

S P E E C H  
OF  
THE HON. JOSEPH HOWE  
AT THE  
INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL CONVENTION  
AT DETROIT.

DELIVERED ON FRIDAY, 14TH INSTANT.

*(Specially revised by MR. HOWE for the HAMILTON SPECTATOR.)*

Hon. JOSEPH HOWE, of Nova Scotia, took the floor and made a long and eloquent speech. He said: I never prayed for the gift of eloquence till now. Although I have passed through a long public life, I never was called upon to discuss a question so important in the presence of a body of representative men so large. I see before me merchants who think in millions, and whose daily transactions would sweep the harvest of a Greek island or of a Russian principality. I see before me the men who whiten the ocean and the great lakes with the sails of commerce—who own the railroads, canals and telegraphs, which spread life and civilization through this great country, making the waste plains fertile and the wilderness to blossom as the rose. I see before me the men whose capital and financial skill form the bulwark and sustain the Government in every crisis of public affairs. (Cheers.) On either hand I see the gentlemen who control and animate the press, whose laborious vigils mould public sentiment—whose honourable ambition I can estimate from my early connection with the profession. On those benches, Sir, or I mistake the intelligence to be read in their faces, sit those who will yet be Governors or Ministers of State. I may well feel awed in the presence of an audience such as this; but the great question which brings us together is worthy of the audience, and challenges their grave consideration.

What is that question? Sir, we are here to determine how best we can draw together, in the bonds of peace, friendship and commercial prosperity, the three great branches of the British family. (Cheers.) In the presence of this great theme all petty interests should stand rebuked—we are not dealing with the concerns of a city, a Province or a State, but with the future of our race in all time to come. Some reference has been made to "Elevators" in your discussion. What we want is an elevator to lift our souls to the height of this argument. Why should not these three great branches of the family flourish under different systems of government, it may be, but forming one grand whole, proud of a common origin and of advanced civilization? We are taught to reverence the mystery of the Trinity, and our salvation depends on our belief. The clover lifts its trefoil leaves to the evening dew, yet they draw their nourishment from a single stem. Thus distinct, and yet united, let us live and flourish. Why should we not? For nearly two thousand years we were one family. Our fathers fought side by side at Hastings, and

heard the curfew toll. They fought in the same ranks for the sepulchre of our Saviour—in the earlier and later civil wars. We can wear our white and red roses without a blush, and glory in the principles those conflicts established. Our common ancestors won the great Charter and the Bill of Rights—established free Parliaments, the Habeas Corpus, and trial by Jury. Our jurisprudence comes down from Coke and Mansfield to Marshall and Story, rich in knowledge and experience, which no man can divide. From Chaucer to Shakespeare our literature is a common inheritance. Tennyson and Longfellow write in one language, which is encircled by the genius developed on either side of the Atlantic. In the great navigators from Cottrell to Hudson, and in all their "moving accidents by flood and field" we have a common interest. On this side of the sea we have been largely reinforced by the Germans and French, but there is strength in both elements. The Germans gave to us the sovereigns who established our freedom, and they gave to you industry, intelligence and thrift, and the French who have distinguished themselves in arts and arms for centuries, now strengthen the Provinces which the fortune of war decided they could not control. But it may be said we have been divided by two wars. What then? The noble St. Lawrence is split in two places—by Goat Island and by Anticosti—but it comes down to us from the same springs in the same mountain sides; its waters sweep together past the Pictured Rocks of Lake Superior, and encircle in their loving embrace the shores of Huron and Michigan. They are divided at Niagara Falls as we were at the revolutionary war, but they come together again on the peaceful bosom of Ontario. Again they are divided on their passage to the sea. But who thinks of divisions when they lift the keels of commerce, or when drawn up to heaven they form the rainbow or the cloud? It is true that in eighty-five years we have had two wars—but what then? Since the last we have had fifty years of peace, and there have been more people killed in a single campaign in the late civil war than there were in the two national wars between this country and Great Britain. The people of the United States hope to draw together the two conflicting elements and make them one people. And in that task I wish them God speed! (Cheers.) And in the same way I feel that we ought to rule out everything disagreeable in the recollection of our old wars, and unite together as one people for all time to come. (Cheers.) I see around the door

the flags of the two countries. United as they are, I would ever have them draped together, fold within fold, and let "their varying tints unite and form in heaven's light one arch of peace." (Applause.) He thanked the Board of Trade and the people of the city for the hospitality extended to the Provincial Delegates, and proceeded as follows to the general exposition of his subject: The most important question to be considered at this great meeting of the commercial men of North America involves the relations which are to subsist between the inhabitants of the British empire and the citizens of the United States. Before we can deliver a rational judgment upon that question it becomes us to consider what those relations are now. The British Government controls the destinies, and regulates the trade of two hundred and fifty millions of people, distributed over the four quarters of the globe; and in the British Islands alone the machinery in constant running order does the work of eight hundred millions more. Now in what spirit has the British Government, controlling this great empire, dealt in commercial matters with the United States? It has extended to them all the privileges of the most favored nation, and has opened up to them on the most easy terms the consumption for everything that they can produce, of all these people. Millions of emigrants, and hundreds of millions of money, have flowed in here without any attempt, by unwise laws, to dam up the streams of industry and capital. Leaving those of her provinces that have legislatures free to regulate their own tariffs, Great Britain restrains them from discriminating, as against the productions of this country, even in favor of her own. Though burdened with an enormous debt, and always compelled to confront the military monarchies of Europe by a powerful force by land and sea, the people of England prefer to pay direct taxes to burdening commerce with heavy import duties. Year by year the highest financial skill of the nation has been employed to discover how its tariffs could be simplified, port charges reduced, obsolete regulations removed; and year by year as trade extends and revenue increases, taxes are reduced or abolished upon articles of prime necessity, consumed by the great body of the people. I notice that some writers in the West complain that wheat is sent into this country from Canada, duty free; but it should be remembered that the surplus of all the cereals, ground or unground, is not only admitted to the British Islands duty free from the United States, but to almost, if not to all, the ports in our widely extended empire. It is sometimes said that because this country admits breadstuffs from Canada, manufactures free of duty should be taken in return. But Great Britain and the Provinces take annually an enormous quantity of breadstuffs and meat from this country, but do not ask from you the privilege that some persons would claim from us.

In three departments of economic science Great Britain has made advances far outstripping in liberality the policy of this or of any other foreign country. France and the United States continue to foster and extend their fisheries by high bounties, but she leaves her people, without any special encouragement, to meet on the sea, and in foreign markets, the unfair competition to which they are subjected by this system.

Great Britain throws open to the people of this country the coasting trade of the entire Empire. A ship from Maine or Massachusetts, or from any State in the Union, may not only visit and unlade at the port to which she has been cleared, but she may go from port to port, and from province to province, until she has circumnavigat-

ed the globe, the discretion of her owners being the only limit to the extent of her transactions. The Government of the United States gives to British subjects no participation in their coasting trade. Whether they find a market or not, they must break bulk and sell at any port they enter. With our fifty colonies spread over the face of the globe, your shipowners participate in the same privileges as our own. And when I speak of the shipping interest, it must be admitted to include many interests—the lumber interest (and an important one it is), the industry of the blacksmith, the caulker, the rigger, the ropemaker, and of the man who works in copper. All these branches of industry are represented in a ship and fostered by this policy of Great Britain. (Cheers.)

Mr YOUNGLOVE, of Philadelphia—I would ask the gentleman if the rights he speaks of, on the part of the shipping interest, are dependent on the Reciprocity Treaty?

Mr HOWE—Yesterday, our worthy friend, Mr Hamlin, talked about Reciprocity in "slices," and I am now simply showing you how many slices we gave you before the Reciprocity Treaty was negotiated. [Loud cheers and laughter.] I assert that Great Britain, with a liberality which would do honor to any Government, has thrown open this whole trade without any restriction. She says to us, if not in so many words, "You are all children of mine, and are dear to me. You are all on the other side of the Atlantic, possessing a common heritage: make the best of it." [Hear, hear.] Your vessels are permitted to run to, Halifax, from Halifax to St John, from St John to British Columbia, and from British Columbia to England, Scotland, or Ireland. They are allowed to go coasting around the British Empire until they rot. But you do not give us the privilege of coasting anywhere from one end of your Atlantic coast to the other. And now I hope that our friend from Maine will acknowledge that in granting this privilege with nothing in return, Great Britain gave you a pretty large slice. [Cheers and laughter.]

The citizens of this country may build in any of its ports, steamers or sailing vessels, and clothe them with the character and invest them with the privileges of British ships, by registering them in any part of the Empire. In peace this is a great privilege, and gives to the shipbuilders of Maine and Massachusetts a very decided advantage over those on the opposite side of the Bay of Fundy. In war, assuming Great Britain to be a neutral, it is a protection. I trust I have shown, 1st, That the British Empire is sufficiently extended, populous, and powerful to be independent of the hostility or fiscal errors of any foreign State; 2nd, That her commercial code is characterized by principles of liberality so broad, as to invite exchanges with all the world; and that, altogether independent of the Reciprocity Treaty, she has granted privileges to this country for which no equivalents have been asked or given.

The Reciprocity Treaty was a special arrangement, forced upon both countries by a long frontier, by the proximity of rich fishing grounds, and by the difficulty of drawing accurate and recognised boundaries upon the sea. I need not enter upon the history of this question, which has been most accurately given by Lorenzo Sabine, Esq., in his very able reports to the Boston Board of Trade. It is sufficient for us to know that for forty years the use by American citizens of the in-shore fisheries upon the coasts of British America was in controversy between the two Governments. That every year American fishing vessels were seized or driven off, it being impossible to define accurately a sea line of five thousand miles

—that disputes were endless, tending ultimately to the employment of naval forces, with evident danger of hostile collisions and of war.

On the other hand, the Canadians, seeing the great staples of the United States freely admitted into every part of the British empire, naturally claimed that their breadstuffs should pass with equal freedom into the United States, the greater portion being only in transitu to the mother country. The Maritime Provinces, admitting breadstuffs from the United States duty free, and all their manufactures under low import duties, not exceeding 10 to 12½ per cent, naturally claimed that their own unmanufactured staples should be admitted free into this country. They as fairly claimed that their tonnage should be entitled to the right of registry in the United States, and to participate in its coasting trade.

The Reciprocity Treaty was a compromise of all these claims and interests. For the Provinces it was an unfair compromise. The right of registry and to trade coastwise was not conceded. The free interchange of the produce of the soil, the forest and the mine, was satisfactory. The right to navigate Lake Michigan was perfectly fair to both countries.

But the retention of the bounties gave to the fishermen of the United States an unfair advantage, and for the free navigation of the rivers and canals of British America no equivalents were given. To the maritime provinces the concession of the in-shore fisheries, with the right to dry and cure fish upon their coasts, was particularly distasteful. So long as American fishermen were kept outside of a line drawn three marine miles from the headlands, as fixed by the Convention of 1818, the mackerel, herring, and alewife fisheries were secure from intrusion within those limits, and the codfishery within the great bays of Newfoundland was a close preserve, while the protection of the revenue in all the provinces gave the Government but little concern. But the moment that American fishermen obtained the right to fish in all the bays, harbors, and estuaries of British America, the line of operations was doubled in length, and the privilege, if they choose to use it, of carrying on illicit trade with the inhabitants of the sea coast, and of sending goods into the interior free of duty, gave them facilities extremely difficult to control. A very large amount of spirits and manufactures have in this way been introduced into the maritime Provinces free of duty, within the past ten years, that it would not be easy to trace in the regular trade returns. So distasteful was this great concession, without equivalent, to the people of the Lower Provinces, that it was denounced by some of their ablest public men as an unrequited sacrifice of their interests.

In this connection it is but right to show that, whether the treaty was fair or unfair, in the working of it, the citizens of this country have had advantages not contemplated when it was signed. The arrangement was completed on the 5th of June, 1854, but was not to come into full effect till ratified by the Colonial Legislature. Mr. Marcy requested that pending the decisions of the Provinces, the American fishermen should be permitted to enter upon the inshore fisheries in as full and ample a manner as they would be when the treaty came into force. The concession was yielded and the British and Colonial cruisers withdrawn. When the Colonies claimed the free entry of their products, pending the ratification of the treaty in return for this concession, existing revenue laws were pleaded, and this very reasonable claim was denied, so that at the outset the citizens of the Republic enjoyed the chief advantages of the treaty for nearly a

year before the Colonists were practically brought within its scope and operations.

Again, when the civil war broke out, one-half the seaboard of the United States was blockaded, and all the advantages of the Reciprocity Treaty, so far as the consumption of the ten millions of people in the Southern States was a benefit to the Provinces were withdrawn. Assuming that the treaty runs over ten years, it will be seen that for the whole of that period the people of this country have enjoyed all the benefits for which they stipulated, while the British Americans, for one year of the ten, have enjoyed no benefit at all, and for four years have lost the consumption of one-third of the people with whom, by the treaty, they were entitled to trade. Recognizing the political necessities of the period, British subjects have made no complaints of this exclusion, but it ought to be borne in mind, now that the whole subject is about to be revised.

Let us now look at the working of the treaty and estimate, if we can, in a judicial spirit, its fair and legitimate fruits. We must confess that, as a measure of peace and National fraternity, it has been most successful. It has extended to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and to the North Atlantic, the freedom and the security enjoyed by the Great Lakes, under a kindred arrangement. There have been no more intrusions, warnings, captures—no rival squadrons guarding boundaries not possible to define. This treaty settled amicably, the last boundary question, about which the Governments of Great Britain and the United States could, by any possibility, dispute. This was a great matter, had no other good been accomplished, and he is no friend to either country who would desire to throw open this wide field of controversy again. Looking at the industrial results of the treaty, any fair minded and dispassionate man must admit that they have far surpassed, in utility and value, all that could have been hoped by the most sanguine advocates of the measure, in 1854. The trade of the United States and of the Provinces, feeble, restricted, slow of growth, and vexatious before, has been annually swelled by mutual exchanges and honourable competition, till it is represented by a grand total of \$456,350,391, in about nine years. This amount seems almost incredible figures by which this trade will be expressed, but who can hazard an estimate of the ten or twenty years hence, if this wise adjustment of our mutual interests be not disturbed? If there be any advantage in a balance of trade, the returns show that the citizens of the United States have had it to the extent of \$55,951,145. But in presence of the great benefits conferred upon both countries by the measure, it would be a waste of time to chaffer over their distribution. In the interests of peace and honest industry, we should thank Providence for the blessing, and confidently rely upon the wisdom of our statesmen to see that it is preserved.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn your attention to some of the topics touched by other gentlemen in the course of the three day's debate. Some gentlemen seem to be apprehensive that if this treaty is renewed it will lead to illicit trade along the frontier. For a long time your duties were lower than ours. Mr. Sabine said he was once a smuggler. At that time he could not carry on trade or business at Eastport and be anything else. The traders on the whole coast of Maine were engaged in the same business, and so was Massachusetts; and small blame to them. The smuggler is a check upon the extravagance of government, or the increase of taxation. (Cheers.) Any country that raises its tariffs too high, or increases its taxation too far, will be

kept in check by smugglers. The boot was formerly on your leg; it is now perhaps on the other. You have been driven into a war which has created a large expenditure and increased your taxation. It would perhaps pay at this moment to smuggle some articles from the provinces into this country. You are entitled to defend your revenue. But at the same time bear this in mind, that one of the main objections in the maritime provinces to this treaty, was that it gave to your people the power of smuggling. And that power you possess, and may use to any extent you please. (Laughter.) Over thousands of miles of coast we can not afford to keep revenue officers. Down come cutters from Maine, with flour, pork, salt, &c; but who can tell what they have in the salt. (Great Laughter.) Why, sir, we sometimes laugh at Yankee notions; one of those is what is called white-eye in the provinces—a life destroying spirit which these coasters bring and with which they deluge our coasts; and it comes in the salt. (Laughter.) So in like manner tea, tobacco and manufactures. Some fisherman can land on any part of our 5,000 miles of coast, and when challenged by our custom-house officer withdraws, and the white-eye is landed. And I will tell you what we do to adapt ourselves to the circumstances. We are free-traders, and we maintain our government, have an overflowing treasury and carry on our public works with a tariff of ten per cent. (Hear, hear.) The only way we can keep out smuggling is to keep our tariff so low as to make it not worth while for any one to smuggle. Let me now draw your attention to the value of these North American fisheries. You have behind and around you here, boundless prairies, which an all bountiful Creator annually covers with rich harvests of wheat and corn. The ocean is our prairie, and it stretches away before and around us, and Almighty God for the sustenance of man, annually replenishes it with fish in myriads that cannot be counted, having a commercial value that no man can estimate. The fecundity of the ocean may be estimated by the fact that the roes of thirty codfish annually replace all the fish that are taken by the British, French and American fishermen on the banks of Newfoundland. In like manner the schools of mackerel, herring, and of all other fish that swarm in the Bays and swim around the shores, are replaced year by year. These great storehouses of food can never be exhausted. But it may be said, does not the free competition, which now exists, lower the prices? No. Codfish have never been higher in the markets of the world than they were last summer. Herrings are now selling in Baltimore for \$13 a barrel. Thirty years ago I used to buy No. 1 mackerel in Halifax for \$4 a barrel. They now cost \$19, and I have seen them selling since the Reciprocity Treaty was signed for \$23. The reason of this is that, relative to other employments, fishing is a perilous and poor business, and that, with the progress of settlement and growth of population in all these great States and Provinces, to say nothing of the increased consumption in Spain, the Mediterranean, the Brazils and the West Indies—all that your fishermen and ours can catch will scarcely supply the demand. I placed before the committee a paper signed by two American merchants, carrying on trade in Prince Edward's Island, which proves that under the Treaty, your mackerel fishery has flourished and expanded to an extent unexampled in its former history. Taken two years prior to the existence of the treaty and contrasting them with the last two years, they show that your mackerel fishery has grown from 250 vessels measuring 18,150 tons, valued at \$750,000 and manned by 2,750 men and securing a catch

worth \$850,000, to 600 vessels, measuring 54,000 tons, employing 9,000 men, and securing 315,000 barrels, worth \$4,567,500. So with the herring fishery, it is equally prosperous. I have seen two American seine boats take 500 barrels of herrings, at Baltimore prices, worth \$6,500, on the Coast of Labrador, in a summer afternoon. The net fishing is also profitable. The Bank earns and Mill grinds while the banker and miller sleep. The fisherman sets his net at night, and finds in the morning that a kind Providence, without a miracle, except the "wealth of the seas," that standing miracle, has loaded his nets with a liberal hand. These fisheries, sir, are sufficient for us all. The French who are anxious to build up a powerful navy maintain 10,000 men by their bounties in these North American waters and it is most creditable to our fishermen, that in the face of these bounties and of yours, they have been able, by strict economy and hardy endurance, to wrestle for a share of these ocean treasures, to main their families and increase their numbers.

A gentleman asked—But had we not the right to fish on the Banks of Newfoundland before the Treaty?

Mr. HOWE—Yes, but not in the great bays of Newfoundland, and along the coast lines where the people of Newfoundland, who frequent the Banks but little, catch all their codfish. Some of these bays are twenty or thirty miles in width, and deeply indent the island, being broken into numerous fords or smaller bays, where fish are plenty. By the treaty American fishermen can now use all these bays, as well as those upon the coasts of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The command of the inshore fisheries gives to your people the opportunity to supply themselves with bait, whether they resort to banks or fish around the coast.

I trust I have thus shown you, Mr. Chairman, that the fisheries are inexhaustible, and of inestimable value; that free competition does not lower the prices, and that your fishermen and the French have special aids to stimulate their industry. But my great objection to the abrogation of this treaty is, that it throws open again a wide field of controversy. Who can measure by the eye a mile even upon the land? And how are your fishermen to measure accurately three marine miles at sea even in fair weather? In a fog it is impossible to do so. And the naval officers who may be sent down to guard our mutual rights will be as much mystified and puzzled as they were before.

But it may be said you gave us your inshore fisheries when we gave you ours. You did, but they were of comparatively little value. This was the objection that we took to the treaty in Nova Scotia in 1854. Let me illustrate. Suppose a farmer, living on a poor farm, exhausted by excessive cropping, were to say to a neighbour having a rich soil, let us save fencing and throw our farms into one. (Laughter.) That was your proposition, and it was accepted. Now mark the result—that while your vessels have swarmed in our waters for the last nine years, carrying off enormous values every year, we have never sent a vessel south during all that time, or caught a single cargo of fish on the coasts or in the bays of the United States. (Hear, hear.)

Let me ask your attention to another matter which requires to be explained. Mr. Seymour, of New York, who made an excellent speech in favour of the resolution, took exception to the high tariff of Canada. Now, in the provinces, our people are naturally anxious to improve their internal communications, and bring them up to a level with other portions of the continent. Yield-

ing to this pressure the Government of Canada has expended large sums in the construction of railroads and canals; and let me say that for every pound expended this western country has, either directly or indirectly, derived some benefit. But the money being spent, of course the interest has to be paid, and that this might be done changes have been made in the tariff from time to time. But you have been compelled to raise your tariff, and although I have not the two to compare, I assume that yours is much higher than that of Canada. Of this we do not complain. Why should you? Both countries must maintain their credit and pay their obligations. I was very much amused by a speech made by Mr. Morrill in your Congress, who assumes that "the magnificent railway improvements of Canada have been made with the profits derived from the Reciprocity Treaty." But Mr. Morrill ought to know that out of about £13,000,000 expended upon the Grand Trunk Railway and the Victoria Bridge, £10,000,000 were subscribed by a body of British capitalists who have never got a shilling in return for their outlay. I was even more amused at the gentleman from Maine who took exception to the construction of the Intercolonial Road. He ought to remember that a very large amount, for which Canada pays interest, has gone to improve and restock the road running through Maine to Portland, and to pay interest to the American proprietors from whom it was leased. As respects the road from Halifax to Bangor, I am happy to be able to inform him that the Government of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have made 160 miles of that road since the Treaty was signed, while the State of Maine has not made a single mile to meet us. It ought to be remembered that Canada is spending, at this moment, a million of dollars on her frontier. For what? To keep her own people from coming to injure you? Why there is not a man would ever come. It is to keep the people from your side, who abused the rights of hospitality, from injuring or compromising us.

The necessities of Canada from these great expenditures compelled her to raise her import duty. And after all, Canada cannot levy a tax upon your manufactures that she does not also lay on those of Britain, so that you may be easy on that point. We are no more fond of taxation than you are, and there is no more popular cry for a man to get up in our Legislatures than that of reducing taxation.

Passing from the subject of railroads, let us speak of canals. I candidly confess that when I came to this convention I was ignorant on the subject of western extension, but I listened with great pleasure to the speeches made here, and especially to that of Mr. Littlejohn, and I began to feel the importance of the question. But this has been felt in Canada for many years. Has not Canada always been in advance of her means in trying to improve the course of navigation?

I know that a large portion of her debt has been expended in these canal improvements to accommodate the great West, and I know there is no question at this time which engrosses the attention of Canadians more than how they can best extend these highways of commerce.—(Cheers.) And let me say, that, from what I have heard here, when New York, Pennsylvania and Canada have done their best, and made their canals as efficient as they can, there will be business enough to occupy them all, and the produce of the great West will still crowd all those avenues. (Loud cheers.) The complaint that Canada has given drawbacks, and discriminated, has been fairly met by my friend Mr. Ryan. There is no complaint against the Maritime Provinces, as the Boards of Trade of Boston and New York

acknowledge with great candor. Newfoundland takes nearly all her breadstuffs and pork from this country free, and all your manufactures under a very low tariff. As Spain, the Mediterranean and the West Indies take all codfish, she has very little to send in return. Prince Edward Island sends you barley, oats and eggs, and takes from you by far the largest portion of her whole import from other countries.

My friend Mr. Hamlin seemed reluctant that any expression of opinion should go from this body. When any expression goes, it must go from American citizens. All we can do is to express an individual opinion. It is for American citizens to judge of what their own rights are. That is for you, and not for us, to determine. But I do not believe that any expression of opinion from any body of men in this country will be looked upon as an interference with the authority of this government, if I know the men at the head of your affairs, and understand your system. (Applause.) I may say that I believe this whole matter might be safely left in the hands of the very able man who presides over your State Department. (Cheers.) I have no hesitation in saying, as a British subject, that the manner in which he has dealt with the variety of vexed questions between the two countries for the last four years gives me a fair assurance that upon this question, as upon all others, he will deal with these important interests as an intelligent, able and experienced statesman. (Loud cheers.) But I quite agree with Mr. Hamlin and other gentlemen that in making this treaty you must have regard to the revenue you have to raise. I know that to be perfectly true. You have had a large expenditure, and I entirely approve of the spirit in which this assembly recognizes the duty of the Government to sustain the credit of the country and maintain its obligations. We know you must do that. Why, if you did not, we should share in the disgrace; we should feel, as a part of the British family, that when you had issued your bonds and sent them largely into foreign countries, we should be disgraced as well as you if you did not sustain them. (Cheers.) But I believe that the resources of this country are so vast and varied, and the development of its industry is so rapid and extensive, that you will be able to master the debt, maintain your credit, and deal with your neighbors in a kindly spirit beside. Why, sir, if it was said by your Minister that this treaty could not be renewed in consequence of your financial wants, there is not a man in the colonies who would but take that answer. (Cheers.) But if it were done in any other way, we would say, "It is not done from necessity—it is not done for revenue—it is done in temper, and it is an indication of the feeling which we must endeavor to eradicate." If Mr. Seward tells us that they cannot retain this treaty and have a revenue, we shall be satisfied, and will live beside you and be good neighbors, and wait till your finances are in a better condition. (Loud cheers.) Now, I quite admit the general principle laid down by Mr. Hamlin, that it is not wise to enter into treaties that shall withdraw large portions of produce from the operation of general revenue laws. But there may be circumstances that will render it expedient to make exceptions to that rule. We have a large debt in England. But, nevertheless, one of the most singular illustrations of this principle was that great achievement by that noble man, whose loss is deplored by all parties, and who was in all respects a representative Englishman—I mean Richard Cobden. (Great applause.) The treaty that he concluded with France was justified by the public necessities, and the importance of that trade. And the ex-

ception to the rule in the case of the Reciprocity Treaty is justified in the same way. The French Treaty was essentially a Reciprocity Treaty, and has rapidly developed the commerce of the two countries, and has bound with ties of amity and peace the people of two great countries who for centuries thought they ought to be natural enemies.

Among the interests represented here is the lumber interest. Now, I know something of the lumber trade, although the Province I come from is not very largely interested in it; but the Provinces of Canada and New Brunswick are. The gentleman from Maine seems to be afraid of the competition of colonial lumber. I wish I had all these gentlemen on the river St Croix. On the one side of that river is built the town of Calais, and on the other the town of St Stephens. They are connected by a bridge, and they have a railway for the transportation of lumber. It is about twenty miles long, and it accommodates the lumber of the two countries. The merchant from Calais is loading a vessel at his wharf, and he has not got lumber enough to make up his cargo. Down goes from the other side a few loads of lumber to make up the cargo, and the next day down goes American lumber to load a British ship.

These two are thus made one by that reciprocity, and I do not believe, in the case of a war, that there is a single man in St Stephens who would shoot a man in Calais. [Laughter.] They are kept together by this treaty, and why should it not be so with reference to these Western States? If there be more lumber in Michigan than in Canada, why should it not go there; and if there is more in Canada than on your prairies, why should not our lumber go out upon the prairies? Why would any one refuse to the poor settler the privilege of buying the cheapest lumber he can get. [Loud cheers.]

But it is said that there is danger of the price of your lumber being affected by the introduction of ours. There is no evidence of this. The price of lumber last year was very high, and I know that since the treaty has been in operation the people of Bangor have all got rich. But let us reassure them. There are causes at work over the face of the continent that must always keep up the price of lumber. Nobody plants a tree except for shade, and everybody is cutting them down. Many of these States are almost cleared of pine from the seaboard back to the lakes. There are a million of axes cutting down trees, and millions of firesides burning them up, to say nothing of railroads in every section of the country in want of fuel. These are our securities that the price of lumber will never get too low. It has passed away or is before the pioneer. Every poor German or Irishman who goes into the backwoods and destroys the timber tends to keep up the price of lumber, and no man in the State of Maine believes that the price can come largely down. But even if it would, is it not better that it should be so. When a hundred logs are thrown into a river, the Almighty furnishes the trees and the means to bring them down free. Why then, should we divide the river and the forest by restrictive regulations? But we do not own all the timber in our possession. In all the Provinces we have abolished our alien laws. The American citizen can come and buy mines and land and timber wherever he likes. And I know of men in Maine and Massachusetts who own as much as 20,000 acres in one block in Nova Scotia. A large portion of the lumber of our Province is owned by the citizens of this Republic. Take the case of the river St. John, and you will find that American lumber comes down there paying no taxes, and the whole

of that river is alive in the summer with your lumber taken off our land, and worked by enterprising Americans. If there is an American vessel there, she carries it to your own ports, or to England; and so the lumber, twisted and intertwined as it is, is a trade owned in fact by the two countries.

A word with regard to coal. I was amused at the exception taken to the action of a gentleman from Philadelphia, and at the statement made by some other speaker that he could see nothing but coal and iron. Well, they are very good things to see, and I am happy to say that in Nova Scotia we have them both in large quantities; and we have them near the sea, therefore I have great sympathy with a Pennsylvanian who does not undervalue coal and iron. But let me say this, that I have just done what I never had an opportunity of doing before—I have seen the front and rear and centre of this State of Pennsylvania. I have seen there what reconciles me to all the misfortunes that may happen to her if this treaty should go into effect. Pennsylvania is so rich in a fertile soil; so rich in honest industry; so rich in iron and coal; so rich in fruits, and in all that can embellish or give animation to industrial life, that she need care nothing about this treaty. God has been good to her, and her thrifty sons have made the best use of the blessings that have been bestowed upon them. As I passed over that State and saw her fertile fields I should have fancied I was in one of the richest districts in England, but for the wooden fences. I visited her great workshop, and I saw a city that has no rival on this continent—a city only matched by three or four in Europe. There Pennsylvania stands in her beauty and power, and she need not fear competition from any of our provinces. But as with timber so with coal. Do you think we own all the coal in Nova Scotia? I think not. There is hardly a steamer comes down from New York or Boston that does not bring American capitalists to invest money in our coal.

Now a few words in explanation for the gentlemen from Buffalo, who asked me if the Provinces had not received some compensation by blockade-running, for the loss of the Southern trade, and I answer, certainly not. We have fifty seaports where we maintain officers, and from whence we carry on foreign trade. But one out of the fifty has had anything to do with blockade running. Now, then, if fifty citizens of this country had the option to do a thing, and but one had done it, it would be rather hard to bring a charge against the whole lot for the wrong done by one. But who has carried on this blockade-running? Not our Nova Scotia merchants. Has anybody put Nova Scotia capital into this business? I do not believe £5. Then where did the capital come from? It came from your own country, either in the form of gold brought there, or it came in the shape of bills drawn on the cotton loan in England, by your own people. A gentleman from New York, or Portland, or Boston, or anywhere else, comes down to Halifax, and says to one of our merchants, I want you to buy 100 brls of pork. He buys it and ships it to whatever place he is directed. Our merchant receives his commission, and that is all he has to do with it. Even in this I know a very few merchants who have touched it at all. There are a few, a very few, but whether they have made a profit by it I do not know. It has not amounted to anything as a business, as compared with the general volume of our colonial trade. I have not been home lately, but I should not be very much surprised if, when I get there, I find that the rebellion caved in so rapidly that some of these bills have not been paid in England.

Mr. ALLEN—I did not inquire for any cap-

tious motives. I have no doubt that American traitors are as deeply concerned in it as Canadian speculators. (Great applause.)

Mr. HOWE—I believe you did not; and let me say, also, Mr. Chairman, that no gentleman from the Provinces has taken offence at anything said or done in this assembly. We are accustomed to free debates at home, and let me assure Mr. Hamlin that none of us felt aggrieved at his banter yesterday, which we accepted as a compliment to our shrewdness.

Mr. Chairman, I must now touch upon a subject of some delicacy and importance. It has been urged by Mr. Morrill in Congress, and by the people of the United States, that the treaty ought not to be renewed, because it had bred no friendship towards them across the lakes—that in their struggle the sympathies of the Provinces were with the South. Well, if that were true in its fullest extent, which it was not—if you had not had one sympathiser among the native people and British residents of the Provinces, it could fairly be pled in response that when Great Britain was at war with Russia the sympathies of the American people were very generally with the latter country. I was in the United States at the time, and was perfectly astonished at the feeling. Russia was at that time a country full of slaves, for the serfs had not been emancipated, and England was at war with her to prevent her aggressions upon weak-neighbouring countries. How the American people could sympathise with Russia was a perfect puzzle at first sight, and could only be explained in the same manner that much of the sympathy for the South on the part of the British subjects can be explained. And when the Canadians once had a rebellion within their borders, where were the sympathies of the American people then? Were they with the Canadian Government or with the rebels? Why, you not only sympathised with them, but I am sorry to have to say it, gave them aid along the frontier in many ways, and to a very large extent. I am happy to be able to say, that during the whole four years of the late rebellion in the United States there has not been developed a particle of evidence to show that a single citizen of any British North American Province put a hostile foot upon your soil. (Loud applause.) Everything of which complaint can be made has been the act of your own people, in violation of the hospitality and right of asylum everywhere extended to them on the soil of Great Britain and her dependencies. I make these remarks in no spirit of anger or of excitement, but to show how unfair it is to hold any Government or people responsible for the actions in it of a few evil-disposed individuals, as well as how natural it was for sympathy to be aroused in the minds of people on one side or another. In our rebellion, when its attention was called to their acts, the United States Government exerted itself to keep its own citizens within bounds, and all that could have been asked of the Provincial authorities has been freely done to prevent any cause of complaint against them. It is something to be able to say that during the four long disastrous years of war just ended, not a single act of which complaint could be made has been committed by a Canadian. Notwithstanding the false reports that were circulated, I do not believe there was a single intelligent citizen of my Province, at least, who did not believe that the capture of the "Chesapeake" off the coast of Maine, by rebellious citizens of the United States, was nothing less or more than an act of piracy. And so of the St. Albans raid. The Government of Canada acted most promptly and nobly in connection with that affair; and has repaid the money which rebellious citizens of the

United States had carried into their territory from the States banks. (Hear, hear.) As to their harboring the rebels and extending to them the right of asylum, is there a single American here who would have his Government surrender that right? There is not an English man, an Irishman, a Scotchman, nor an American who would not fight these wars rather than give up that sacred right. (Applause.) How many excellent citizens of the United States are there from this country at this moment, and how many were there who helped them to fight their battles, who dare not go back to their own native lands across the ocean on account of political offences? The American people would not give these men up to their respective governments, and thus surrender their right of asylum; they would every man of them fight first. (Applause.) It is very proper that criminals should be given up, and a treaty for that purpose has been made between England and the United States. We may sympathise with political offenders, but not with criminals. When Abraham Lincoln fell by the hand of the assassin, the act was reprobated from end to end of the British Empire. (Hear.) But admitting that a large number of people in the Provinces sympathised with the rebels, what of that? Did not a very large number of the Northern States sympathise with them? Nobody ever saw two dogs fighting in the street, or two cocks fighting in a backyard, without having his sympathies aroused, he scarcely knew why, in favour of one or the other of the combatants, and generally the weakest. (Laughter.) Suppose some feeling was excited in the British Provinces, was that any good reason for refusing to allow us to trade with you across the lakes? The sympathy expressed for the South may be well balanced by the young men whom you have drawn from the Colonies. (Hear, hear) For one ton of goods sent to the Southerners, and for one young man sent to aid their cause, we have sent fifty tons and fifty able-bodied soldiers to the North. The people of the Provinces might lay the charge against you of having seduced their young men away from their homes, and left their bodies bleaching on Southern plains or rotting in Southern prisons. Only a short time ago I met 3 British Americans, going home on a single vessel, after having served years in the war, and having left scores of their companions behind to enrich the soil. At Washington I met with a brave nephew of one of my late colleagues in the legislature of Nova Scotia, who held the rank of lieutenant in a Massachusetts regiment, with only one leg to take him back to his home instead of two. (Loud cheers.) I met another veteran from my Province who had fought in twenty battles, and was on his way home. In my own family and person I have suffered not a little by this unhappy rebellion. I have five boys, and one of them took it into his head to enter your army. He has now been for nearly two years in the 23rd Ohio regiment, and has fought in all the battles in which that regiment has been engaged during that period. He was in both the great battles under Sheridan, in which Early's forces were scattered and the Shenandoah valley cleared. (Loud and long continued applause.) All the personal benefit that I have derived from the Reciprocity Treaty or hope to derive from its renewal, will never compensate me or that boy's mother for the anxiety we have had with regard to him; but when he produced the certificates of his commanding officers showing that he had conducted himself like a gentleman, and had been faithful and brave, it was some consolation for all our anguish to know that he had performed his duty. (Enthusiastic applause, during which the speak-

er's feelings nearly overcame him; as this subsided, a gentleman proposed "three cheers for the boy," which were given with great vivacity.) I know that it has been asserted by some, and I have heard it said since I came to the Convention, that if the Reciprocity Treaty is annulled the British Provinces will be so cramped that they will be compelled to seek annexation to the United States. I beg to be allowed to say on that point that I know the feeling in the Lower Provinces pretty thoroughly, and believe I am well enough acquainted with the Canadians to speak for them also, and I speak for them all, with such exceptions as must be made when speaking for any entire population, when I make the assertion, that no considerations of finance, no question of balance for or against them, upon interchanges of commodities, can have any influence upon the loyalty of the inhabitants of the British Provinces, or tend in the slightest degree to alienate the affections of the people from their country, their institutions, their Government and their Queen. There is not a loyal man in the British American Provinces, not a man worthy of the name, who, whatever may happen to the Treaty, will become any the less loyal, any the less true to his country on that account. There is not a man who dare, on the abrogation of the Treaty, if such should be its fate, take the hustings and appeal to any constituency on annexation principles throughout the entire domain. The man who avows such a sentiment will be scouted from society by his best friends. What other treatment would a man deserve who should turn traitor to his Sovereign and his Government, and violate for pecuniary advantage all obligations to the country which gave him birth! You know what you call Copperheads, and a nice life they have of it. (Laughter.) Just such a life will the man have who talks treason on the other side of the lines. (Applause.) The very boy to whom I have alluded, as having fought manfully for the "Stars and Stripes," would rather blow his own father's brains out than haul down the honoured flag under which he has been born, the flag of his nation and of his fatherland. (Cheers.) I do not believe there is a young Canadian in the American army who does not honor his flag as you value yours, and they would be despised if they did not. If any member of the Convention harbors the idea that in refusing Reciprocity to British America, they will undermine the loyal feelings of the people of those Colonies, he is labouring under a delusion, and doing injustice to a people whose sentiment of loyalty is as indelible as your own. (Loud and continued applause.) Some gentlemen from Maine asked me if we were not building fortifications in the Provinces. Well, after so many threats from Northern newspapers that so soon as the rebellion was put down and Mexico attended to, the face of the army would be turned towards Canada, it was not to be wondered at that the mother country should become a little anxious about her children so far from home, and send out an experienced officer to report upon the situation. The officer did not report any armed force in sight but reported that if they did come, Canada was in a very poor condition to receive them, and it was resolved to build some further fortifications at Quebec, and there has been some talk about places further westward, but no action has been taken. But what do we see on the other hand?

I passed down the Penobscot river a few weeks ago and what did I see there?—a great frowning fort, of the most approved pattern, looking as new and pretty as if it had just come from the mint. (Laughter.) At Portland, also, I observe some extensive fortifications in progress, and have been informed that you are at work in the same line at other points so that nothing need be said if Canada does invest some money in costly fortifications. But I have no faith in fortifications. I did not rely on military defences.

We need no bulwarks,  
No towers along the steep;  
Our march is o'er the mountain wave,

and our homes are in the mart on the mountain and the prairie, wherever there is good work to be done, and God's gifts to be appropriated. I have faith in our common brotherhood—in such meetings as this—in such social gatherings as that magnificent demonstration which we all enjoyed so much last night. I sincerely hope that all thought of forcing annexation upon the people of Canada will be abandoned, and that if not, you will seek a more pleasant sort of annexation for your children and children's children. It was a novel mode of attaching them that the people of Detroit adopted in lashing a fleet of their steamers together and getting up such a grand entertainment, and there was no question that it had a strong tendency to promote one kind of annexation, especially among the young people. (Laughter.) As a measure of self-protection, I put myself under the wing of a pretty little New Brunswick woman, and charged her to take good care of me until we got safe ashore. (Laughter and applause, twice repeated.) I fear I am detaining you too long. (Cries of "go on" from all parts of the house.) In conclusion let me say, that in dealing with this great subject, I have spoken in an open, plain manner, and kept back nothing that ought to be said upon it, considering the limited time at my disposal. My friend Mr. Hamlin wished us "to show our hands"; we have done so, and shown our hearts also in all sincerity. The subject is of vast importance to us all. Though living away down East, I take a deep interest in the great West, and I trust God will spare my life long enough to permit me to explore its vastness more thoroughly than I have yet been able to do, that I may the better discuss the great interests created by its commerce. British America has a great West as yet almost entirely undeveloped, out of which four or five States or Provinces may yet be formed, to pour their wealth down the great Lake Huron into Canada, and through the Straits, past the city of Detroit, to the ocean, while the manufactures of the United States, of England and of the Provinces go back to supply the wants. The moment Providence gives me opportunity, I will return to the West and examine its resources, and understand its position, in order that I may lay before my own people, and the people of the Provinces generally, and the capitalists of the mother country, an adequate idea of its importance, with a view of promoting a more active settlement and development of the territory on both sides of the boundary line, for the trade would be as valuable to the world on one side as on the other. Thanking the Convention for the courtesy of so extended a hearing as had been granted him, the honourable gentleman left the platform, amidst deafening and long continued applause.