood that I am in favor of reciprocity. Every manufacturer is, I believe, in favor of reciprocity,—but on such terms that we shall have equal rights with the Americans. If the duties are equal, I do not believe that any of our manufacturers would be at all afraid of the competition of Americans. Considering the prosperous condition of our country since the abrogation of the last treaty, there is no reason why we should hurry into an arrangement for twenty years which we might regret before five years had expired. In 1854 the United States Government promised to use their influence with the State governments to induce them to do certain things. I believe they did use their influence; but with what effect? Now, we are again promised their influence in the same direction, if we build the Caughnawaga Canal,—which will simply open an outlet to New York and do our

selves very little good. About this part of the Treaty, however, I do not profess to be well informed; but I do sincerely hope that this Board will take into serious consideration that portion of it which will so vitally affect our manufactures. And whatever we do, I am sure we will leave politics aside, and deal with the question entirely from a commercial point of view.

Mr. S. E. GREGORY, (Hamilton)—Coming from a city that calls itself the Manchester of Canada, and which is surrounded by a fine agricultural country, I may fairly claim an interest in this question of reciprocity. The treaty in its present shape, does not meet the views of our manufacturers. I have not seen a single manufacturer in our city, in any branch of industry, who favors it. I consider that, in the present unsettled state of American currency, we could not get dollar for dollar—they would get our gold dollar, while we would have to receive their depreciated currency. The difference is not much at present; but we have no guarantee how it will be for the future. Then the Treaty will interfere in a special manner with some branches of industry. For instance, our reapers and mowing machines are mostly made under American patents, and our manufacturers of these articles could not send them into the United States, even though the duty were removed, because they could be prosecuted for violation of the patent laws. With reference to the subject of Canals, I do not believe that either the Erie or Champlain Canal will be enlarged so as to accommodate our craft. We allow the Americans to bring their barges up to Ottawa, and surely in all fairness they should permit us to take our barges down the Hudson to New York, instead of being compelled to discharge at American ports on Lake Champlain. Of course, in any treaty we should be prepared to make concessions, and even sacrifices; but we should not enter into any agreement that will sacrifice some of our principal interests, as the treaty now under consideration will do.

Mr. HENRY FRY, (Quebec)—No one can rejoice more than I do at the prospect of a measure to facilitate trade between Canada and the United States. Whether we look at the magnitude of the interests involved, or the length of time the Treaty is to remain in force, it deserves the calmest deliberation from business men, uninfluenced by any political feelings. We meet here as men of business, to discuss matters of business. In order to satisfy the country, it is necessary that the Treaty should be felt by business men, to use the words of my friend from Milwaukee, "to be just, liberal and comprehensive." In one respect it is easy to see that this Treaty is neither just nor liberal towards Canada. I will not speak on the question of manufactures, because there are gentlemen here from the western part of Canada, as well as from New Brunswick, who are better acquainted with manufactures than I am. Nor will I allude to the question of revenue, which, I understand is a very serious matter, for I am told on very good authority, that our Government estimate the loss of revenue under this Treaty at something like \$4,000,000 per annum. But I allude more particularly to the coasting trade of the neighboring Republic. The United

States hav
by the Im
Under the
Canadian
can ships
If you go
find Amer
pose there
ships has
remember
tion laws
to Great
York, and
to carry
is consider
delphia, an
to ballast
that recipr
but we can
another fea
and that is
ernment to
Lawrence t
There are
accomplish
will be?
out this pr
itself? Y
disastrous c
Caughnawa
more than
company, an
upon this co
of building
are entirely
opinion that
lumber fre
be, instead
forests. I t
profitable ou
the past; an
new market
ber, and the
that the reg
ularly gratif
able advance
legates to th

ty, however, I do not think that this Board will be so high as to be sure we will leave from a commercial city that calls itself a fine agricultural of reciprocity. The our manufacturers. y branch of industry, d state of American would get our gold ted currency. The warantee how it will special manner with nd mowing machines nufacturers of these though the duty were n of the patent laws. lieve that either the commodate our craft. ttawa, and surely in down the Hudson to t American ports on ould be prepared to l not enter into any crests, as the treaty

more than I do at nada and the United rests involved, or the ves the calmest deli- tical feelings. We siness. In order to ould be felt by busi- se, "to be just, liber- see that this Treaty peak on the question om the western part tter acquainted with uestion of revenue, m told on very good revenue under this t I allude more par- ublic. The United

States have enjoyed, since 1851, a boon of very great magnitude, granted by the Imperial Government,—I mean the repeal of the Navigation Laws. Under the operation of that Act, we find American ships competing with Canadian ships all over the world. If you go to Bombay, you find American ships competing with British ships in carrying merchandize to Liverpool. If you go to Calcutta, you find the same thing. If you go to Australia, you find American ships loading for London; and to come nearer home, I suppose there is no port in the British Empire where competition with American ships has been found so severe as in this city of St. John. I can remember the trade of St. John before the repeal of the navigation laws; and the result of that repeal has been to reduce freights to Great Britain about one half. But supposing I send a ship to New York, and want to go from there to California, I am not allowed to carry a ton of freight, because from New York to San Francisco is considered coasting trade. Or if I have a ship in Baltimore or Philadelphia, and want to send her to New York, I am obliged to pay for stones to ballast her, because I am not permitted to carry freight. Now, I ask, is that reciprocity? Americans can take freight from London to Australia, but we cannot carry any from New York to San Francisco. Then there is another feature of this Treaty to which we in Quebec are strongly opposed, and that is the part relating to Canals. We think it unwise for our government to pledge this country to deepen our Canals and the River St. Lawrence to 12 feet within a limited time, and at a cost practically unknown. There are many engineers in Canada who doubt even the possibility of accomplishing that work; and who will say what the cost of the attempt will be? Suppose that at the end of five years we have failed to carry out this provision of the treaty,—in what position would this country find itself? You can easily see that it might lead to complications of the most disastrous character—even to war itself, for all we know. Then, as to the Caughnawaga canal, we believe that this work interests Americans far more than ourselves, and that it should be undertaken by a private company, assisted perhaps by the United States Government. To throw upon this country the burden, not only of enlarging our own canals, but also of building the Caughnawaga canal, is a proposition to which we in Quebec are entirely opposed. With regard to the lumber trade, I for one am of opinion that it is no matter to us in Canada whether the United States admit lumber free, or charge five or fifty per cent. duty. My policy would be, instead of opening up new markets for our lumber, to preserve our forests. I think the less timber we cut, within certain limits, the more profitable our forests will be. We have been wasteful in our use of them in the past; and it would now be better to preserve them, rather than seek for new markets. The Americans must, to a very great extent, have our lumber, and the duty they impose on it they themselves have to pay. I admit that the registration of Canadian ships is a boon, and I am the more particularly gratified at this feature of the Treaty, as it evinces a very considerable advance in public opinion in the United States. I was one of the delegates to the Detroit Convention in 1865; and when I proposed there,

that, as a matter of reciprocity, Canadian ships should be admitted to United States registration, I was regarded as a sort of simpleton to even suggest it. I am very happy to see the change of public opinion in this respect; at the same time I do not consider that the Americans are losing anything by this concession. I remember, in 1851, when our navigation laws were repealed, I had just invested all the means I had in ships, and I thought I was ruined;—but experience has shown that their repeal, so far from injuring our shipping, improved it; and we stand to-day the first among the maritime nations of the world. The last objection to the Treaty I shall mention is this: considering that, to some extent, we are taking a leap in the dark, I think that 24 years is too long for the Treaty to continue. A shorter time, and a shorter notice of abrogation, would be more prudent. I have only to repeat that I feel bound to vote for the amendment.

Mr. THOS. COWAN (Galt)—I desire to add a few words to what has been said respecting the Treaty from a manufacturer's point of view. It is true that we are promised reciprocity with the United States; but that reciprocity is hemmed in with such conditions as to make it altogether one-sided. For instance, during the three years in which the duties are to be abolished, the Americans would virtually have free access to our markets, while we would be virtually excluded from theirs. Few manufacturing establishments could bear up under that disadvantage; and it must be remembered that after the American duties were altogether removed, it would take some time for our manufacturers to find a market in the United States. They would have to establish agencies, and demonstrate by actual use the superiority of their goods, before they would be able to successfully compete with the Americans, well established in their own markets. All this would take time,—and all this time the Americans would have the free use of the Dominion markets. The manufacture of reaping-machines, and of agricultural implements generally, has been referred to. Now, I am free to admit that we can manufacture that class of goods at less cost than our Republican neighbors can. But while that is the case, the American market, even though the duties were removed, would not be open to us,—because most of our agricultural machinery is made under American patents. So that while the manufacturers in the United States would have Canada as a market for their surplus productions, we would be shut out of theirs. In Ontario we have looked forward to the opening of our great North-West, as affording a market for our surplus productions; but we now find that the Americans, from their proximity and the smallness of the duty imposed, have been able to take possession of that market also; and thus the hope which we cherished at the time of Confederation, of having a large market for our manufactures, has been disappointed. Then with reference to another important branch of manufactures—mill and factory machinery—we find that our people yet look largely to the United States for their supply. That branch of manufacture is still in its infancy in this country. We have yet, to a large extent, to educate our

people into our American wisdom for machinery manufacture; but I classes of machinery with anything established who is isolated component have the wisdom as compare I must end believe it w interests; s us by the s full advantage of this Treaty

Mr. J. would have and would I not agree to whether Canada, we that goods t admitted fr whether of that part of committee, stolen. If then the or acceptance of for amendment to have any tural machinery of American right to sell facturers. It can be done manufacture. to supply the facturers were footing as the

could be admitted to
 of completion to even
 ublic opinion in this
 Americans are losing
 when our navigation
 s I had in ships, and
 at their repeal, so far
 and to-day the first
 jection to the Treaty
 nt, we are taking a
 the Treaty to con-
 tention, would be more
 vote for the amend-

words to what has
 's point of view. It
 ed States; but that
 ke it altogether one-
 the duties are to be
 cess to our markets,
 w manufacturing es-
 ; and it must be re-
 ogether removed, it
 market in the United
 demonstrate by ac-
 ould be able to suc-
 d in their own mar-
 e Americans would
 ufacture of reaping-
 as been referred to.
 at class of goods at
 ile that is the case,
 oved, would not be
 ery is made under
 n the United States
 ctions, we would be
 d to the opening of
 surplus productions;
 nity and the small-
 ssion of that market
 ne of Confederation,
 s been disappointed.
 of manufactures—
 e yet look largely
 manufacture is still
 tent, to educate our

people into the belief that we can make that class of machinery as well as our American competitors. At such a time it scarcely seems the part of wisdom for us to throw open our markets to the free admission of that machinery from the United States. I admit that, as a general rule, we can manufacture almost any article in this country as cheaply as the Americans can; but they have the advantage of us in this respect, that they have all classes of manufactures in their midst, and can be supplied at their own doors with anything they want. One branch of manufactures is largely dependent upon another; and when manufactures generally of all kinds are established, each individual manufacturer has the advantage over any one who is isolated, so to speak, as most of our manufacturers to a certain extent are. In the building of machinery in this country, a great many of its component parts have to be brought from the United States; and until we have the whole manufacture within our midst we shall be at a disadvantage as compared with those in the United States. Viewing the treaty as a whole, I must endorse the opinion expressed in the resolution of Mr. ELDER. I believe it will not operate favorably, but the reverse, to our manufacturing interests; also, that it will prevent us from reaping the full benefits promised us by the scheme of Confederation. If we are to secure to ourselves the full advantages of that scheme, we certainly ought not to endorse the terms of this Treaty.

Mr. JAMES DOUGALL, (Windsor)—I am still of the opinion that we would have had a more intelligent and practical discussion of the Treaty, and would have saved time, if we had taken it up clause by clause. I do not agree with the gentleman from Port Hope, that there is any doubt as to whether manufactured articles, the material of which is not produced in Canada, would be admitted free under the treaty. Article IV. declares that goods being the growth, produce, or manufacture of Canada, shall be admitted free. The words "or manufacture" include manufactures whether of material produced in Canada or imported. I am opposed to that part of Mr. ELDER's resolution which proposes to refer the matter to a committee. That would be shutting the stable-door after the steed was stolen. If we wait until after the meeting of the United States Senate, then the only question before us and before our Parliament, will be the acceptance or rejection of the Treaty as a whole, and it will then be too late for amendment. Now is the time for us to express our opinion if we wish it to have any effect. It has been stated that our manufacturers of agricultural machinery cannot send their goods into the United States, because of American patents; but there is nothing to prevent them obtaining the right to sell their goods there on the same terms as American manufacturers. It seems to me that if we can manufacture here cheaper than can be done on the other side of the line, we shall have American and English manufacturers coming over here and establishing large manufactories to supply their market as well as ours. It is not long since our manufacturers were declaring that all they wanted was to be put on the same footing as the Americans; but, now that that very thing is proposed, they

appear to be afraid of it. There can be no making of treaties without injury to some persons; but the question we have to consider is, will the country as a whole be injured or benefitted by it?

Hon. G. W. HOWLAN (P. E. Island)—I am sorry that the decision of the Board has been such that we cannot take up the Treaty, and discuss it clause by clause. The only course left us now is to make a flying commentary upon it, as a whole. As I listened to many of the remarks made here to-day, I was forcibly reminded of the story of an Irishman who, when on his trial for some offence, said he did not want a just judge, but one that would lean a little. It seems to me to be so here—every gentleman wants reciprocity, provided it leans a little towards his particular views. I doubt very much whether the course pursued by our Government is not the proper one after all. I am one of those who believe that, if the Joint Commission met at Halifax to determine the relative value of Canadian and United States fisheries, we would find such an array of statistics produced, setting forth the value of the American fisheries, as would astonish us. My reason for saying so is, that the Internal Revenue Department of the United States is so complete, that there is every facility for procuring full statistics of their fisheries, while we have not such facilities. I have no hesitation in saying that the statistics of our Gulf fisheries are altogether unreliable. Those who are practically engaged in the trade will tell you so. I am not finding fault with our Government; but I speak what I believe to be the fact, when I say that there is now in the hands of the United States authorities such an array of facts and figures respecting the value of their fisheries, as would completely off-set any value for our fisheries that we could establish. When the Commissioners met, therefore, the reliability of the statistics would have to be considered, and it would be almost, if not altogether impossible to come to any satisfactory conclusion. With regard to manufactures, we are told that many things can be manufactured in Canada cheaper than in the United States. If that be the case, I think the Americans are shrewd enough to see it, and to buy in the cheapest market. Being a Free-trader myself, I cannot come to any other conclusion than, that if we can manufacture cheaper than they can, our manufactures will have the advantage over theirs, when all duties are swept away, and the markets of both countries thrown open. I should suppose that four millions of people coming into a market of forty millions of people would receive quite as great a benefit, as would the forty millions by coming into the market of four millions; therefore, I am not disposed to find fault with that branch of the Treaty. But with regard to another important matter, I have a word of objection to make. It will be seen that the Treaty provides for the appointment of a joint Commission for the propagation of fish in the inland rivers. I think there ought also to be provision made for a Commission to protect the fisheries we already possess. It appears from reports presented to the Massachusetts Legislature, that the Atlantic Coast fisheries have become greatly depleted by the wanton and reckless manner in which they have been conducted; and if the same course is pur-

sued with r
would have
for the pro
exception to
that the nat
diately on t
certain rate
natural pro
not imposed
protection.
effectually a
products.
as in Prince
would like t
hope before
The time fo
points upon

Mr. Fry
we must give
tion the "gr
Americans d
products of t
upon to enl
Mr. FRY has
enlarge the c
sidered that
ing interest o
agricultural c
perity, I thin
speak on this
know that un
barley for 4
as 80c.,—and
At that time
abrogation of
up ever since
States, found
natural marke
place in the w
believe that t
this proposed
to make sacrific
which really v

It being

of treaties without consider is, will the

that the decision of Treaty, and discuss make a flying com- of the remarks made Irishman who, when t judge, but one that ery gentleman wants ular views. I doubt ment is not the pro- f the Joint Commis- nadian and United s produced, setting nish us. My reason ment of the United curing full statistics ave no hesitation in together unreliable. you so. I am not believe to be the nited States autho- the value of their fisheries that we e, the reliability of l be almost, if not sion. With regard e manufactured in e the case, I think y in the cheapest o any other conclu- can, our manufac- es are swept away, l suppose that four s of people would ns by coming into osed to find fault another important en that the Treaty the propagation of provision made for

It appears from the Atlantic Coast d reckless manner ae course is pur-

sued with regard to the Gulf fisheries, they will speedily be destroyed. I would have been glad, therefore, to have seen some provision in the Treaty for the protection of our coast fisheries. The next feature that I take exception to, is that relating to the gradual reduction of duties. I think that the natural products of each country should be admitted free immediately on the ratification of the Treaty, because if the duty is beyond a certain rate, it is immaterial whether it is 50 cents or a dollar. Take the natural products of the United States, and you will find that the duty was not imposed with the intention of raising a revenue, but for the purpose of protection. Fifteen cents a bushel on potatoes excludes importation as effectually as 60 cents would. The same may be said of the other natural products. I have no fault to find with schedules A and B,—particularly as in Prince Edward Island we are not manufacturers. (Laughter.) I would like to see the coasting trade of the United States conceded, and I hope before this debate closes we will have a resolution on that subject. The time for speaking is so limited that I must omit reference to other points upon which I would like to say a word or two.

Mr. THOS. CHURCHER, (London)—We have been told that in a treaty we must give and take; but it seems to me that in the one under consideration the "give" is all on one side, and the "take" on the other. What the Americans desire almost more than anything else is facility to move the products of the West to the seaboard through our canals, and we are called upon to enlarge them for their accommodation. I quite agree with what Mr. FRY has said respecting the impropriety of pledging the Dominion to enlarge the canals to a certain size within a limited time. It seems to be considered that the only interest that will be served by this Treaty is the farming interest of Ontario. Coming from a city which is surrounded by a fine agricultural country, and depending largely upon agriculture for its prosperity, I think I am entitled to speak from that side of the question. I speak on this point from an experience with and without reciprocity; and I know that under reciprocity we sold our oats for 18c. and 20c. per bushel,—barley for 40c. to 45c., peas at about the same price,—wheat as low as 80c.,—and so on at proportionate rates for all our natural products. At that time our market was controlled by American buyers; but after the abrogation of the Treaty, prices went up with a bound, and have remained up ever since. The reason is, I believe, that our buyers, shut out from the States, found a better market in England. We found that England was the natural market for the products of Ontario, and I believe Ontario is the best place in the world for England to draw her supplies from. For my part I believe that the farmers of Ontario will derive no substantial benefit from this proposed Treaty, and the Maritime Provinces should not be called upon to make sacrifices for the sake of securing a supposed advantage to Ontario, which really would be found to be no advantage at all.

It being now one o'clock, p.m., the Board took recess for an hour.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

On resuming, the roll was called, after which

The PRESIDENT read the following letter from the President of the New York Produce Exchange:

FREDERICK FRALEY, Esq., (*Philadelphia, Pa.*)

NEW YORK, 13th July, 1874.

President National Board of Trade,

DEAR SIR,—It is with very great regret that I find myself compelled at the last moment to forego the pleasure that I had anticipated of attending the approaching meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, which is to be held at St. John on Thursday next. I find it impossible to arrange my affairs so as to be absent from this city for the length of time that would be required, and unfortunately this conclusion has been reached at too late an hour to admit of another delegate being appointed.

We wish you would say to our brethren of Canada and Newfoundland, that the members of the New York Produce Exchange will hail with satisfaction any action on the part of our respective Governments which shall place these countries on a footing of just and equitable reciprocity in all matters pertaining to trade, commerce, and navigation.

If you can possibly make it convenient I should be much gratified to have you call upon us on your way back.

Meanwhile wishing you a happy and profitable meeting,

I remain, with sincere respect,

Yours,

FRANKLIN EDSON, *President.*

The PRESIDENT invited the delegates from the National Board of Trade of the United States to address the Board, either now or at a later stage of the debate.

Mr. T. C. HERSEY (Portland), Chairman of the delegation, rose and said: Mr. President, this Treaty, as it now stands, has never been before the National Board of Trade, nor has it ever been before our constituent bodies for discussion, and consequently we do not feel authorized, as representatives of that Board, to take ground either for or against it. The National Board have always been committed to a broad, liberal, equitable Treaty—just to all. That, I believe, is what the United States desire. If we are to allow our special and sectional interests to come up foremost in this matter, allow me to say, the day is far distant when we may expect any Treaty. It is right and proper that those manufacturers who have so ably represented their interests here should make those interests known; but, having done so, it must be left to statesmen to settle the matter, entirely apart from personal or sectional considerations. If my associates and myself were to represent our particular States in this matter, we should each of us find very serious objections to the proposed Treaty. But I hope good counsels will prevail, and that we will secure what we have long contended

for—a ju
ther in al

The
President
absence f
attend.
connection
elsewhere
and the S
given to t

CONT

Mr. .
looked up
I think the
quently ex
of the am
(hear, hea
although
with perh
opinion re
question h
expect the
But while
posed Tres
Dominion l
I appeal to
its desire
regard to
They will
would urg
separately,

Mr. A
in favor of
whole ques
standpoint;
interest is s
ously to o
growth, an
works only
be careful
those intere
expense. I
present per
must say th

for—a just, liberal and statesman-like Treaty, which shall bring us together in all our interests. (Applause).

The PRESIDENT here read a note from Mr. C. H. Fairweather, the President of the St. John Board of Trade, desiring to have excuses for his absence from the meeting conveyed to the members, lest he should not be in attendance upon the adjournment of the Board; but his services in connection with the arrangements for entertainment required his presence elsewhere. He hoped the President would tender on behalf of himself and the St. John Board their hearty thanks for the cordial acceptance given to their invitation.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE RECIPROCITY TREATY.

Mr. A. JOSEPH (Quebec)—I do not think the amendment should be looked upon in the light of an amendment, as it really is a substantive motion. I think there is good reason for this Board to reiterate its opinion, so frequently expressed, that reciprocity is wanted by Canada. The second part of the amendment should be laid on the table until the first part is carried, (hear, hear.)—the more so, as this is not our regular business meeting, although we are all delighted that it has taken place. Moreover, with perhaps two or three exceptions, there has been no expression of opinion respecting the treaty, on the part of the Boards of Trade. The question has not been before the Quebec Board. Of course, none of us expect that a treaty will ever be adopted that will please every section. But while few of our Boards have expressed any opinion upon the proposed Treaty, I am safe in saying that every Board of Trade in this Dominion has expressed *one* opinion, and that is, that we want reciprocity. I appeal to every delegate here, if this Board has not always expressed its desire for reciprocity. Of course, no opinion has been given with regard to details, nor are we called upon at this time to deal with details. They will be better dealt with by our Representatives in Parliament. I would urge the mover of the amendment to allow the first part to be put separately, and after that the second part could be dealt with.

Mr. A. WATTS (Brantford)—There can be no doubt that we are all in favor of reciprocity; but we want a reality,—not merely a name. The whole question should be viewed from a national rather than a sectional standpoint; but at the same time we should see to it that no important interest is sacrificed. In my judgment this treaty will operate very injuriously to our manufacturing industries. Those industries are of recent growth, and many persons engaged in them have established their works only after a great deal of hard experience. We should, therefore, be careful about entering into arrangements that would tend to destroy those interests which have been built up with so much arduous labor and expense. I am not a manufacturer myself, and the interest that I represent personally will be well served by the proposed treaty. But I must say that I think the arrangement for the gradual reduction of duties

will give the American manufacturers a great advantage over ours. They are a shrewd people, and they know very well that if they can crush Ontario manufactures in the two years during which they will have almost free access to our markets, while we are practically debarred from theirs, they will then have the whole field to themselves. If, during these two years, they only sent in ten per cent. of their products they would annihilate every manufacturing interest we have. The result would be that, when reciprocity really did come, we would not be in a position to take advantage of it. With reference to the coasting trade, it seems very hard that a Canadian vessel cannot go to an American port, and, if the master finds prices are better in another port, go there, because that would be coasting trade. As I understand it, a Canadian vessel must discharge its cargo at the port it is first designed for, or else bring the cargo back. In any arrangement between the two countries this matter should receive a fair consideration. I think we would run great risk if we adopted this Treaty. Almost all our industries are now in a prosperous condition, and it is best to let well enough alone. I am willing that our trade relations should be extended, but not if it cannot be done without absolute loss.

Mr. J. A. HARDING (St. John)—I approach this question of Reciprocity with the feeling that it comes before us under unfortunate circumstances. We have been told by our friends from the United States, that their Government having abrogated the former treaty, it would only be courteous for them to initiate negotiations for a new one. But we now learn from the message of President Grant, that this treaty has been proposed by our Government and not by theirs. Now that it is before us, however, it is our duty to consider it, and although I agree with the remark that it should be considered from a national point of view, yet we are here from different parts of the Dominion, and it is quite proper that we should learn from one another how the Treaty will affect particular interests. Besides, the Treaty is in some respects itself sectional. For instance, one part of the Dominion is to have reciprocity in the coasting trade, while we of the Maritime Provinces are denied it. If the principle is right in the one case, it is certainly right in the other. The Americans have the full benefit of our coasting trade, and even more, for they not only can carry freight from one of our ports to any other,—they can do so from any of our ports to Great Britain or any of the Colonies. One gentleman who spoke, however, laboured under a mistake when he said that a Canadian vessel going to an American port must discharge in that port or bring back her cargo. I believe the fact is, that if a Canadian vessel does not break bulk in an American port she is at liberty to take her cargo to any other port. We in New Brunswick feel that the coasting trade of the United States is very important to us,—not merely for what it is now, but for what it may become in the future. The American Government are continually adding to their territory; and we may find in the course of time that some countries with which we are trading—ports of the West Indies, for instance—may be-

come and
coasting
impolicy
limited to
work in
It would
generosity
time—the
as rapidly
the canals
and it we
paratively
regard to
that ques
radius of a
factories o
one of inte

Mr. J
present at
States last
to the conc
abrogate th
should tak
resolution &

WHEREAS
been abrogat
desirable tha
taken by the
Resolved,
ing for the a
ment in neg
regulations b
advantageous
also to secur
waters, on the
is instructed
and urge its

Now, I
a few weeks
proposed Tr
that our cou
Treaty (hea
a Treaty up
word "just
our fisherie
canals the U
they are not
promises to
To make the

ge over ours. They t if they can crush hey will have almost lebarred from theirs, f, during these two ts they would anni- esult would be that, a position to take , it seems very hard , and, if the master ause that would be ssel must discharge ng the cargo back. after should receive risk if we adopted a prosperous condi- m willing that our not be done without

question of Recipro- rounate circumstan- d States, that their d only be courteous ve now learn from ve now proposed by our us, however, it is mark that it should here from different ould learn from one Besides, the Treaty rt of the Dominion e of the Maritime the one case, it is full benefit of our ary freight from ny of our ports to o spoke, however, vessel going to an ck her cargo. I break bulk in an other port. We United States is t for what it may ontinually adding at some countries stance—may be-

come annexed to the United States, and we will be shut out from that coasting trade. I entirely agree with what has been said respecting the impolicy of binding this country to enlarge its canals within a certain limited time. Supposing that Canada finds it impossible to complete the work in the time specified,—what position would this country be in? It would be at the mercy of the United States. We do not doubt their generosity; but we would rather not be bound down to a specific limited time—they ought to be content with our engagement to carry on the work as rapidly as our financial condition will admit of. The enlargement of the canals has been made part and parcel of the progress of our country; and it would be unwise to pledge ourselves to complete works in a comparatively short time, the magnitude of which we do not yet know. With regard to manufactures, I suppose Western Canada is more interested in that question than New Brunswick; but when I tell you that, within a radius of a mile from this spot, there are one hundred steam engines driving factories of various kinds, you will agree with me that the question is also one of interest to us.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON, (Montreal)—It was my good fortune to be present at the meeting of the National Board of Trade of the United States last year at Chicago. On that occasion our American friends came to the conclusion that, as the United States had taken upon themselves to abrogate the treaty of 1854, it was therefore only fair to Canada that they should take the initiative in proposing and securing a new treaty. The resolution adopted by the National Board at that time was in these words:—

WHEREAS, The Treaty of 1854, between Great Britain and the United States, having been abrogated by notice from the United States in 1865, it would be courteous and desirable that the first steps towards devising and negotiating a new treaty should be taken by the United States,—therefore

Resolved, That the Executive Council is hereby instructed to prepare a Bill, providing for the appointment of a Commission to act in conjunction with the State Department in negotiating a Treaty with Great Britain, for such modifications of the trade regulations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States as would be mutually advantageous, and tend to facilitate the freest interchange of necessary commodities, and also to secure for American vessels the use of Canadian canals connecting common waters, on the same condition as Canadian vessels use them; and the Executive Council is instructed to take measures to secure the introduction into Congress of said Bill, and urge its passage.

Now, Mr. President, as I was not near telegraphic communication for a few weeks, it was only on Monday last that I first saw a copy of this proposed Treaty, and I must say as a Canadian that I felt ashamed to find that our country had taken the first step towards a renewal of a Reciprocity Treaty (hear, hear.) While saying this, I will also say that I am in favor of a Treaty upon a broad, comprehensive and liberal basis. I shall not use the word "just," because that we cannot have. What are we to receive for our fisheries? Nothing. What are we to receive for our canals? The canals the United States have to offer us are comparatively small, and even they are not offered absolutely, but the United States Government only promises to ask the State Governments to give us the use of them. To make the Treaty in this respect really reciprocal, the State Governments

should be compelled to give us the use of their canals, just as we promise absolutely to give the Americans the use of ours. In the meantime, I would be willing to give our friends the use of our canals and to have them enlarged at the earliest date possible; but I do object that the Dominion should be bound by treaty to a foreign power to build canals of a certain length, breadth and depth, and within a certain specified time. I may say, however, that I am not averse to this Treaty in many respects. A good deal of objection has been taken to Article 4 relating to the gradual reduction of duties in three years; but we must remember that the United States have to meet large demands upon their revenue, and they must look to the effect of this reduction of duties upon that revenue,—just as we must look to the effect on our country of a loss to our revenue of \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 which will result from the operation of this proposed treaty. To Schedules A and B I take no special exception, because I do not exactly understand the peculiar nature of the different articles enumerated. I dislike, however, the ambiguity of Schedule C. For example, the woollen trade, which is perhaps the largest manufacturing interest in Canada; and in my opinion there will be no end of trouble arising out of ambiguity in the classification of articles in this Schedule, both in woollens and cottons. Take, for instance, "Tweeds manufactured of wool solely." 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 West of England Tweeds or Yorkshire Tweeds. Canadian Tweeds, as understood here, embrace all the peculiarities of those named, and in fact, extend to any description of goods manufactured in Canada of pure wool. But these again are subdivided, according to style of weave and finish, into imitations of Scotch or English Tweeds, Doeskins, Buckskins, Deerskins, Meltons, Etottes, Friezes, etc. Then as to Satinettes made of wool and cotton, they are neither more nor less than what is known as a Union Doeskin in England, and in Canada as a Union Tweed, a Satinette of cotton warp and woollen or mixed weft. Of course, if it is understood that all the goods which are produced in Canada, whether as Tweeds or Satinettes, are wholly included,—and which I suppose must have been the intention of the proposers,—then no difficulty might arise; but I fear, were the Treaty concluded without some better understanding, difficulties of interpretation would assuredly arise, as to what is a "Tweed," on the part of the American Customs authorities. And in proof that we must be careful on this point, and have everything most clearly defined, I would simply say that this very day I have been informed by a gentleman from Montreal, who came by way of Boston, that a lot of salmon had arrived there a few days ago from Labrador, which, by the Treaty of Washington, were entitled to pass free, if from Canada or Newfoundland; but being entered from Labrador, the authorities ruled they had no treaty with that country, and that duty must be paid,—for-

getting to
doubt this
to trade
pretation
such good
have never
who under
understood
warp and
and cotton
ous. The
Understan
Canada,"
in Canada
tion is not
manufactu
pletely.
ed; it can
fair Recip
fairly with
and many
giving us
nothing bu
comprehen

Mr.
upon this s
therefore, I
connection
that it is to
Canada,—I
so-called T
United Sta
or endorsat
round, I ha
the Treaty,
are three or
Treaty of th
be sacrific
ciple has no
time Provin
ing trade, th
vessel does
other port a
made up of
to sell one o
But that can

ETING
 s, just as we promise
 he meantime, I would
 d to have them en-
 that the Dominion
 canals of a certain
 d time. I may say,
 spects. A good deal
 gradual reduction of
 United States have
 ust look to the effect
 we must look to the
 ,000 or \$4,000,000
 aty. To Schedules
 exactly understand
 I dislike, however,
 ollen trade, which
 ; and in my opinion
 in the classification
 ottons. Take, for
 What is a Tweed?
 se solely from the
 l of the towns and
 otland, and were
 now understood by
 West of England
 understood here,
 ct, extend to any
 wool. But these
 ish, into imitations
 eerskins, Meltons,
 wool and cotton,
 Union Doeskin in
 te of cotton warp
 rstood that all the
 or Satinettes, are
 he intention of the
 were the Treaty
 of interpretation
 the part of the
 at we must be
 clearly defined,
 en informed by
 Boston, that a lot
 or, which, by the
 from Canada or
 authorities ruled
 ust be paid,—for-

getting that Labrador belongs to one or other of the countries named. No doubt this will ultimately be put right; but constant interruptions like this to trade are sure to arise, if any ambiguous classification requiring interpretation is left in the Treaty. Then as to "Cottonades unbleached," such goods may be known in the United States, but in my experience I have never seen them, and if there are any other members of this Board who understand them, I should be glad to be informed. Cottonades, as understood by us, mean cotton tweeds, made of dyed or colored thread of warp and weft, in imitation of those purely made from wool or mixed wool and cotton fabrics already referred to. "Cotton plaids" is very ambiguous. These I simply name, so as to induce caution, and prevent future misunderstanding. As to the words, "the growth, produce, or manufacture of Canada," I think they clearly define that foreign wool, when manufactured in Canada, is to be admitted; but care must be taken that the conjunction is not substituted, so as to make it read, "the growth, produce, and manufacture of Canada," which, if done, would ruin our manufactures completely. I repeat that the Treaty is unjust to Canada and must be amended; it cannot pass as it is. And I repeat also that I am anxious for a fair Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I am quite willing to deal fairly with our American friends. They have great difficulties to overcome and many diverse interests to satisfy, and they no doubt think they are giving us a good share of reciprocity in this proposed Treaty. I want nothing but what is right and fair and liberal—a Treaty upon a broad, comprehensive, and liberal basis. (Cheers).

Mr. J. S. LARKE (Oshawa)—There is great difficulty in speaking upon this subject, on account of the short time allowed; and I propose, therefore, merely to notice a few general points, and one special point, in connection with the Treaty. I certainly agree with those who have said that it is to be regretted that the first step in this matter was taken by Canada,—the regret applying also to the way in which it was taken. This so-called Treaty seems to be merely a proposition to the Government of the United States, and by them handed over to the Senate, without acceptance or endorsement on their part; and, when the month of December comes round, I have no doubt we shall find that body making modifications in the Treaty, and that not to our advantage. It appears to me that there are three or four general principles which ought to be considered in a Treaty of this kind. The first is, that the interest of no one Province should be sacrificed for the benefit of any other. I very much fear that this principle has not been followed in the present case. For example, the Maritime Provinces are to lose their fisheries; then they fail to get the coasting trade, though it is granted on the lakes. It is true that, if a Canadian vessel does not break bulk at any American port, she may put into any other port and discharge there; but it is rarely the case that a cargo is made up of a single class of articles,—and it may be found advantageous to sell one description of goods at one port, and another at a different port. But that cannot be done, because where bulk is broken, there must the

whole cargo be discharged. This restriction operates almost exclusively against the Maritime Provinces; because in Ontario we ship our goods by rail, and can send them to any point where we can find the best market. It is not only the ship-owner who suffers by the restriction upon the coasting trade, but the producer as well; for it prevents him from sending his produce at all times to the best market. I do not want, if this Treaty be found to work injuriously to these Provinces, to be told by anyone from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia—"This Treaty was negotiated by an Ontario man; and not only did you give away our fisheries in order to get a better market for your grain, but you obtained for yourselves coasting privileges which you did not secure for us." (Hear, hear). When that takes place, the death-knell of Confederation has been sounded. There is another principle which I think ought to be observed in a Treaty of this kind, and that is that no large interest should be sacrificed for the benefit of other interests. For instance, suppose it is taken for granted that the agriculturalist will be benefitted by the Treaty,—and to a certain extent he will, but not in my judgment to the extent that is generally imagined;—suppose it is taken for granted that the lumberman will be largely benefitted—and no doubt he will, but not to the extent that is supposed, because the trouble with the lumber interest now is over-production, and there will be over-production in any case;—even taking it for granted that these interests will be benefitted by the Treaty, they ought not to be built up on the ruins of the manufacturing interests. The reason is this:—If the Treaty is not adopted, neither the lumberman nor the miller will be one farthing worse off than he is to-day; but if these interests are promoted by the sacrifice of the manufacturing interests, the country as a whole will gain nothing. It must not be forgotten that if the manufacturing interest suffers, every other interest suffers with it. Without manufactures to create a local market, our farmers would have to return to the old system of raising scarcely anything but grain, to the detriment of the soil. With a local market for a variety of produce, our farmers are adopting the better plan of having rotation of crops; but this course would be abandoned if the local market were destroyed,—as it would be to a great extent if our manufactures were crushed out. But will our manufacturing interests suffer under this Treaty? They must suffer, because they will not be subject merely to the competition of the United States, but of the whole world. I have heard it stated that it is not necessary for us to throw open our trade to Great Britain,—even though we do so to the United States, But if such a provision were in the Treaty, I do not believe there is a Canadian who would not vote against it,—however much he might approve of it in other respects. But we are not to have a fair competition with the United States; because the Treaty provides that in order to be admitted free of duty the article must be manufactured in Canada. Now, many of our manufactured articles are only partially manufactured in Canada; and this fact would prevent them from coming under the Treaty provisions. Besides, as has already been observed, many of our manufactures could not be sent into the United States on account of the American patent on them.

From a Pr
interests o
benefit of
from a nati
will destro
without we

Mr. V
subject of l
thing that s
to the Unite
coasting tra
the Treaty
the Hudson
the United
Again, it ou
Treaty have
sent back ag
difficulty wa
grain was im
from anothe
difficulty wa
back to the
great import
material is)
article itself
For, if it we
was made in
material of v
would be of
advantage of
material whic
not think the
the Caughnav
but that Cans
before the co
to the enlarg
at all reason
not fall upon
to incur great
It will be ver
be able to tak
The choice of
be of as muc
appears to me
Canadian mer
No doubt rates

is almost exclusively
we ship our goods by
the best market. It
upon the coasting
rom sending his pro-
this Treaty be found
anyone from New
ated by an Ontario
order to get a better
s coasting privileges
men that takes place,

There is another
Treaty of this kind,
d for the benefit of
r granted that the
to a certain extent
is generally imag-
man will be largely
that is supposed,
ver-production, and
ing it for granted
ey ought not to be
s. The reason is
man nor the miller
these interests are
s, the country as a
if the manufactur-

Without manu-
ve to return to the
triment of the soil.
s are adopting the
se would be aban-
e to a great extent
manufacturing inter-
e they will not be
of the whole
us to throw open
e United States,
re there is a Can-
ight approve of it
petition with the
be admitted free
many of our man-
da; and this fact
isions. Besides,
ould not be sent
patent on them.

From a Provincial point of view, we ought to reject this Treaty, because the interests of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are to be injured for the benefit of Ontario;—while they pay the price, we reap the benefit. And from a national point of view also we should oppose the Treaty, because it will destroy our manufacturing interests; for you cannot destroy them without very seriously injuring every other interest in the country.

Mr. WM. DARLING, (Montreal)—After some general remarks on the subject of Reciprocity as now brought under discussion he said:—The first thing that strikes me in connection with this Treaty is the concession made to the United States of the fisheries. Against that, it appears to me, the coasting trade should have been granted. (Hear, hear.) I also notice that the Treaty does not provide that Canada should have the coasting-trade of the Hudson River. Then, with regard to the question of duties, it seems that the United States' duties should be reduced at once to the Canadian rate. Again, it ought to be provided that, when any of the articles included in the Treaty have been exported from either country into the other, they could be sent back again free of duty to the country whence they came. Considerable difficulty was found in this respect under the old treaty. For instance, if grain was imported into Canada at one port and sent back to the United States from another, it became subject to duty in the United States. The same difficulty was experienced when the grain was ground into flour and sent back to the United States. There is one point which I look upon as of great importance, namely, that it ought to make no difference where the material is produced from which an article is manufactured, provided the article itself is manufactured in the country from which it is to be exported. For, if it were necessary to declare in each case, not only that the article was made in the country from which it was to be exported, but that the material of which it was manufactured was produced there, the Treaty would be of little use; and so far as it did operate, it would be to the advantage of the United States, because they produce a variety of raw material which is not produced in Canada. With regard to Canals, I do not think there are many merchants in Montreal who do not consider that the Caughnawaga canal would be a great advantage to both countries; but that Canada should be required to build this canal, or any part of it, before the consent of the Government of the State of New York is given to the enlargement of the Champlain Canal, does not appear to me to be at all reasonable. It must be remembered, however, that the expense will not fall upon us alone, but that the people of the United States will have to incur great expense to enlarge their canal connecting with the Hudson. It will be very advantageous to every New York and Montreal shipper to be able to take his choice of exporting via New York, Montreal, or Quebec. The choice of shipment, which the Caughnawaga canal would give, would be of as much value to Canadian as to American merchants; it even appears to me that the balance of advantage would be on the side of the Canadian merchant,—inasmuch as the St. Lawrence is the shorter route. No doubt rates of freight are sometimes very low in New York; but the

probabilities are that our import trade would be greatly increased by the Caughnawaga Canal, inasmuch as the imports to the West would be through that Canal from New York,—and it would be for vessels for Montreal to compete with shipments through that Canal *via* New York. If freight to Montreal was any lower our sea-going tonnage would increase at that port, for unless we have vessels arriving with cargoes from abroad, we never can have cheap freights to Europe. With regard to the size of our canals, and the time limited for their completion, these matters might safely be left to the Government,—guided, as they no doubt are, by the advice of competent engineers. They can tell far better than we are able to do what may be accomplished in a given time. I can hardly imagine that any Government would ever enter into obligations with another country, without first having a clear idea of how they were to fulfil them.

Hon. JAMES SKEAD, (Ottawa)—I come from a section of the country where we all want reciprocity, though we have prospered without it, and are not disposed to make great sacrifices to secure it. The lumber trade, in which we have twenty-five thousand men engaged, has been somewhat depressed by over-production; but, with careful management and less production, we hope to have the trade in a better condition in another year. A Reciprocity Treaty upon a fair and honorable basis, is all that we want, and we are not willing to accept anything less. The proposed Treaty must be amended before it can be acceptable. With regard to canals, we believe that the Caughnawaga Canal would be a great boon to our section; for it would enable us to build ships at Ottawa, where they can be built cheaper than in any other part of the world,—thus giving winter employment to our surplus population, who are engaged in the lumber trade during the summer. But if the Dominion Government is to be obliged to build the Caughnawaga canal, the Government of the United States should be required to assume the canals of the State of New York, and enlarge them to the capacity of the Canadian canals. We would then be able to build vessels on the Ottawa and send them out freighted. Respecting the depth of the Canadian canals, it appears to me that it will be impossible to enlarge them so as to afford a depth of twelve feet during the whole season. How will you get twelve feet of water on Lake St. Francis, or in many of the ports of Ontario? There is only one port where you can get twelve feet of water up to the docks. Dredging is very well when you have only earth to dredge; but blasting out the solid rock is too expensive. I will conclude by repeating that we desire and hope to receive a fair and liberal treaty,—nothing more, and nothing less.

Mr. ROBT. SPRATT (Montreal)—I do not feel prepared to discuss all the important questions involved in this Treaty; but I cannot allow the remarks of Mr. CHURCHER, of London, to go unanswered. I have had considerable experience in Ontario, both in farming and in the handling of farm produce, and this is the first time I ever heard that a Reciprocity Treaty would be injurious to those interests. I perfectly agree with him that the agricultural interests of Ontario have progressed very much since

the abrogati
would have
judgment th
barley, and
Treaty. Th
it seems mos
last, such an
Then they w
petition with
kets; but no
other hand, v
American me
tention to th
because Can
of the opposit
been propose
new Treaty, i
ernment of th
regard to m
Treaty, it str
liberty and in
power to do t
ment knows th
carrying trad
object to make
the coasting t
to be thrown o
the benefit of
tage of their c

Mr. GEO.
to say a few w
Ottawa last Fe
the United Sta
turer would be
I correctly unc
hold the same
tage the manuf
the duties are
right. It will
cheaper in the
case, I can see
not find it to t
and supply both
if they can carr
country, there s
ing the opportu

MEETING
 atly increased by the
 West would be through
 ssels for Montreal to
 York. If freight to
 increase at that port,
 n abroad, we never
 the size of our canals,
 s might safely be left
 the advice of compe-
 able to do what may
 ne that any Govern-
 country, without first

the abrogation of the former Treaty, but at the same time I believe they would have made greater progress if we had had reciprocity. In my judgment the farmers of Ontario have lost 15c. per bushel on their barley, and 20c. per bushel on their wheat, by the abrogation of the Treaty. Then, with regard to the effect of the Treaty upon manufacturers, it seems most extraordinary that since the meeting of this Board in February last, such an alteration should have taken place in their views, (hear, hear). Then they would be delighted to have the opportunity to enter into competition with the manufacturers of the United States to supply their markets; but now they appear to entertain a very different opinion. On the other hand, while our manufacturers are complaining of this Treaty, the American manufacturers are petitioning against it, and loudly calling attention to the fact that if it is carried out, their interests will be destroyed, because Canadians can manufacture cheaper than they can. A good deal of the opposition to this Treaty seems to arise from the way in which it has been proposed. It had always been our opinion that if we were to have a new Treaty, it should be first proposed by the United States—as the Government of that country caused the abrogation of the previous one. With regard to making the enlargement of Canadian Canals a part of the Treaty, it strikes me that in doing so we are actually bartering away our liberty and independence of action. We are binding ourselves to a foreign power to do things which we may not be able to do. The American Government knows that it is our policy to deepen the Canals, in order to attract the carrying trade of the West. I approve of that policy, but most decidedly object to making it a part of any contract with the United States. As to the coasting trade, it is only fair that, if the coasting trade of the Lakes is to be thrown open mutually to both countries, and if the Americans have the benefit of our Atlantic coasting trade, we should have the full advantage of their coasting trade.

Mr. GEO. H. WILKES (Brantford)—As a manufacturer I would like to say a few words in defence of the position taken by manufacturers. At Ottawa last February, what they advocated was a “reciprocal” tariff with the United States. Place the tariff at any per-centage, and the manufacturer would be satisfied, provided it were the same on both sides; and, if I correctly understand the arguments used here to-day, the manufacturers hold the same opinion still. The difficulty we apprehend is in the advantage the manufacturers of the United States would have during the time the duties are being reduced;—if once over that period we would be all right. It will be conceded, I think, that manufactures can be conducted cheaper in the Dominion than in the United States; and that being the case, I can see no reason why manufacturers in the United States would not find it to their advantage to move their establishments into Canada, and supply both markets. They are not blind to their own interests; and if they can carry on business here ten per cent. cheaper than in their own country, there are few whose patriotism would prevent them from embracing the opportunity. I think we should take the view that whatever adds

section of the coun-
 prospered without
 to secure it. The
 sand men engaged,
 but, with careful
 re trade in a better
 a fair and honorable
 cept anything less.
 e acceptable. With
 al would be a great
 ps at Ottawa, where
 world,—thus giving
 are engaged in the
 a Government is to
 ment of the United
 State of New York,
 s. We would then
 hem out freighted.
 s to me that it will
 twelve feet during
 n Lake St. Francis,
 ne port where you
 g is very well when
 solid rock is too
 and hope to receive
 ss.
 ired to discuss all
 cannot allow the
 red. I have had
 in the handling of
 hat a Reciprocity
 y agree with him
 d very much since

to the prosperity of the country as a whole, will benefit the manufacturing interests; and with the advantages we possess, we need not be afraid of the competition of any country.

Mr. W. J. KEAYS (Sarnia)—My co-delegate and myself did not expect that this question would be brought to an issue at this meeting; but that a discussion would merely be had upon it, and that it would be left over to our Annual Meeting at Ottawa. Our Board did not give any special instructions on this matter, but from what I know of their views, I believe that if they were placed in the form of a resolution they would be something to the effect:—that the Atlantic coasting trade should be conceded, that the time for the completion of the canals should not be absolutely fixed, and that the abolition of duties should take effect simultaneously and at once.

Mr. WM. HARTY, (Kingston)—In reading over Mr. ELDER'S amendment I cannot see any practical difference between the first part of it and the main motion submitted by Mr. TROUT,—which I think should first be adopted, and then we could go into the details; but as Mr. ELDER presses his full motion, I beg leave to move the following amendment, (seconded by Mr. A. JOSEPH, of Quebec), to be added to the first part of his motion, and to supercede the second part of it:

“That a Committee of this Board be appointed to consider the draft Reciprocity Treaty at present before the country, and report to this Board at its Annual Meeting in January next any amendments they may deem necessary to recommend to the Government.”

I believe that all the objections to the Treaty which are entertained by our people have already been pretty well detailed in course of this debate; and with some of them I fully agree. The provision respecting the gradual reduction of duties is one of the objectionable features which could be dealt with by the proposed Committee. Article 5 also, which binds the Dominion to enlarge the Canals to a certain size within a limited time, is another objectionable provision of the Treaty. I think that all we should be asked to do in this respect is, that whatever improvements we make in our channels to the Ocean—and the Americans know we are as desirous of improving them as they are—they shall receive the benefit of them on the same condition as our own people. Some able engineers say that the St. Lawrence never can be deepened to more than ten feet, except at a very great expense; we may therefore find it impossible to fulfil the Treaty obligations, and we may, when the time has expired, find the American Government speaking to us in this wise:—“You have humbugged us in this matter; you signed a Treaty agreeing to deepen your river navigation to twelve feet; you have not carried out that agreement; you have received great benefits from us, in your products being admitted free into our country; and now we demand from you payment of the difference between the old duties and the present duties.” I claim, therefore, that Article 5 should be either expunged or amended. As to the Caughnawaga Canal, I recognize the advantage it would be to us to have it; and I would be willing that our Government should subsidize a Company to build it.

But I do not unless the navigation of in which the trade of the tee I propose made through

Hon. T. meets about 1 not meet until

Mr. W. allowed for 1 remarks, I fail instance, with that the mere prestige or w built ships for opportunity of regard to its e manufacturers natural tende the United St severance of 1 States. Now and no small to say that a acceptable to made in the oc time interests, conceded, I be the fisheries as the question na once, the free once also and n the use of our 1 be permitted to three years ha judgment of th maritime intere manufactures, i that therefore respects it ough make a point ag changed their p “give us a marl told, when the

But I do not think it would be wise to make that work a part of the Treaty, unless the American Government definitely agreed to secure to us the navigation of Whitehall Canal and the Hudson River. Another respect in which the Treaty should be amended is that relating to the coasting trade of the Atlantic. All these points could be considered by the Committee I propose, in the light of this debate; and recommendations could be made through this Board to the Government in accordance with them.

Hon. T. R. JONES, (St. John)—The Senate of the United States meets about the 7th of December. The Dominion Board of Trade does not meet until January, and the Committee could not report in time.

Mr. WM. ELDER, (St. John)—I fear that owing to the short time allowed for speaking and the consequent necessity for compressing my remarks, I failed to make myself clearly understood on some points. For instance, with regard to the building of ships, what I intended to say was that the mere building of ships for another nation does not add to the prestige or wealth of a country, and that we had found it so whether we built ships for England or the United States. And this gives me an opportunity of saying that one of the objections I have to this Treaty is with regard to its effect upon us as a nation. If this Treaty does not satisfy our manufacturers who have large capital invested in various industries, its natural tendency will be to lead them to prefer the powerful protection of the United States; and if their patriotism is not proof against it, to desire a severance of the connection with England and annexation to the United States. Now, with every love to the people of the United States, and no small pride in their national prosperity, I do not hesitate to say that any Treaty that would have such a tendency cannot be acceptable to the people of this country. (Cheers). Another point I made in the course of my previous remarks was, that with regard to maritime interests, there was not an equal exchange; and that point has been conceded, I believe, by all the speakers. With regard to the concession of the fisheries as an off-set to the free interchange of natural productions, the question naturally arises—why, seeing that the fisheries are given up at once, the free exchange of natural products should not take effect at once also and not wait for three years? As it is, the Americans are to have the use of our fisheries from the passage of the Treaty, while we are not to be permitted to enjoy the equivalent they give us for the fisheries until three years have elapsed. I gather therefore from this debate that the judgment of this Board is that the Treaty is unfair to us in regard to the maritime interests affected by it; while with regard to its effect upon manufactures, it is almost wholly in the interest of the United States, and that therefore it should be urged upon our Government that in these respects it ought to be amended. The friends of the Treaty have sought to make a point against its opponents by asserting that our manufacturers have changed their position, because at the last meeting of this Board they said “give us a market, and we do not care about protection;” but now they are told, when the market is offered to them, that they are afraid of competi-

MEETING

benefit the manufacturing
need not be afraid of

and myself did not
issue at this meeting;
and that it would be
Board did not give
that I know of their
of a resolution they
coasting trade should
canals should not be
d take effect simultan-

MR. ELDER'S amend-
be first part of it and
think should first be
s Mr. ELDER presses
ment, (seconded by
art of his motion, and

draft Reciprocity Treaty
annual Meeting in January
to the Government."

are entertained by
course of this debate;
pecting the gradual
which could be dealt
o, which binds the
in a limited time, is
that all we should be
ents we make in our
are as desirous of
benefit of them on the
rs say that the St.
feet, except at very
to fulfil the Treaty
find the American
unbugged us in this
river navigation to
you have received
itted free into our
difference between
fore, that Article 5
oughnawaga Canal,
e it; and I would
ompany to build it.

tion. This, however, is only the *argumentum ad hominem*, which is not the style of argument that should be used in discussing a question of such grave importance as this. It should be considered solely upon its merits; and being so considered, I hope the amendment I had the honor to propose will be adopted, and that such recommendations will be made to Government as will enable them to secure for us a Treaty fair, liberal and comprehensive in its provisions.

Mr. J. M. TROUT (Toronto)—I find myself placed in a somewhat peculiar position. When, this morning, I rose to move the resolution now before you, it was simply with the intention of affirming our approval of the general principle of Reciprocity; and I did hope that this Board, in harmony with its own history, and in order to avoid any liability to misconception from any source, would have passed that resolution unanimously. I cannot see what possible harm that could have done. If you look at the resolution, you will find that it merely affirms the desirability of reciprocity with the United States, and that this Board takes an interest in the proceedings now pending for the obtaining of a Treaty. It does not approve of these proceedings in any shape or form. Is there any reason why this Board should divide upon the general principle of Reciprocity as enunciated in my resolution? My own opinion is that the Board should first affirm the general principle, and then we could naturally pass on to the consideration of objections to this Treaty, and specify them in the form of resolutions. But what is the issue now presented to us? You are asked to vote against the general principle of Reciprocity.—(No, no.) My resolution affirms nothing but that general principle, and you are going to vote against it.—(No, no; only to amend it!) Then our action has no meaning at all. How do you reconcile that with your past utterances? The only consistent course for this Board to take, is to affirm that we are in favor of Reciprocity and intend to support it whenever it is fairly and squarely presented to us. That is one matter, and the objections to this draft Treaty are quite another matter. We ought to remember that we are only a section of the community; that the agricultural part of the population outnumber us ten to one, and can if they like, pass the Treaty in spite of us. We ought to be consistent as commercial men, and to reaffirm in unmistakable terms our approval of Reciprocity.

This closed the debate on the part of the Delegates; and an invitation was again extended to the representatives of the National Board of Trade of the United States to address the Dominion Board before the vote was taken.

Mr. B. F. NOURSE (Boston)—Mr. President and Gentlemen: As has been said by the Chairman of our delegation, the provisions of this Treaty which you have been discussing here to-day, have not been considered by our National Board of Trade, nor by our local Boards. I could not therefore, under these circumstances, enter into a discussion of its merits,—feeling that if I should do so I would transgress the line of duty marked

out for me. on some p comments; my remark general se at all,—t considerat ing. In t that is inst well as for kindly feeli have occur and in the the fact that the Treaty Wool-Growe ground agai festo in whic the Treaty v here to-day same clause gentleman fr agricultural former Treat For several; When the co out their us Europe, I sh American gr both. On th rency was te had swept aw have not yet of meats an look to the fu duction in h those which h we underwent interests. B our currency iron and steel the world.] We have had flow comes it consider, in d the past five or or six years.

out for me,—and I think such is the feeling of my colleagues here. But on some points which have been mentioned I am free to make a few comments; and in doing so I wish it to be distinctly understood that my remarks are not intended to advocate or oppose the Treaty in its general scope. They will tend rather,—if they have any influence at all,—to suggest to the minds of gentlemen at this Board some consideration of the effect of certain causes at present existing. In the course of the discussion we have heard very much that is instructive and interesting; and I may say for my colleagues as well as for myself, that we have been deeply gratified at the expression of kindly feeling towards our country and our people. Such comments as have occurred to me, in listening to this debate shall be briefly expressed; and in the first place, I must say that there is a strange coincidence in the fact that, on both sides of the border, the same objections are made to the Treaty by similar classes of persons. The National Association of Wool-Growers and Manufacturers of the United States have taken strong ground against it; and Mr. Speaker BLAINE has issued a very able manifesto in which, on behalf of the timber and ship interest of Maine, he assails the Treaty with a force and vigor not surpassed by any of its opponents here to-day. These same interests on this side are opposing the same clauses of the Treaty. With regard to some remarks made by a gentleman from London, respecting the prices which have prevailed for the agricultural productions of Western Canada since the abrogation of the former Treaty, he seems to lose sight of some concurrent circumstances. For several years the harvest in a great part of Europe has been a failure. When the countries in the vicinity of the Black Sea and the Baltic again turn out their usual extraordinary yield of grain for the supply of Western Europe, I should like to know what will be the prices of Canadian and American grain and flour? The prices will be fixed in Mark Lane for us both. On the other hand, at the time the old Treaty was abrogated our currency was terribly depreciated, gold being from 140 to 150; and the war had swept away our surplus production of cereals, from the effects of which we have not yet recovered. All these things have tended to make the prices of meats and breadstuffs high throughout the world. But we must now look to the future, when an abundant harvest in Europe and increased production in the United States may bring down the prices considerably below those which have ruled for a number of years. Then, only a few months ago, we underwent a terrible financial panic which seriously injured our industrial interests. But from this we are recovering, and we hope before long, when our currency is again upon a gold basis, and with our cheap production of iron and steel, to be able to throw open our doors to the free competition of the world. These circumstances, I submit, are worthy of your reflection. We have had an ebb of the tide, and are yet upon that ebb; but when the flow comes it will flow in our favor. I therefore submit that it is for you to consider, in deliberating upon your own interests, whether the experience of the past five or six years is that to which you are fairly to look for the next five or six years. Allusion has been made to the fact that the Treaty you have

minem, which is not a question of such value upon its merits; the honor to propose made to Government and comprehensive

in a somewhat peculiar resolution now giving our approval of that this Board, in any liability to misinterpretation resolution unanimously done. If you deem the desirability of taking an interest in the Treaty. It does not seem to me there is any reason why the Board should not naturally pass on and specify them in the report to us? You are in favor of reciprocity.—(No, no, no, principle, and you amend it!) Then I think that with your Board to take, is to support it whenever the matter, and the result. We ought to be satisfied; that the agricultural can if they like, content as commercial of Reciprocity.

; and an invitation to the Board of Trade before the vote was taken. I think gentlemen: As has been the case of this Treaty been considered by I could not thereon of its merits,—and of duty marked

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

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

cial. We the highest and even which it I felt all day rel as it s Canada, to principles (sylvania an are not my represent ti the Canadia have often e delegates wi and resist u the two co secured the (Cheers.) from the do our country known to you in regard to baskets, one In this count unless you r soon find it qu agricultural shows that th shaping the long; but be associates, to to us, and for when you com in this respect Mr. R. assure you with you,— the delegates and to meet l pleasure. I gratification a tended to us together, it wil your kindness. these comparis countries,—ha

turers of American
ates; but surely it
stop to the wrongful
commercial morality
object to the law in
merican re-prints of
refer to a remark
generosity of Great
y is not the word
n between nations.
ted with a sincere
eir charge; and it
at it was for the
the repeal of the
ordinate, and even
good of the whole
deals and timber
Who gained by
in part, perhaps,
ple as a whole, but
ight for one-half of
sh people saved so
king of the general
d contrast to much
hings I have heard
England, or to those
tive tariff prevailed
l economy in these
d us unfortunately
gh we do retain it.
to construct your
t complain of that.
on of our policy;
n carries me back
the interest of her
veen our Atlantic
d; and I think the
, and so decided,
upon the Atlantic.
d give a stimulus
marine larger and
dant—better than
ese walls in these

cial. We believe in the greatest good of the greatest number. We believe the highest rule of government is that which looks beyond its own interest, and even beyond the interest of its own people, when the purpose for which it legislates forms part of the interest of mankind. I have felt all day that this matter is, as we sometimes say, "a very pretty quarrel as it stands;" and it shows the influence of American opinion upon Canada, to find Englishmen, and those who enjoy the heritage of the great principles of English liberty in Canada, adopting the principles of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. (Cheers and laughter.) Gentlemen,—they are not my principles, and they are not the principles of those who best represent the interests of the American people, whether north or south of the Canadian line. With regard to the general question of Reciprocity, we have often expressed ourselves in favor of it, but we have no instructions as delegates with regard to any of its details. For one, I hope you will resist and resist until you get every restriction removed from intercourse between the two countries that can possibly be taken off,—and until you have secured the very best Treaty possible in the interest of the whole continent. (Cheers.) Mr. President,—I have already alluded to the departure from the doctrines of Adam Smith, which I have witnessed here. In our country the agricultural interest may be typified by that animal known to you all by the length of his ears,—not in regard to intellect, but in regard to the burden it is compelled to bear; and with us it carries two baskets, one freighted with iron, and the other with woollens and cottons. In this country, your animal has only to carry the basket on one side; but unless you return to those good sound principles of your youth, you may soon find it quite as heavily weighted on the other side. In our country the agricultural element is beginning to resist this oppression; and the whole shows that the agricultural community is going to take a large share in shaping the policy of our country. I did not intend to detain you so long; but before sitting down I feel it my duty, in the name of my associates, to express to you our thanks for the courtesy you have extended to us, and for the kindness we have received at your hands;—and I hope, when you come over to our side again, we will be able to show you reciprocity in this respect at least. (Applause.)

Mr. R. HAWLEY, (Detroit).—Mr. President: I beg briefly to assure you that it has been a great pleasure once more to meet with you,—as I have had the honor of doing before, as one of the delegates of the National Board of Trade to this Dominion Board; and to meet here in St. John, has, to me, been a source of additional pleasure. I cordially respond to the sentiment of satisfaction and gratification at the courtesies and kindnesses which have been extended to us; and when again our National Board shall be called together, it will give us pleasure to the extent of our ability to reciprocate your kindness. We may be sure that this interchange of greetings,—these comparisons of opinions upon great questions which concern the two countries,—have been productive of good. Let us continue them in the

lent and Gentle-
wholly commer-

same spirit, and they will ever tend to the result which we all desire—increased commercial freedom and reciprocity, and a growing interchange of friendship between the peoples who have so many interests in common. With regard to the question that has been under discussion, I take it that substantially we are a unit. We all desire that a just, liberal, and comprehensive Treaty may be agreed upon between the two countries, so that we may enjoy respectively the advantages to flow from it—one of which will be a large increase in commercial exchanges. There are many other advantages which would flow from such a Treaty, but time will not permit me even to mention them,—nor is it necessary. Let us rely upon it, Mr. President and Gentlemen, that our respective Governments—as I believe they are—are earnestly endeavouring to consider this question from all its stand-points, in an enlightened, fair, and liberal spirit. They can appreciate and give due weight to the various considerations which are brought out at a deliberative meeting like this;—and I am glad to cherish the hope and conviction, that what has already not only begun, but so far progressed, will be brought to a conclusion, which, if not entirely satisfactory to all at the beginning, will ere long be found to be for the common good of both countries. (Applause.)

The PRESIDENT observed that Mr. A. S. MITCHELL, representative of the *New York Tribune*, was present; and, if the Board had no objection, an opportunity would be given him to offer a few remarks.

Mr. MITCHELL.—Mr. President and Gentlemen, of the Dominion Board:—I do not feel at all able to express properly my appreciation of the compliment, that has been paid me, in this departure from what might be considered the regular order of proceedings. I am no part or parcel of your organization, and have come here merely to do my duty to the great journal which aspires to be a power in the American Union, and therefore desires to obtain information upon every important movement, not only in the United States, but other countries. I appreciate the compliment personally because I have come into personal contact with many members of this Board; but I recognize also, that it is paid to the journal which I represent, whose great founder was known and appreciated wherever the English language is spoken (Cheers). I thank you on behalf of that journal for the recognition extended to it; and, while I have no right to speak of the position which it may take upon any question affecting the interests of the Dominion and the United States, yet I am free to say that whatever will elevate humanity, and promote concord, and amity, and prosperity among the nations, will find in the *Tribune* a zealous and able advocate (Applause). I have, Gentlemen, a confession to make. When it was proposed to me that I should attend this meeting, I treated the matter with some degree of indifference. I said to myself, what is Canada to us?—or we to Canada? I have come and I have been astonished at the development I have seen here,—at the foundation I recognize for a great people. You are of the Provinces, but not Provincial; on the contrary, you are

metropoli
worthy to
I should to
moment to
people.
I want to
what surp
Treaty is
any degr
surprised
my own p
Treaty is
with it and
it all your
naturally c
apparently
which may
average pol
is a very lit
of the most
tection in h
If you dro
will find t
Dominion, t
coal and iro
extreme Sov
the southern
favor of free
of the who
and simple.
are all natur
but he is rea
naturally fre
else. That,
both sides of
rose to return
press to you
country. Yo
vision; and I
duties of a pu
hope that in t
no step back
American con
will be the fir
eral and enlig
follower in the

metropolitan,—cosmopolitan in the broadest sense of the word,—and worthy to be treated with on the footing of the most-favored nation; and I should be ashamed of our Government if it could condescend for one moment to offer or accept anything that was unequal or unjust, from this people. If there are to be any amendments made to this proposed Treaty, I want to see them made in the interest of both countries. I am somewhat surprised, I confess, to find such a unanimity of opposition to the Treaty as I have found in the Dominion. I do not propose to speak with any degree of critical accuracy upon this question; but what I am surprised at is the coincidence between the objections raised to it among my own people and the people here. I guess that the trouble is that the Treaty is pretty nearly right (Laughter). For, if you were all pleased with it and glad to get it, it would be a very strong indication that you had it all your own way; and if our people were all very fond of it, you might naturally conclude that we had the best of the bargain. But both sides are apparently displeased with it. Well, there is a principle of human nature which may perhaps explain and illustrate this position. If you take the average politician in the State of Maine, for instance, he will tell you that he is a very liberal-minded public man,—that he is in favor of Reciprocity and of the most liberal dealings with the Dominion—provided you give him protection in his ship-building, and other industries in which he is interested. If you drop down to Pennsylvania and speak to her representatives, you will find that they are most cordial in their disposition towards the Dominion, towards free-trade and all that,—provided that you protect their coal and iron from competition with Nova Scotia. And if you go to the extreme South, where free-trade has long had its home in our country, the southern planter will tell you that he has time 'out of mind' been in favor of free-trade,—but you must protect his sugar. And so the absurdity of the whole thing is apparent; it is nothing but selfishness pure and simple. Sydney Smith is credited with the remark, that people are all naturally generous and charitable; for A never sees B in trouble but he is ready to call on C to relieve him. (Laughter.) We are all naturally free-traders; but we want free-trade at the expense of somebody else. That, I fear, is what is the matter with regard to this subject on both sides of the line. But I shall not attempt to discuss this question. I rose to return thanks for the honor done me and my journal, and to express to you the profound satisfaction I have experienced in visiting your country. You have instructed me,—you have enlarged the scope of my vision; and I hope I shall be able in future more adequately to fulfil the duties of a public journalist by knowing the value of these Provinces. I hope that in the career you have marked out for yourselves, you will take no step backward. I hope that as these Provinces are the first on the American continent to catch the sunlight of opening day, so they politically will be the first to catch the sunlight of unfettered commerce, and liberal and enlightened legislation,—and so be the pioneer and not a mere follower in the march of civilization. (Applause).

The amendment to the amendment was then put to the vote, and lost on the following division:—

Yeas—Messrs. Darling, Harty, Joseph, Shannon, Trout, Wilkes,—6.

Nays—Messrs. Baptist, Churcher, Clemow, Cowan, Dobell, Dougall, Elder, Findlay, Fry, Gordon, Gregory, Guilbeault, Hamilton, Harding, Holmstead, Jamieson, Jones, Keays, Larke, Murray, Robertson, Scott, Skead, Spratt, Waterman, Watts, Young,—27.

Mr. Elder's amendment was then put and carried on the following division:—

Yeas—Messrs. Baptist, Churcher, Clemow, Cowan, Dobell, Elder, Findlay, Fry, Gordon, Gregory, Guilbeault, Hamilton, Harding, Holmstead, Jamieson, Jones, Larke, Murray, Robertson, Scott, Shannon, Skead, Spratt, Waterman, Watts, Wilkes, Young,—27.

Nays—Messrs. Darling, Dougall, Harty, Joseph, Keays, Trout,—6.

REPORT ON PROPOSED INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), from the Committee on Insolvency, presented the following report:—

Report of the Committee on Insolvency to the Dominion Board of Trade, at St. John, N.B.

Your committee have had under their consideration the Bill relating to Insolvency prepared by the late Minister of Justice, and introduced at the last session of Parliament. They are pleased to notice the attention that has been paid by the Minister to the suggestions made by your Board. The suggestions which have been embodied in the Bill are as follows:

That the Act extend to incorporated trading companies, except banks and railways. That the insolvent prepare the statement of his affairs, and make oath that it is correct.

Security must be given by every assignee elected by creditors before he can act as assignee.

Money collected by the assignee must be deposited in a bank in the name of the estate, and can only be withdrawn by the joint cheques of the assignees and inspectors, or by order of the court.

Assignee must prepare his final account, and apply to the Judge for a discharge.

Inspectors must examine all claims and determine whether any of them should be contested.

A debtor is to be considered insolvent if he has called any meeting of his creditors and has exhibited a statement of his affairs.

Shewing his inability to meet his creditors, or acknowledge his insolvency.

The changes made in the Insolvent Act which were not suggested by the Board of Trade were as follows:

That Official Assignees be to be appointed by the Governor in Council, in place of by Boards of Trade.

Your Committee disapprove of this latter provision, preferring that such appointments be made as heretofore by Boards of Trade.

That after a den

Your C

That p of Limitati

This is

The rat vote any ri meeting of

Your C left to credit

Opposit

Your C

Offers of a special me

The Jud eligible who

Any cre amounts to \$

These al

Clerks, in al two month

Your Co four months'

Committee w of servants sh

Judge is t of creditors.

False ent misdemeanor.

Rights of

These cla

The sugg made in the bi

That at th of creditors mt right to vote o and deducted.

That writs claims and who should be of su

That when any legal exper unsuccessful par

That deeds offer of a compe to the assignee.

That perso been taken, al inspectors, but

That Insolvents shall not make a voluntary assignment, and may only assign after a demand is made by creditors having claims for \$500 or over that amount.

Your Committee desire to retain the provision for voluntary assignments. That persons who have incurred debts as traders which are not barred by the Statute of Limitation, although not in trade, shall be considered as traders.

This is approved by your Committee.

The rate of Commission to Assignees is reduced in amount, but the creditors can vote any rate of commission to the assignee; he is also to be allowed \$5 for each meeting of creditors, and 10 cents mileage.

Your Committee are of opinion that the remuneration of assignees should be entirely left to creditors.

Opposition to claims are to be made before the Judge in the case of the assignee.

Your Committee approve of this alteration.

Offers of composition made at any meeting are to be taken into consideration, and a special meeting called to accept or reject the offer.

The Judge may appoint inspectors if the creditors neglect to do so; any creditor is eligible whose claim is \$100.

Any creditor may propose a resolution of creditors before the Judge if his claim amounts to \$100.

These alterations are also approved by your Committee.

Clerks, in addition to three months arrears of salary, are to be entitled to an additional two months' salary of the unexpired year.

Your Committee think that the provision of the present law, namely not exceeding four months' wages, is ample protection to employees. If any change is made, your Committee would rather see it in the direction of shortening the period for which wages of servants should be preferred.

Judge is to fix the remuneration of the official assignee, if he is removed by a vote of creditors.

False entries made by assignees, for the purpose of deceiving creditors, to be a misdemeanor.

Rights of hypothecary creditors, in Quebec, are better provided for.

These clauses are approved by your Committee.

The suggestions of the Boards of Trade which do not form part of the changes made in the bill, were as follows:

That at the first meeting of the creditors and before any vote is taken, the claims of creditors must be proved and the vouchers produced, and that the creditors have the right to vote only for the amount of the balance after all securities have been valued and deducted.

That writs of attachment be only issued on the petition of persons who have direct claims and who have no security for them. If security is held the unsecured portion should be of such an amount as the Act requires to take those proceedings.

That where there is a competition between two assignees for possession of an estate, any legal expenses incurred should not be paid out of the funds of the estate, but the unsuccessful party should be liable to the successful party.

That deeds of composition and discharge should always contain, in addition to the offer of a composition to creditors, the offer to pay all expenses incurred and commissions to the assignee.

That persons who acquired claims by purchase after insolvency proceedings have been taken, should not be entitled to vote for the appointment of assignee or inspectors, but in all respects should have the same rights as other creditors.

That no assignee be eligible for election who is related to the insolvent or who has an interest opposed to the general interest of creditors.

That while creditors who cannot produce vouchers should be entitled to have dividends reserved for them for a reasonable time, by declaring on oath why he cannot produce them, or in whose hands they are, to the best of his knowledge, he should not be permitted to act or vote at any meeting till they are produced.

That the amount of costs payable by the estate for the discharge of the insolvent should be limited to the taxed costs.

That accounts for law costs should be submitted to the inspectors, and taxed by them if they consider it necessary.

That after goods are delivered to the purchaser, the vendor should have right to recover them, in case of the insolvency of the purchaser, but only have the right to the *pro rata* share of the proceeds in the distribution of the estate.

That the expense of advertisements should be decreased by being made only in the *Official Gazette* of the Province in which the debtor resides.

That assignees, after being elected by the vote of creditors, should only be removed at a special meeting called for the purpose of removing the assignee.

That if any of the assets of an insolvent have been sold by the Sheriff, the proceeds should form part of the estate which the assignee is to receive.—Sections 59 and 116 of the Insolvent Act of 1869 do not seem to agree on this point.

That deeds of composition and discharge should not be confirmed by the Judge until the Insolvent prove to the Court, by the certificate of the assignee and inspectors, that the requisite number of creditors have signed the deed, and the creditors have claims to the required amount after the deduction of all securities.

That securities, after they have matured and are unpaid, have not to be valued and deducted. Under the Act of 1869 it was requested that they should be valued and deducted after they had matured and were unpaid.

That as the costs in any suit against a debtor who becomes insolvent must be paid by the creditors, and he can only rank for a dividend on those costs, it was requested that where the suit for the recovery of a debt tended to bring about the liquidation of the estate, the costs of the suit should be paid by the estate.

That as it has been decided in Ontario that Force makes the transfer of real or personal estate legal, even when a creditor thus obtains a preference—it should be provided that it is of no consequence under what pressure the preference is granted that the transfer of the security is null.

That creditors who vote at any meetings or sign a deed of composition and discharge without having valued and deducted from their claim the value of the securities they hold, or who sign a deed of composition and discharge for an amount larger than the true amount due to them after the deduction of the value of all securities to be subject to a penalty of \$100, which should be recoverable by the assignee, inspector or any creditor.

Register of Bankruptcies and unclaimed dividends should be provided for.

Accountant in insolvency for each of the Provinces with power similar to those exercised by the accountant in bankruptcy in Scotland.

That Section 149 of the Insolvent Act of 1869 was strongly objected to by the delegates from St. John, N.B.

Your Committee recommend that those amendments be pressed on the attention of the Government during the Parliamentary recess, with a view to their incorporation in the bill to be submitted at the next meeting of Parliament.

Your Committee further urge that the laws relating to Insolvency be placed on the Statute Book of the Dominion without limitation as to the period of their duration, and that the word "Trader" be clearly defined so as to embrace all manufacturers,

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ANDREW ROBERTSON,

Chairman.

W. F. FINDLAY,

Secretary.

St. John, N.B., 18th July, 1874.

Chairman

F. FINDLAY

"The

Boards of

of the

The

The

and Life

Drummond

and W.

(John), as

of the

Moved by Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal), seconded by Mr. W. F. FINDLAY (Hamilton), as follows:—

"That the Report on Insolvency now presented be printed and sent to the various Boards of Trade in affiliation with this Board, for their consideration and report."

The motion was carried.

INSURANCE POLICIES.

The PRESIDENT named the following Committee on the subject of Fire and Life Insurance Policies:—Messrs. Robert Marshall (St. John), G. A. Drummond (Montreal), W. J. Keays (Sarnia), Wm. Harty (Kingston), and W. F. Findlay (Hamilton), with Mr. A. C. Fairweather (St. John), as Secretary.

OCEAN ROUTES FOR STEAMERS.

Mr. J. A. HARDING (St. John) asked and obtained leave to submit the following resolution, which was seconded and adopted:—

Resolved,—“That the Dominion Board of Trade views with great satisfaction, the movement recently begun in the United States, towards the establishment of an International Commission of the Maritime Powers, for the regulation of Ocean Atlantic travel, by the laying down of Ocean courses for the inward and outward Summer and Winter passages of steam vessels, and by such other means as the progress of science and the teachings of experience may suggest.”

INTERNATIONAL NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

Mr. WM. ELDER (St. John, N.B.) moved the following resolution, which was seconded and adopted:—

Resolved,—“That this Board regards an International rate of Newspaper Postage between the Dominion and the United States as most desirable; and that the Executive Council memorialize the Government of Canada to take steps to procure the establishment of such a rate.”

RESOLUTIONS OF THANKS.

Mr. HENRY FRY (Quebec) moved the following resolution:

“That the thanks of the Dominion Board of Trade are due, and are hereby tendered, to the St. John Board of Trade for the hearty welcome given, and the extreme kindness and hospitality shown to the members of the Dominion Board and their friends.”

The motion was seconded by Mr. ANDREW ROBERTSON (Montreal) and unanimously adopted.

HON. T. R. JONES briefly responded and expressed the pleasure which the St. John Board had experienced in this visit of the Dominion Board to their City.

ment of Congress, whether it will give its constitutional concurrence to the conclusion of a treaty with Great Britain for the purposes already named, either in such form as is proposed by the British Plenipotentiaries, or in such other more acceptable form as the Senate may prefer.

WASHINGTON, June 18, 1874.

U. S. GRANT.

The following is the report of the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 17, 1874.

I have the honor to inclose a copy of the draught of 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, which the British Plenipotentiaries have proposed to this Government.

THE PRESIDENT.

HAMILTON FISH.

The following is a complete copy of the treaty:

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-coasts 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 therunto 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. I
in commo
mentioned
the eastern
of north la
bays, harb
the said isl
to land up
purpose of
interfere w
in the peac

It is u
and that sa
are hereby

ART. I
under the
cluded at V
Majesty's d
of fishing
common rig
between the
common rig
commission
same mann
appointed t

ART. I
unto annex
of the Unit
from the 1st
two-thirds o
country of s
of June, 187
the 1st day
shall be adm
For the
in the Unite
produce, or
produce, or
articles, the

SCHEDULE
ashes, pot, pe
stuffs of all
hewed, wrou
waste; dyes
kinds; fish,
in oil; fire-w
dried; furs,
hay; hemp,

nce to the conclu-
either in such form
ore acceptable form

U. S. GRANT.

STATE,

on June 17, 1874.

for the reciprocal
and Canada, with
their use by United
British Plenipoten-

MILTON FISH.

of America, being
pective territories
North America and
ly beneficial, have
that is to say :

rade between the
Canadian canals,
ritish vessels.

n addition to the
etween the United
r, 1818, of taking,
n colonies therein
ith the subjects of
n Article XIII of
its and shores and
n, New Brunswick,
nt, without being
in the said coasts
purpose of drying
interfere with the
use of any part of

of fishery,
rs and mouths of

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 said 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; pease, 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; talls; 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-buskers 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 broadcast-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. IV. 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, 1886.

ART. I.
The 1st day
venient po
said canal
and the loc
And the U
to cause ti
enlarged, a
equal capac
navigation
Champlain

ART. V
in Article 2
dian port t
itants of Ca
in their ves
lakes or riv
United Stat
Majesty, in
any port of
therewith, t

ART. V
treaty, the c
Lawrence, a
nawaga Can
and that, wi
such tolls or
shall be levi
back or disc
canal or can

And it i
enjoy the us
the United S
shall be free
ject to any le
respectively,

And th
of New York
the Whiteha
canal or oth
Hudson Rive
with the inh

And it i
cargo from v
of every cana
And, fur
Lake Champ
Canal be not

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 Saint 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 be of not 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 Saint 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 Saint 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 Saint 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 tranship 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 canal 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.