

As the motions raised deal with the reciprocity treaty which is at present before your Committee, I forward them on for the consideration of the members. I may say that the conference has representatives from the following associations: Auckland, Northcote, Birkenhead, Albany, Canterbury, Teviot, Hawke's Bay, Motueka.

Yours, &c.,

The Chairman, Commerce Extension Committee, Wellington.

ROBERT McNAB.

SIR,—

Roxburgh, Otago, 13th September, 1906

I am instructed by the fruit-growers of the Teviot district to urge upon your Committee the necessity of maintaining the present duties on imported fruits, as any reduction of the same would mean a serious drawback to the growers of this district and to the whole colony, for the following reasons:—

(a.) New South Wales is much earlier than New Zealand, and sends its surplus into our markets just as our early fruits are coming in, consequently the prices of locally-grown fruit are much reduced.

(b.) Victoria follows quickly on the track of New South Wales, and keeps the glut going.

(c.) South Australia and Tasmania each come in to the disadvantage of our own products.

(d.) By the importation of Australian fruits there is a continual risk of introducing disastrous fruit-pests, of which Australia has quite a number.

(e.) Because the water transit from Australia is cheaper than road and railway transit from many of the fruit-growing districts of New Zealand, of which Teviot and Otago Central are samples.

(f.) I may say that it was on account of the duty placed upon imported fruit that growers in this district were induced to plant the large areas they now have under cultivation, and which are now rapidly increasing.

While everything is being done to foster fruit-growing throughout the colony, I think it would be most unfair to those who are doing all in their power in this direction to put the industry in jeopardy by allowing fruit which we can produce ourselves to come into the colony free of duty, and so absorb much of the public money, which can just as well be retained in the country.

I have, &c.,

Thomas Mackenzie, Esq., M.H.R., Chairman of Trades and
Commerce Committee, Wellington.

J. BENNETTS.

SIR,—

Canterbury Fruit-growers' Association,
Heathcote Valley, Christchurch, 7th September, 1906.

I am requested by the Committee of the Canterbury Fruit-growers' Association to ask you to use your best endeavours in opposing the alterations in the duties on fresh fruits and wines, as suggested in the reciprocity treaty with the Commonwealth now under consideration by your Committee.

Our association has contended for a long time that the present duty of 1d. per pound on apples and pears should be continued for an additional two months, whereas the present suggestion is, that the duty of ½d. per pound shall be extended for an additional two months of the summer. This alteration will have a very disastrous effect on an industry which, in many other ways, the Government is spending money to foster, and our committee earnestly hope the alteration will not be allowed to pass.

Yours, &c.,

The Chairman, Industries and Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives, Wellington.

EDW. WILKINSON, Hon. Secretary.

(Telegram.)

Auckland, 31st August, 1906.

AUCKLAND Fruitgrowers' Union respectfully protests against proposed concessions reciprocal tariff *re* grapes and other fruits, also extension period *re* apples and pears.

HENRY MACKIE, Secretary.

Chairman, Industries and Commerce Committee, Wellington.

(Telegram.)

Oamaru, 3rd September, 1906.

THAT this Chamber views with much concern the proposals contained in the reciprocal treaty, and is strongly of opinion that it will adversely affect the producers and local industries without benefiting the consumer, and trusts that the treaty will not be ratified.

J. MATTLAND JONES,

President, Chamber of Commerce.

The Chairman, Industries and Commerce Committee, Wellington.

(Telegram.)

Whangarei, 4th September, 1906.

FRUIT-GROWERS view with utmost alarm treaty proposals. If confirmed, grape-growers consider themselves ruined. Extending ½d. duty time to 1st March on apples and pears means great loss to our growers; and where in the treaty is their *quid pro quo*?

MACKIE,

Industries and Commerce Committee, Wellington.

Secretary, Fruitgrowers' Association.

Canterbury Chamber of Commerce,

SIR,—

170 Hereford Street, Christchurch, 4th September 1906.

I beg to forward you copies of resolution passed at a meeting of the committee of this Chamber held to-day:—

"That the Committee of this Chamber views with alarm the proposal now before Parliament to ratify the suggested reciprocal treaty between the Commonwealth of Australia and this colony, on the following grounds: (1.) The benefits obtainable therefrom by New Zealand are apparently in nowise commensurate with those to be given to Australia. (2.) That some of the provisions—notably that having reference to sugar—would result in a large loss of revenue without equivalent advantage. (3.) That the proposed removal of the duty on flour would seriously injure the milling and farming interests. (4.) That in any treaty of this nature the Mother-country and all sister colonies should be made participants."

Yours, &c.,

H. ANTILL ADLEY, Secretary.