DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SENATE OF CANADA

IN THE

First Session of the Third Parliament

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

Ottawa:

PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., TIMES OFFICE, WELLINGTON ST.

1874.

SENATE.

ERRATA.

In Hon. Mr. Ryan's Speech on the Copyright Question, column 95, line 35 from top of column, for the word London, read Canada.

Omit the five lines following the ninth, exclusive, and including the word "committed," in Mr. Miller's Speech in column 65; and in column 81 read "these Government railways (N. S. and N. B.) cost but $38,052," instead of 380,052.

DEATH OF HON. MR. LESLIE.

The following is a fuller report of Hon. Mr. Bureau's Speech on the death of Hon. Mr. Leslie:

After the Hon. Mr. Ferrier had addressed the Senate on Monday in eulogy of Mr. Leslie, the Hon. Mr. BUREAU said that he and all men of his race had especial reason to regret the departed Senator; for though of another origin Mr. Leslie had always been a friend of the French Canadians, and had always acted politically in such a manner as to secure their rights; not their rights as French Canadians, but as Canadians; for Mr. Leslie's efforts had always been directed to the abolition of distinctions derived merely from race and creed, and to the creation of a nationality with the constitutional system of Government which we now enjoy. Mr. Leslie had never been a revolutionist—had never sought to separate Canada from her allegiance; but he had endeavoured to secure for her a fair share of popular control over her own destinies. In that he had in Lower Canada acted as Mr. Baldwin had done in Upper Canada, and eventually with the same result. At the time when the disputes arising under the old system of government were rapidly culminating, Mr. Leslie saw, as others saw, the danger of provoking a movement towards separation from Great Britain. To avoid that danger he and Sir L. H. La'ontaine went on board the steamer "Royal George" on the 2nd of December and proceeded to Quebec to urge upon Lord Gosford the propriety of calling together the representatives of the people. Unhappily his Lordship was advised by those who took another view of the situation, and he declined the counsel of Messrs. Leslie and Lafontaine; and in the succeeding year, acting on hints conveyed to him from the Governor of Lower Canada, Lord John Russell overthrew the constitution of Lower Canada and established another form of Government in which the Governor was supreme, aided only by the Special Council of his own adoption. Mr. Leslie always combated this and kindred measures—always struggled until he had obtained it, to procure constitutional government for his country; and the French Canadian part of the population recognized his worth and his merits, and were not ungrateful. His return as member for Montreal, and his frequent return for Vercheres, where there was hardly a man of his own nationality or religion, was a proof of the affection and confidence with which he had inspired them. They would always regret Mr. Leslie as an honest man and a good patriot, in short, a worthy son of Canadian soil.

INDEX.

INDEX TO DEBATES.

Answer to Speech, 9
Adulteration of Food, 104

Caughnawaga Ship Canal, 153
Canadian Mail Service, 171
Copyright, 95–120
Credit Foncier, 139
Customs Bill, 315

Detention N. B. Mails, 200
Dismissals, P. E. I., 78–212

Election Bill, 340
Extradition Fugitive Debtors, 49
Excise Duty, 165

Govt. Railways, N. B. & N. S., 74
G. T. Railway, 151
Gulf Ports Co. (Subsidy) 36

Intercolonial R. R., Secs. 4 & 7, 102-108-142
Intercolonial R. R., Construction, 112
Ice-Bridge, Quebec, 259
Indemnity (Perry's) 292

Libel, 128–147–162
Lower Province Railways, 100

Marine Electric Telegraphs, 297
Montreal Harbour Commission, 373
Murders in North West, 31

Oaths Bill, 254

Pacific Railway, 363–386
Prohibition, 354

Re-adjustment of Representation, 256

Sanitary Arrangements, (Ottawa) 238
Supplies (Baie Verte Canal) 359

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SENATE OF CANADA,

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA WHICH WAS CALLED TO MEET, FOR THE DESPATCH OF BUSINESS, ON THURSDAY, THE 26TH MARCH, A. D., 1874, IN THE 36TH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 26th, 1874.

The members of the Senate having assembled in the chamber at the hour of 2.20 o'clock, the Senate met, and after prayer by the Chaplain, the Rev. Mr. Johnson, the Clerk read the Commission appointing the Hon. Mr. Christie to the position of Speaker.

NEW SENATORS.

The SPEAKER took the chair and announced that Senators were waiting to be introduced. The Hon. Mr. LeTellier de St. Just and the Hon. Mr. Wilmot then escorted the Hon. R. W. Scott to the Clerk's table, where the oath was administered to him. The Hon. Mr. Penny was then introduced by the Hon. Mr. LeTellier and the Hon. Mr. Wilson. He also took the necessary oath, after which the Speaker left the chair, and the old members came forward to exchange congratulations with the Speaker and the new Senators on their appointments.

After prayers, the House adjourned during pleasure, and when it was resumed, His Excellency the Right Honorable Sir Frederick Temple, Earl of Dufferin, Governor-General of Canada, and Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Prince Edward, and Vice-Admiral of Canada and Prince Edward, &c., being seated in the chair on the Throne,

The Hon. Speaker commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to proceed to the House of Commons and acquaint that House—"It is His Excellency's pleasure they attend him immediately in this House."

Who being come, Hon. Speaker said:—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate; Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

His Excellency the Governor General does not see fit to declare the causes of his summoning the present Parliament of Canada, until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen, according to law: but to-morrow at the hour of three o'clock, in the afternoon, His Excellency will declare the causes of his calling this Parliament.

His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to retire, and the House of Commons withdrew.

FRIDAY, March 27th, 1874.

His Excellency the GOVERNOR GENERAL, at three o'clock p. m., this day, proceeded in state to the Chamber of the Senate, and having taken his seat upon the Throne, His Excellency commanded the attendance of the House of Commons. The members of that body, preceded by their Speaker, the Honorable Timothy Warren Anglin, appeared at the Bar. The

Honorable T. W. Anglin then informed His Excellency that the choice of the House of Commons had fallen upon him to be their Speaker, and he prayed for the members thereof the customary Parliamentary privileges.

After which His Excellency was pleased to deliver the following

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE:

Hon. Gentlemen of the Senate, Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have convoked Parliament with the least possible delay consistent with the delay entailed by the recent dissolution.

Your attention will be invited during the present session to measures having reference to the representation of the people in Parliament, embracing the system now prevailing in Great Britain and most other countries enjoying Constitutional Government, of taking votes by ballot, and to the establishment of a General Court of Appeal.

Measures will also be submitted to you for the amendment of the laws relating to controverted elections, the Militia and Insolvency.

The enactment of 1872 respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, having failed to secure the prosecution of that great enterprise, you will be called upon to consider what plan will best and most speedily provide the means of trans-continental communication with British Columbia. A report of the Chief Engineer will be laid before you, shewing what progress was made during the past year in the surveys connected with the proposed line. The destruction of the Railway offices by fire involved a serious loss of maps, plans and papers, the possession of which would have made the report more complete.

The Canal and Harbor improvements are being vigorously prosecuted with a view to ensure adequate accommodation for the rapidly growing trade of the country.

The report of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works on the proposed canal between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy will be submitted for your consideration.

With the progress already made in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, another year will be required to complete it.

A report indicating its actual condition will be laid before Parliament, and a measure will be introduced to vest in the Department of Public Works the powers now exercised by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

The question of compensation due to the Dominion for the privileges to the United States by the Treaty of Washington, has given rise to a renewal of negotiations tending to widen reciprocal trade relations with that country. At the instance of my Government, the Imperial authorities have given directions to the British Minister to discuss the whole subject with the Administration at Washington and have associated with him for this purpose a Canadian Commissioner.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts of the last financial year, will be laid before you, as well as a statement of the receipts and expenditure of the present year to the latest practicable period.

I regret to state that the receipts of the current year will not be sufficient to meet the expenditure. It will therefore be necessary for you to consider the best means to be adopted for making good the anticipated deficiency.

The estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before you. They have been prepared with as much regard for economy as is consistent with the efficiency of the Public Service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The combined efforts of the Dominion and Provincial Governments to promote Immigration have met with a reasonable measure of success, thus adding a considerable number of desirable persons from other countries to our industrial population.

Notwithstanding the commercial depression which, through exceptional causes, prevailed to some extent during the past year, it is satisfactory to know that the general prosperity was not thereby seriously affected. I do not doubt but that as the great natural resources of the Dominion become more widely appreciated, the results will be a healthy stimulus to the enterprise and energy of our people, and a still larger accession to our numbers.

I trust that your deliberations may be directed by wisdom and aided by Divine Providence.

The great bulk of the spectators now retired, and the floor having been left to the members of the Senate, the Speaker, Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE, took the chair.

After some routine business,

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER introduced a bill for the incorporation of a company. He next moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Scott,

that the House adjourn till Monday, mentioning as the reason for this delay in the consideration of the Speech from the Throne, the arrangements for the levee in that Chamber in the evening.

The motion was agreed to, when the House adjourned till the day in question.

MONDAY, March 30.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Mr. PANET and Mr. BAILLERGEON, the most recently appointed members, were introduced with due formality, and they took the oaths and their seats.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. CAMPBELL gave notice of his intention to move for copies of all despatches between the Government and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba since November last, on the subject of the murders alleged to have been committed by American citizens in the Northwest Territories, and on the subject of the alleged establishment of trading ports by them within those territories.

Also, to ask when the present contract with the Gulf Port Steamship Company expires, and whether it is proposed to renew the existing subsidy to that company.

Whether it is proposed to continue to subsidise two lines of steamers on Lakes Huron and Superior, or to effect a contract with one line only, either from Collingwood or Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALL gave notice that on Thursday next he would enquire, "Do the Government intend to grant to the Province of British Columbia £50,000, or any less sum in lieu of the interests guaranteed for 10 years on £100,000, under clause 12 of the terms of Union, for the purposes of a dry dock, and if so, on what terms and conditions?"

Also, on the same day he will move "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he may be pleased to furnish this House with a copy of the instructions given to Mr. Edgar, agent or commissioner, recently sent by the Dominion Government to the Province of British Columbia."

Also that he will, on Wednesday, the 8th of April, move "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency, the Governor General, praying that he may be pleased to cause returns to be laid before this House, showing the number of Engineers, surveyors, and other persons, specifying their different grades sent from the eastern portion of the Dominion to British Columbia in connection with the Pacific Railway during the year 1873, together with the cost of transportation each way."

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

The first order of the day was to take into consideration the address from the Throne, and the Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Scott proposed, that the consideration of the Speech be now proceeded with.

The Hon. Mr. PENNY in proposing the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, after asking pardon for any deficiencies arising from his inexperience, proceeded to say that the delay in calling together the two Houses of Parliament arose from circumstances which spoke for themselves—the accession of a new Ministry to the places vacated by the resignation of their predecessors. It would perhaps be natural for him to express some gratification at the change that had occurred, but this was rendered unnecessary by the loud and almost unanimous expression of that opinion which had been recently given in response to the appeal to which all must defer. He proceeded to say that the necessity for the appeal to which that expression of almost unanimous judgment was an answer, fully justified the few weeks of delay in calling Parliament together, especially as we see that no time had been lost in preparing the materials of a very important and comprehensive legislative programme. In the first rank of the measures to be brought before them, he mentioned the establishment of a Court of Appeals and of the Ballot. As to the first its necessity was recognized in the Act of Confederation, and had since been acknowledged by repeated promises made by the late Ministry, that it should be provided for. That it was still to be constituted notwithstanding these promises, might be supposed to be taken as a proof that many practical difficulties stood in the way, and perhaps should warn them against expecting a very early or very complete arrangement of this very important tribunal. That such a Court was essentially necessary for the working of our present system and the co-ordination of the powers of the Federal and Provincial Legislatures was, he thought, obvious, and he ventured to hope that all parties would give their best efforts to facilitate the perfection of the project. The ballot, like the Court of Appeals, had been widely demanded, and once at least promised. He believed it should be incorporated into

our system. And yet, he might say, that he believed the desire for it was rather imported from another country than indigenous to our own. The great object of the ballot was to prevent intimidation of voters by employers or wealthy patrons. He thanked God that few of our voters were subject to such influences, and hence the protection of secrecy was here, he thought, of comparatively little consequence. When they had the ballot, he trusted they would take means to prevent the special abuses to which that method of voting was liable. He would say very little on the subject of the Militia laws. He was not himself of a very belligerent disposition, and knew almost as little of those brilliant decorations which were judged necessary to make up the "pomp and circumstance of glorious war" as he did of the manner of setting a squadron in the field. He would omit all mention of that subject, the more readily as he was to be followed by a gentleman of large experience in the service. Reverting to civil life, he would express his hope, that while some amendments were to be proposed in the Insolvent law, and experience had shown that some amendments were requisite, the main structure of the present statute, and the great principles which were embodied in it, would be allowed to stand. He believed that he might claim some acquaintance with the opinions of mercantile men, and he ventured to say not only that the law was very generally approved of, but that the dislike of it which was at first felt is rapidly diminishing. At the same time he knew that there were in particular clauses provisions which were either flatly unjust, or else failed to carry out the wishes of the country and the Legislature.

They should, he was sure, cheerfully give their co-operation to any judicious plan for carrying forward the Canadian Pacific Railway. The original plan, as they all knew, was an entire failure—a failure, let him add, for financial and not for political reasons—a failure predicted from the first by the coolest and most capable financiers. What had already taken place should warn them against rash engagements, especially as to time. When they remembered the many years which it would have taken to accomplish such a work as the Intercolonial, lying all along a series of harbors in a long, if not thickly settled country, they should see at once the folly of pledging their good faith to any hard and fast line as to the time of its completion. The late Government did bind itself to a given, and in his judgment far too short a period—both for beginning and ending—and it failed to keep its promise. But it is one of the understood rules of public treaties that the parties to them were only held to an endeavor in good faith to act up to their engagements and were not bound to do what was impossible. They must act under that rule. On the one hand the act of an authorized Government is the act of a nation, and they were doubtless bound to-day by the undertakings, however rash, of the preceding Government. But, on the other hand, the failure of the late Administration established the propriety of refraining from additional obligations of the kind, which they could not carry out. Let them acknowledge their obligations to construct a great trans-continental highway as early as possible; but let them make haste slowly in order that each step might be perfect in itself, and an assured advance towards the great design. He acknowledged that he attached a great deal more importance to the speedy improvement of our canals and harbors than to the Pacific Railway, for the benefits of the canal and harbor improvements were immediate, and were conferred at once on two or three millions of people, who would at once turn them to account for their own prosperity and that of the Treasury, whereas the gain from the railway was prospective, and was to be secured for people who had yet to be brought to settle in the great waste to the West of us. He was sure that the House would heartily support the promptest and most energetic measures for that end. Among this class of improvements he must especially notice that which was intended to connect the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, with those of the Bay of Fundy. Nothing could be more conducive to that West Indian trade and Southern trade to which our merchants and manufacturers were now turning their attention. They should all rejoice at the prospect of the opening of a larger field for commercial transactions with our immediate neighbours. He supposed it was yet too early to indulge in any exceptions as to the success which might be hoped for; and they were all aware of the obstacles which conflicting interests create. But it was pleasing to know that the American Executive had taken a liberal view of the matter, and had manifested a cordial desire for the re-opening of negotiations. He believed that these negotiations could not be in better hands than those of their colleague, Mr. Brown, and that under his guidance there was little danger that the treaty, if

treaty there should be, would be derogatory either to the honor or the interests of this country. He believed this House would generally re-echo the Governor-General's expression of regret at the avowed deficiency in the revenue, for he (Mr Penny) thought few of them would believe it was an advantage to a country that its taxation should be augmented. This was not the time to inquire as to the causes of this condition of things; but he was quite satisfied that so far as our concurrence was necessary, they would cheerfully concur in any sacrifices which might be required to maintain the credit of the country. He knew nothing of the plans by which our able Finance Minister would endeavor to redress the balance between his expenditure and receipts. But if he (Mr. Penny) might make one suggestion to him from that place, it would be to allow himself to be guided solely by his own necessities as the guardian of the public Treasury and credit, and his obligation to procure the necessary revenue in the most economical and least burdensome manner. He trusted that the Finance Minister will take for his guide the light of science, not the rigmarole of quackery, and that he would not commit the absurd blunder of trying to ride two provincial horses under whatever name it might be disguised, that is to say, of seeking to augment his revenue from duties on importations, by imposing duties which must prohibit the importations from which the revenue is to be collected. And in this connection he could not but remark with pleasure the justice of the concluding paragraph of the the Speech from the Throne, in which his Excellency congratulates them upon the prosperity of the country, notwithstanding the depression which has prevailed elsewhere. They knew that that depression had been the cause in some in some places of intense suffering, and though he was not disposed to impute such effects exclusively to one cause, he might, perhaps not unfairly, set up our own prosperity during the trying times which our neighbours had passed through, in opposition to those who would invite us to change our own wholesome fiscal system for that which had been coincident with, if it had not produced, the misery to which he had referred. The hon. gentleman concluded by moving the Address in reply to the speech.

Hon. Mr. PANET said that on him had devolved the position, always a difficult one to a new member, of seconding the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. He regretted not having been endowed with the same eloquence and brilliant elocution of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken and who had done so well; nevertheless he felt proud of his position in having an opportunity as the junior member of the House of addressing them. He had listened with admiration to the eloquent and dignified speech of his hon. friend, and after the able manner in which he had treated the various questions mentioned in the Address, he would not tax their patience by a long speech. He would say that it would be unjust if they did not accept the reason for not calling Parliament together sooner, from the fact that the general elections took place at the usual time of their assembling. But they might entertain the hope that in future they would be called together about the month of February. If the general election had caused this delay, it had furnished them with several subjects for reflection, which will be useful in the legislation proposed in the Address. The simultaneousness of the elections advised by the Government have had a useful result, and the law which was promised in the speech would, he hoped, sanction this principle, as well as efficacious measures to prevent the corruption, violence, and excesses which harrass the electoral body. It was with a lively satisfaction that he learned in this speech that the Government intend to encourage and improve our channels of communication, either by canals or railways, to place us in connection with all parts of the Canadian Confederation from the Atlantic to the Pacific, so as to secure to us the greatest facilities for the carriage of the products, and the encouragement of our trades and industries. Before taking up the last subject which he proposed to submit to their consideration he thought they should congratulate the present Government in having succeeded in re-opening negotiations with the Government of the United States, to obtain a treaty of commercial reciprocity, and should they only secure the provisions of the last treaty it would be an immense advantage which would entitle the Government to the confidence of the country. In conclusion, not being desirous of touching upon all the points of the speech for the reasons already mentioned, he would conclude with a few remarks upon our militia system. Commanding as he had for several years a battalion of militia, the slight experience he had acquired would permit him to speak of the existing law, or rather of the difficulties of

putting it into practice. The majority of those who had never had occasion to acquaint themselves of the difficulties of the situation, found the present law bad, the system inefficient, and with a dash of the pen would wipe the whole thing out. He would regret, for his part, a determination to entirely set aside the present volunteer militia system. The present law is a wise one and its results could not but be happy for the country, if every one brought to its execution the moral and physical support which we had a right to expect from all good citizens. In the Province in which he had the honor to represent an electoral division, the services and practical results of the law had been almost null. Nevertheless, no body will question the existence with us of all the elements necessary to the organization of a force sound in every respect. To what then must they attribute this deplorable state, although flowing from wise legislation which they desired partly to retain. The want of success is due to two causes which seemed to him to be the source of the evil. If the country wants a militia law, every one must contribute personally his share to the organization. The public outside of the ranks had not understood the moral and material support which it is incumbent upon it to lend to military organization, therefore the Government of the day had to struggle against a prejudice for which it was not responsible. In the second place the law should be administered strictly, impartially, and not as a political engine. In a word the governing and the governed should make this their duty. Now, these two essential causes had been lacking in the present organization; every one did not do their duty, and the law was not executed strictly and impartially. If the thing be necessary he would make it his duty, later on, to establish the correctness of his assertions. He had said that in the Province of Quebec serious and practical results were almost null; it would not be right if he did not make honorable mention of the Garrison Batteries of the Dominion. He could only personally speak of B. Battery, whose school is in the Quebec citadel. He was happy to acknowledge, in its able commandant, the eminently practical and scientific qualities which would be a great assistance to the country if the sphere in which he exercised them were not so restricted. In Quebec as elsewhere we have weak battalions which owe their existence to pecuniary sacrifices, in the generality of cases, excessively onerous upon their officers, whose services the country should recognize. It was to be hoped that by the enlargement of the Military Schools, every facility should be given for instruction in that career, whose practical science cannot be acquired in time of peace, except in well constructed schools. Moreover, to guide them, had they not the example of West Point, the American military training school, whose graduates spread all over the country, in a few days succeeded in improvizing an army of a million and a half of men, commanded by experienced officers. He thanked the House for the kind attention with which he had been honoured.

The Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he had no desire to occupy the time of the House, nor to take exception to what the hon. gentlemen who had moved and seconded the adoption of the reply to the Address had said, and he was quite sure he would get credit for his sincerity. The hon. gentleman who had moved the address had taken occasion to deprecate the mode in which he was about to make the motion, but there was no necessity for that, as what was said was full of thoughtfulness and good sense which must commend the speech to every gentleman who had heard it. As he had said before, he did not rise to offer any objection to the resolution, but to define to what extent the views set forward differed from those of a considerable party in the House. Since the last Parliament a very considerable change had taken place in the other branch of the Legislature. The party to which he belonged had sustained a complete overthrow, and that would be one of the remarkable features in the history of the country. He did not allude to the subject but for the purpose of drawing attention to what would be the duty of hon. gentlemen in the Senate Chamber. The very remarkable expression of public opinion at the late elections put all cavil on one side, and he thought, the usefulness of the Senate would be to bring about the wishes of the people as brought forward by the other House. Although the Senate was independent of the popular voice, there was no such distinction between them and the other branch of the Legislature as to justify them in taking up the exalted position which the House of Lords sometimes assumed. Experience had shown them that they ought to defer to the opinions of the people in all matters relating to their welfare, and the Ministry who had that experience, and had public opinion so unmistakeably pronounced in their favour had a great

public duty to perform. Their majority was quite equal to the whole vote of the Opposition, and so they were in a position to give a full and favourable consideration to all matters connected with the leading questions of the day. For his own part, and he might say for other hon. gentlemen who belonged to his party, they would be anxious to receive with every consideration of fairness all measures which the Government might bring forward. (Hear, hear.) They would not meet with any factious opposition, or arising out of a spirit of warfare. They would be glad to assist the Government in perfecting those measures that might be submitted for the consideration of the Senate. He did not know what those measures might be, nor could he gather much from the speech. But from what had been said on former occasions, the party now in power had so frequently conveyed the impression that if the late Government were swept away, as they now were, there would be great and sweeping changes that would almost reconstruct the whole constitution of the country. Now as to the measures indicated in the speech most of them were those brought forward by the late Government. There was nothing to indicate that there was to be any of those sweeping measures that were said to be of such great advantage to the country. The present Government, with what he might call great humility, had shadowed forth nothing, if he excepted a very scanty allusion to one matter, but what had been before the late Government for the last two or three years. To him it was somewhat puzzling when the gentlemen who formed the party now in power were before their constituencies to know what was to be the policy of their Government. It was hardly supposable that they would have been content with the measures which the late Administration proposed. The remarks which fell from the Hon. Minister of Justice differed very much from what was said by the Prime Minister in the Far West. He said they would pursue the same policy which had been pursued in opposition. One would have supposed that the present Ministry would have uprooted all that had been done since 1867, for the policy of that party when in opposition had led them to oppose every Government measure.

The SPEAKER—Order! order! there is a stranger in the House.

The person alluded to made his exit in very quick time, and

The Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL continued to say that it was supposable from their past conduct that every measure that had been introduced by the late Government, which comprised the entire constitution under which we live, would have been overturned, and they would take a fresh start. In fact it seemed that things which were considered settled were to be overturned, but he was glad to believe that the policy indicated by the Minister of Justice, in the Province of Quebec, was that which was to be followed. It then came to this: They found the party in power readily adopting measures which the late Government had indicated, and which would have been again brought forward by them. He was glad to see that the accession to power had made the present Ministry almost Conservative, or at all events that they were content to walk in the footsteps that the Conservatives had worked out for them during the past few years; and he hoped the advantages which would result to the country, would be that the same honorable gentlemen would be more reasonable in their opposition if they should again come to be in that position. (Laughter). They would now feel the responsibility of their position, and he hoped they would never again loose sight of that, whether in the Opposition or in the Government. The last clause had reference to the immigration policy which was adopted by the late Government, and he wished to ask the hon. gentleman opposite what was the nature of the appointment of the gentleman who was appointed Emigration Agent in England for Canada? Was he simply appointed as the Emigration Agent in England representing Canada, or had he a right to represent this country almost in the same way as an ambassador from Portugal or Belgium. He thought it would only have been proper if any appointment of the kind was made that the Government should first have secured the sanction of Parliament; and if they were to take the gentleman's own words and conduct, he was far more than an Emigration Agent to this country. He (Mr. Campbell) found fault with the choice that had been made, and he thought he was justified by the conduct of the gentleman. It might be very right and proper to have somebody in England like an ambassador at St. James from Canada in the same way as there was an ambassador from the United States. It would be of advantage in a social point of view, and they would then have a representative to whom Canadians could appeal, who would be a sort of warranty that they would be able to get into official circles, or be able to obtain access to high officials. In other respects it

would be very desirable to have such a representative, for it would be the means of maintaining a social relationship with the Imperial Government; but such a representative ought to be a man well acquainted with all the wants of Canada, and whose knowledge on all matters would be accurate. It would be very desirable to have some one who would command the confidence of the capitalists of England, and also the confidence of the Imperial Government, and from whom reliable information could be had. But such he did not consider the gentleman who was sent to England as Emigration Agent or whatever else he was, for he took it upon himself to lampoon in a very coarse sort of way the present Prime Minister of the mother country. He spoke of Mr. Disraeli as a "Penang lawyer," and on making enquiry he found that the expression meant a walking stick. This he considered was not the way in which their representative was to secure any advantage to this country. No doubt Mr. Jenkins was a man of culture, but he despaired of his being of any service to this country. He could not think that the present Government of England would think much of the person sent to represent this country in England. He would not detain the House longer, but merely add that he had great pleasure in listening to the remarks of the mover and seconder of the Address, which he trusted would be carried.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said he could not express himself in English as well as he could desire, but the members of the chamber had ever treated him with great indulgence, and he expected that would be continued. (Hear, hear.) He must join in the congratulations that had been expressed at the accession of the Hon. Mr. Penny, a distinguished member of the Press, to a seat in the Senate, which was quite as satisfactory as when the present Government asked the Hon. Geo. Brown to accept a seat. He thought the more talent and wealth they could get into that Chamber the more influence it would have. He would not follow the hon. gentleman who had spoken last, who said they had become Conservatives when they might have been Democrats and socialists; but if to-day it was said they were taking up any of the measures that the late Government had brought forward that did not give any reasonable grounds for saying that they should have passed over these measures. If they were good in the hands of the late Government and tended to the well-being of the country, and of the morality of the country, then they could not be bad in the hands of the present Government. Since they got Confederation in 1867, they had been told from the Throne every Parliament, that a law for the suppression of corruption would be passed. That law had not been passed, but the present Government were going to pass such a law, and simply because the late Government neglected to pass it. He had no desire to quarrel with his friend opposite. He knew that gentleman could be very mild when he pleased, and as bitter as gall when he took it into his head. (Laughter.) He desired to preserve the good temper of the House, and deal fairly with all matters brought forward. He would leave it to his friend on his right (the Hon. Mr. Scott), to say what he thought proper in answer to the observations that had been made, and he had no doubt that every one would be satisfied that the Premier had done all in his power when they heard what Mr. Scott had to say.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said it was exceedingly gratifying to hear the observations of the Hon. gentleman from Kingston. On the first blush of it he could not but recollect that he had long been in sympathy with the party to whom he alluded, and who had very much to do with the gentlemen who sat in that chamber. He felt satisfied, from the kindly remarks that had been made by his hon. friend, that all measures which the Government would lay before the Senate would be fairly considered—that the gentlemen opposite would give a kindly aid in the consideration of every bill to come before them, and in forming the laws that they all desired for the good of the country. There could be no doubt that the Government must consult what the people desire, and that only so long as they form laws that are in the interest of the people so long will they be in power. It was quite true there was very little in the Speech with regard to reciprocity with the United States, but nothing had been matured on that subject, and when it came up for consideration he had no doubt it would, like all other matters, receive fair play from the members of the Chamber. There were very few paragraphs in the Speech which had not been ably dealt with by the mover of the Address, and as he had been long connected with a leading newspaper in the Dominion, he was familiar with the affairs of the country. His hon. friend opposite had referred to the appointment of Mr. Jenkins, as Emigration Agent for the Dominon in London, and while it was in his memory

he would say a word or two in reply. Mr. Jenkins was appointed simply in the place of the late Mr. Dixon, when he was here in this country. He was known to be a man of great ability, not because he was the author of "Ginx's Baby," but as a writer for several papers and magazines. It spoke no small things in his favour that the people of Dundee returned him as their representative in Parliament when he was 3,000 miles away from them. With regard to his appointment to represent the Dominion, he was simply nominated as the Emigration Agent for Canada, but after he had been nominated as the successor of Mr. Dixon, and he was returned as a member of the Imperial Parliament, the Government thought that there would be no objection to his position being considered in a wider sense. He was also a contributor to many papers, and it was thought that his appointment should be considered in a wider character than that of a mere Emigration Agent. The letter of instructions to him conveyed something more than that he should act merely as agent, but it did not in any sense authorize him to act as the representative of Canada, either in commercial circles or court circles, but in some such sort as Mr. Childers in Australia. He was in no sense recognized as the medium of communication with the Minister at the head of Colonial affairs. With regard to what he had said of Mr. Disraeli, they could not hinder him the freedom of speech, nor were they in a position to control what he might say. He was a public man, and was particularly identified with the labour movement in England. He (Mr. Scott) did not share any sympathy with him in lampooning Mr. Disraeli, but the words complained of were uttered by Mr. Jenkins as an independent member of the Imperial Parliament, and not as in any way representing Canada. Passing from that, he might say that the first part of the Address referred to the ballot, which might be said to entirely affect the other Chamber. In Ontario it had been under agitation for some time, and now it had been carried by an almost unanimous vote. In England, the House of Lords allowed it to pass without any alteration, but it was somewhat paradoxical that the party in England who had been fighting for the ballot, had gone under by the people's vote when the ballot was brought into operation. He hoped that would not be the result on this occasion. (Laughter.) A legacy had fallen on the shoulders of the present Government from the hon. gentlemen lately in power, in the shape of the Pacific Railway, and with regard to that the Government would bring in a bill in which their policy was set forth. They were anxious to carry out the arrangements with British Columbia, but no faster than circumstances would permit. They must not rush into liabilities and responsibilities that they were not equal to. A mixed manner of making a communication with British Columbia by land and water had been shadowed forth during the late elections, and that no doubt could at once be made more useful than attempting the larger scheme immediately. It would only require the construction of a comparatively small extent of railway, whereas to reach British Columbia by the Canadian Pacific would require the construction of a road 2,500 miles in length with no possible facilities except at three points. The really important question, to his mind, would be found in the 9th paragraph of the Speech, in reference to reciprocal trade with the United States. If they could accomplish that they would have accomplished enough for one session. It was very important for the people of this country that reciprocal trade should be brought about. It was quite true that the progress of Canada had been extraordinary, but there were circumstances that had brought about things that were not expected. It was a very large question, but they entertained the belief that the American Government was now prepared to discuss that question on broad principles. The American Government seemed inclined to pay compensation to Canada in consideration that the Canadian fisheries were more valuable than theirs. They knew that in their past negotiations with the United States, Canada had always been the sufferer. Whatever negotiations might in future take place must be filtered thoroughly. Of course they could do nothing without the sanction of the Imperial Government. England had the fixing of the boundary and the people at the Colonial Office, either through ignorance of the country, or from some other cause, allowed the Americans to get the better of them. Whether in the north or in the west, wherever there could be any injury done to Canada by a deflection of the line, that line was bent inwards. It was, however, the determination of the present Government in any negotiations with regard to reciprocity to get as good terms as they could, and to respect the expression of opinion so lately given by the people. He hoped the Government

would submit only such measures as could be approved of, and he was sure the Senate would give them a fair and impartial consideration. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD, (Victoria) said. I regret that the speech from the Throne did not place something definite before us with regard to the Canada Pacific Railway. I hoped to have heard that the easy construction of this work had been fully determined upon in the most vigorous and expeditious manner, but although we have not been told this, yet I am willing to believe that the Government will lose no time in pushing on this great work, and that their scheme will be a liberal and comprehensive one, satisfactory to the country generally, and to British Columbia in particular. Our Province expects that the railway will be commenced this year, and nothing short of a down right earnest beginning and prosecution will satisfy us, not a commencement, merely to keep within the letter of the law. I understand that the plans and surveys of the Pacific end of the road have not been destroyed by the late fire, and that there is no good reason why the work should not be commenced without much delay. While caution is to be used, and while British Columbia does not wish to cripple the resources of the country, she at the same time expects earnestness and vigour to be used in carrying out this work. Although this road is of vital importance to British Columbia, it is none the less necessary to the progress of the whole Dominion as the only means of filling up our waste lands and keeping pace with other nations. I trust that the Government scheme, or railway policy, will at an early day be laid before Parliament, being a very important matter, the discussion of which will doubtless occupy considerable time. The sooner it comes before us the better.

The Hon. Mr. WARK said he did not wonder that there should be a desire that the work of constructing this railway should be entered upon as soon as possible, but he would not be in a hurry, because a railway was a thing that could be laid down, but it could not be taken up again, and a blunder at the outset would be one of a permanent character. He hoped it would not be undertaken prematurely, nor until all the features of the country were fairly investigated, and all the information obtained that it was desirable to have. It was highly desirable that the Government should obtain this before they commenced, and as it was desirable that the session should not be prolonged, it was doubtful whether that information could be obtained in time. But he trusted that what had been done would be carried through, at all events, if not in the first session. It was not desirable in this first session that they should attempt too much but whatever they did should be done thoroughly. Reference had been made to the measure for taking votes by ballot, and that measure he looked upon as one of progress. If the people were to be deprived of the right to vote by ballot, it would be forcing them back to the evils of the old open voting system. In New Brunswick and other places the scheme had obtained the hearty approval of the people. He would only say in conclusion with regard to the Pacific Railway that the late Government had not been very successful in the matter. It was unfortunate that they had undertaken to complete it so early.

The Hon. Mr. CORNWALL said that the people of British Columbia were now and had been for some months past in great doubt as to what the policy of the Government was with regard to the Pacific Railway.

The Hon. Mr. READ said that the first paragraph in the Speech alluded to existing commercial depression, but he did not know where. He supposed it meant Canada, but if that was what was meant he must say that he differed with the language used in the paragraph. He thought it was very unfortunate that such a paragraph should have been placed in the Speech, and at a time when we were asking for a new reciprocity treaty with the United States. If there had been a commercial depression in the country, he had failed to discover it, and to satisfy his mind on this point, he had referred to statistics, and, perhaps, as good a test as any with regard to the country's prosperity was the bank capital of the country. The result of his examination of these statistics was as follows: Paid up bank capital, 30th November, 1872, $48,767,532; paid up bank capital, February 28th, 1874, $58,237,671; increase since 30th November, 1872, $9,470,138; bank deposits other than the Government deposits, November 30th, 1872, $52,906,992; 28th February, 1874, $58,773,779; increase from 30th November, 1872, to 28th February, 1874, $5,866,786; bank capital paid up to 30th June, 1870, $29,801 13; increase in three years and nine months, $28,435,892; bank circulation, March, 1873, $26,575,223; Feb. 28th, 1874, $28,343,195; increase, $1,767,972. He objected to the paragraph, and it should have been made to read something

like this: "Notwithstanding the commercial depression that has occurred in other nations, it is satisfactory to know that the prosperity of the Dominion has not been seriously affected." He thought those were the words that should have been put into the mouth of His Excellency. He had had the pleasure of hearing the Finance Minister speak, and he heard him state what seemed most extraordinary. He said that if the Pacific Railway was built every man would have to work one month each year to pay the interest on the money. Now if that were true there was no doubt but that the gentlemen from British Columbia must wait. But he hoped the time was far distant when the people would forego the opportunity of constructing that railway on their own land and at the earliest possible moment. He had to say to the Government that if they would bring down any reasonable scheme for the construction of the road he would give them every possible assistance in his power.

The Hon. Mr. WILMOT said there was one fact alluded to in the Speech, and that was to the effect that the income would not meet the expenses. That was certainly vague. Either there must have been some falling off in trade or there must have been some extraordinary expenditure to call for that particular statement in the Speech. They knew what had occurred in the neighbouring Republic. Any such calamity in that country this Dominion must feel injuriously on her trade. He thought the paragraph was right, but the general state of trade was not at all bad, though there were sufficent grounds to make allusion to it. With regard to the Pacific Railway, it was a matter of the most intense interest to British Columbia, and for the interests of the Dominion that within a reasonable time that road should go on; but hon. gentlemen knew, and it had been always his opinion, that it was something almost monstrous that they should commence the road in two years and finish it in ten. It was a road of almost 2,700 miles in length, and the expense of it they could not comprehend. He was glad when he heard that the contract had been broken through, and he thought the expression of the people throughout the country went to show that they were not sorry. He hoped they would never give encouragement to the breaking of public faith. What British Columbia asked in the first instance he was always willing to grant. With regard to reciprocity, he wished to say a word or two as a warning to his honourable friends. They knew very well that the last treaty was abrogated by the United States, because it was their idea that it would force this country into annexation. What was the history of what occurred since? It had the effect of throwing this country on her own resources. Before that time a great deal of the lumber trade with the Western Isles and South America passed through the United States, and the profits which then went to New York and Boston came into the pockets of the people of Canada. Boston was the ready market in which to sell fish, and, in consequence of a great fish trade being done with South America and the West Indies, the profits that before went to Boston came into the pockets of our own people after the abrogation of that treaty, because the people got vessels of their own for the purpose of carrying on the trade direct with those countries.

Hon. Mr. MILLER observed that the hon. gentleman's remarks did not at all apply to Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT continued to say that he was speaking of his own Province, and he was not aware until now that his observations would not apply to Nova Scotia also. He could only say that a direct trade was opened up between the West Indies, South America and Canada. He must have been misinformed with regard to Nova Scotia, and that reminded him that he could not but express regret at a vacancy in one seat on the other side, occasioned by the death of an hon. gentleman who was largely engaged in the trade, and it was from him he gained his information. In reference to this new reciprocity treaty he trusted that particular caution would be observed, for Americans were particularly sharp in taking advantage in the smallest matter. In his part of the country they produced a large quantity of hay, and the Americans imposed a duty of 20 per cent. on some hay he had exported because they said it was a manufactured article. There was no more reason to call hay a manufactured article than to call wheat that was thrashed from the straw a manufactured article, but he hoped the Government in making the new treaty would keep their eye particularly sharp upon hay. (Laughter.) He had the honor of supporting measures brought in by the late Government, and he had the honor to say that he always treated measures on their merits. With regard to financial measures, there had been an advance of over twenty-eight millions of dollars in circulation besides twelve millions in the Dominion banks. He be-

lieved this was a state of things that the people were well pleased with. They were in favor of the Dominion banks because they tended to equalize the currency.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said that he, as coming from Ontario, and hearing the statements made by the hon. member from New Brunswick in reference to the reciprocity treaty, could say that matters were very much the same in Ontario. It was not expected that the Speech from the Throne should enunciate in very decided terms what the policy of the Government would be. In fact, as had been well said, the purpose of such a speech was to look at everything and touch nothing. It might fairly deal with any of these great questions which had been canvassed and discussed by this country, but he regretted that the Government failed to give information on one or two occasions. He did not think that the country was prepared to wait but they expected that the Government would proceed with all activity, with maturity and wisdom and justice, with experience to improve on the last Government. They looked to the present Government to proceed vigorously, and to come forward with measures well matured and of the right sort. If they had any faith in the future of this great country and in the resources of the vast Northwest, there could be no doubt that men of right experience would be able to build the road and extend the means of communication to the great fertile belt that was described as the most fertile part of this great continent. And when they looked at what the neighbouring Republic had done and were still doing, there was no need to fear the result. They had constructed railways much inferior to those through which the Canadian Pacific was to pass. But one thing he wished to say, and that was that he should like the Government in constructing that road to be very cautious, as indeed they ought to be, as to the principles on which it was to be constructed. As a Government work it would be fraught with great danger if not great evil, and to say the least of it there would be great difficulties in the way. The safest course was that pursued by the United States in giving a bonus in land. That was the course pursued by the country alongside of Canada, and he could not see why our own country could not succeed by following out a plan that had been successful in another. With regard to the action of the Senate Chamber, he was sure that it would be willing to assist the Government in all wise legislation, for while parties are necessary to the making of a free Government, a partizan spirit should never be carried to such an extent as to prevent the possibility of success for any great and good measure. He hoped that all parties would unite for the accomplishment of a great work which was calculated to double and treble the population of the country, and develope her resources. They should all unite to carry it through. He would also express a hope that the Government would try to promote the manufacturing industries of the people. While it was not the desire to establish any monopolies they must take care of the local trade. They knew what risks local manufacturers had run, and although it might be said that their enterprise was for their own profit, still it ought not to be forgotten that they had added greatly to the country's wealth. It was therefore a great national interest to foster such home manufacture, and he hoped it would not be forgotten. It had been stated that a commissioner was to be sent to the United States, but he hoped the Government would take care that there was no erroneous impression made by sending a commissioner to Washington for the purpose of obtaining a reciprocity treaty. Really the abrogation of the treaty, which was so much feared by many, had led to the happiest results to this country, and had built up in every possible way commerce which would have gone to the States instead of to Canada. He hoped the Government would therefore take care that no impression would go to Washington to show that Canada was not entirely independent of them in her commercial relations with the world. If the States had suffered in consequence of having abrogated the treaty that formerly existed, let them come to us and seek terms by which to obtain a share of that trade that has enriched us. They all knew that the market for grain and many other products of the soil was as high almost as the farmers desired. When wheat was selling at $1.20 that was high enough, and we were in no way indebted to the United States for the prosperity of Canada. He again expressed a hope that the Government would not loose sight of fostering the home manufacturing industries, and as long as the farmers got such prices as they were now getting, there would be contentment in the country, for the fact was that farmers were growing rich all over the country, so that there was no doubt we were perfectly independent of the United States. He hoped the Government would go on in such a course as would strengthen

the confidence in the general government. They all felt that the administration of the affairs of this country since the Union had been a great success, and he said a people would be ungrateful, or might be charged with ingratitude, who were afraid to express their sense of the great public services that had been rendered the country by the late administration during many years past. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. REESOR thought that if additional revenue must be raised, it was worthy of consideration whether it would not be proper to protect the iron trade of this country by imposing a duty upon iron. That would lead to the development of the iron mines of the country, and as iron is a thing in general and common use in all trades and manufactures, it was very important that a stimulus should be given to the development of the iron mines in which this country is so rich. After all, the taxes were paid by the people who used it, and every one had an interest in the iron trade because all were in the habit of using it for one purpose or another. If a tax were put upon iron it would be the means of developing a source of industry now almost neglected, which in a few years would add materially to the wealth of the country.

Hon. Mr. CARROLL desired to say, and he thought he was stating the conviction of many people, that a complete investigation should take place as to the policy of the Government, because any policy not having for its object the commercial well-being of Canada, could not be acceptable to the people. It had been proposed to make a water and railway communication, instead of building the Canadian Pacific Road, but the river was frozen over for seven months of the year, and the water was so low in the river during the summer months as to unfit it for navigation. It had been said that it would be a saving of thirty millions of dollars to the Dominion, and it would be still keeping faith with British Columbia; but such a policy would not satisfy the people, as it would be but a mixed means of communication, and that would be one of the greatest absurdities that could be thought of. He hoped that better councils would prevail, and while such was not at present the case, when the policy of the Government was made known, they would be ready to deal with it. He did not wish to detain the House further than to say that he would give any measure of a sound character his support. He certainly did not desire to offer any hostility to the Government, but he hoped they would take his advice and shape their policy so that they would do all they could to carry out the Pacific Railway.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND, of Manitoba, said he might just say in reply to the remarks that had been made regarding the statements of the Finance Minister on the Hustings in reference to the policy regarding the Pacific Railway, that if any such policy were pressed he would be chased away. [Laughter.] Most people were not aware of the feeling that existed in his Province in regard to this matter. British Columbia was on the seaboard and it was important for her to have the railway, but it was equally if not more important to Manitoba who had no outlet to have this railway. The greatest interest was taken in the building of the road, and from all sources that he could learn, there was great disappointment felt at the policy of the Government. He had no doubt that the proposed means of communication, partly by land and partly by water, would be very unsatisfactory, because goods would have to be frequently transhipped and that was a very serious objection. He did not think he had any more to say just then, but he would reserve any further remarks that he had to make, until he saw what was the policy of the Government.

The motion as follows was then put:—

"That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, to offer the respectful thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which His Excellency was pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament, and it was unanimously adopted as follows:—

"To His Excellency the Right Honorable Sir Frederick Temple, Earl of Dufferin, Viscount and Baron Clandeboye, of Clandeboye, in the County Down, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Baron Dufferin and Clandeboye of Ballyleidy and Killeleagh in the County Down, in the Peerage of Ireland, and a Baronet, Knight of the Most Illustrious Order of St. Patrick and Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Governor General of Canada, and Vice-Admiral of the same.

May it Please Your Excellency:

"We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, respectfully thank Your Excellency for your gracious speech at the opening of this Session.

"We thank Your Excellency for having convoked Parliament at the earliest mo-

ment consistent with the delay entailed by the recent dissolution.

"We receive with satisfaction the announcement that our attention will be invited, during the present Session, to measures having reference to the Representation of the people in Parliament, embracing the system now prevailing in Great Britain and in most other countries enjoying Constitutional Government, of taking votes by ballot, and to the establishment of a General Court of Appeal, and that measures will be submitted to us for the amendment of the laws relating to Controverted Elections, the Militia and Insolvency.

"The enactment of 1872, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, having failed to secure the prosecution of that great enterprize, we assure Your Excellency that we shall be ready most earnestly to consider what plan will best and most speedily provide the means of trans-continental communication with British Columbia. We shall receive with pleasure the report of the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, showing what progress has been made during the past year in the surveys connected with the proposed line, which Your Excellency is pleased to say, will be laid before us, though we regret that the destruction of the railway offices by fire involved a serious loss of maps, plans and papers, the possession of which would have made the report more complete.

"We are gratified to learn that the Canal and Harbour Improvements are being vigorously prosecuted with a view to ensure adequate accommodation for the rapidly growing trade of the country.

"We thank Your Excellency for the assurance that the Report of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works on the proposed canal between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy will be submitted for our consideration.

"We are pleased to learn that from the progress already made in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, it may be completed in another year; that a report indicating its actual condition will be laid before Parliament, and that a measure will be introduced to vest in the Department of Public Works the power now exercised by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

"We rejoice to learn from Your Excellency that the question of compensation due to the Dominion for the Fishery privileges conceded to the United States by the Treaty of Washington has given rise to a renewal of negotiations tending to widen reciprocal trade relations with that country; and that at the instance of Your Excellency's Government the Imperial authorities have given directions to the British Minister to discuss the whole subject with the Administration at Washington, and have associated with him for this purpose a Canadian Commissioner.

"We rejoice to learn that the combined efforts of the Dominion and Provincial Governments to promote immigration have met with a reasonable measure of success, thus adding a considerable number of desirable persons from other countries to our industrial population.

"We receive with satisfaction the intimation that notwithstanding the commercial depression which, through exceptional causes, prevailed to some extent during the past year, the general prosperity was not thereby seriously affected; and rejoice in being assured of Your Excellency's conviction that as the great natural resources of the Dominion become more widely appreciated, the results will be a healthy stimulus to the enterprise and energy of our people and a still larger accession to our numbers.

"We trust, with your Excellency, that our deliberations may be directed by wisdom and aided by Divine Providence.

It was ordered that the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such members of this House as are members of the Privy Council."

Then, on motion of the Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, seconded by the Hon. Mr. SCOTT,

The House adjourned.

TUESDAY, March 31.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Several petitions on various subjects were presented.

The Hon. Mr. McMASTER said as there was no business before the House, and there was not likely to be any of importance for several days, he begged to give notice of motion that when the House adjourned on Wednesday, he would move that it stand adjourned until Thursday, the 9th of April.

Hon. Mr. WILSON asked why they could not adjourn at once until the day named. He did not see that there was any necessity for a notice of motion on the subject of the House decided to adjourn at once which he thought they ought to do, seeing there was no business.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I believe at this early stage of the session, it would be better to carry out the rules of the House. He then proceeded to say that it was their duty to pay some compliment to the memory of the hon. gentlemen who had occupied seats in the Senate, and whose death had occurred since the last session of Parliament. He would therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Campbell, that through respect to the memory of the Hon. Messrs. Leslie, Locke, Steeves, Blake and Mills, the House do now adjourn. He would not dwell on the merits of every one of these gentlemen; it was enough that they had been their colleagues, but they must all feel the loss of Mr. Leslie, who was one of the most ancient representative men in the Chamber. However, he would leave it to other men to make their eulogies. All he would say at present was to express his regret at the loss of those gentlemen, and hope that the House would accept the motion that had been made.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said that, from having had fifty years acquaintance with the Hon. Mr. Leslie, who had departed this life, he was in a position to say a few words; and during that time he remembered him standing as a merchant in Montreal, of a very high character for uprightness and integrity. He was a man of genial temper and a kind heart, and it was a source of great pleasure to him (Mr. Ferrier) to have had his acquaintance for 50 years. When he was able to visit the deceased gentleman, when he was out of health, and when he was not able to attend to his duty in the Senate Chamber—and these visits were frequent—he always found him the same. He paid him a visit just before he was taken away, and he might say that he retained his faculties to the last, and his cheerful disposition never forsook him. The last few visits showed him (Mr. Ferrier) that he was getting towards his end, and when they parted for the last time, it was with the melancholy feeling that they should never meet again on this side of time. To-day Mr. Ferrier felt that he had lost a friend and the country had lost an able representative by the death of the Honorable Mr. Leslie.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU desired to pay his tribute to the memory of the late Hon. Mr. Leslie. He had known that gentleman, and had known him in troublous times when Canadians were sorely beset, and when they were struggling for their rights. Mr. Leslie had been indomitable in his zeal for bringing about a redress of their wrongs, and with others who had taken a prominent part in the affairs of 1857, had brought the issue to a successful termination. It was due also in a great measure to him that the Union of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada had been effected. Since December of last year, five Senators had departed from their midst, and he thought it just, that out of respect to their memory the House should adjourn.

Hon. Mr. WILSON said he had known Mr. Mills for a quarter of a century, and they were called about the same time to take their seats in the Legislative Council of Canada, ever since which time they had been friends. To the inhabitants of the City of Hamilton, Mr. Mills had been very generous and they all regretted his loss. Some time ago he granted a piece of ground for a cemetery, which was of great service to the city, and he erected a church which cost him $30,000, towards which he refused all contributions, and, independent of that, he had made large donations to the church. Politically he had contributed to the party to which he belonged. The last but not the least of his acts which showed a spirit of self abnegation, he gave half his property to the church, and to the city of Hamilton he was strictly devoted during a long life time, and in it he did a great deal of good. No doubt at the final reckoning his good and bad deeds would be weighed in the scale of justice, but there could be no doubt that the good will prevail and his soul will be acceptable to his Maker. During his political career he always voted in a conscientious manner, and there was much reason to deplore his loss.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said the motion had come upon him somewhat unexpectedly, but, as a Nova Scotian, he willingly discharged the melancholy duty on behalf of himself and colleagues, of bearing their sincere testimony to the worth and high character of their lamented friend, the late Hon. Mr. Locke. It was, indeed, sad to contemplate the havoc that death had made in the ranks of the Senate in so short a time as that which had elapsed since their last meeting. No less than five members of this body had succumbed to the destroyer in that brief period, whose loss among ourselves must have shattered many friendships, and left behind many traces of unaffected sorrow. It was worthy of remark that every one of the gentlemen whose death we mourned was a member of the Senate as originally constituted by the Queen's Proclamation calling the Confederation into existence. Six years had not yet elapsed since the

memorable day on which Her Majesty's representatives met within these walls for the first time as the Parliament of the Dominion—an event that seemed to him almost as of yesterday—and yet, notwithstanding the tenure of their office, little over one half of those summoned to this body on that occasion now remained to fill their old places here. Some, it was true, had accepted office in other departments of the public service, but the overwhelming majority of those who were absent had passed alike beyond the services and the rewards of this life, affording a suggestive illustration of the mutability of human affairs. He had enjoyed considerable intercourse with the late Mr. Leslie during the years that venerable gentleman attended the sittings of the House, his seat being beside his own, and had often felt the charm of his urbane, cheerful disposition, and the benefit of his well-stored mind. He had early become acquainted with the late Mr. Blake, than whom, perhaps, there was not a kinder, higher-toned or more practical common sense man among his colleagues. His intimacy with all the other gentlemen outside his own Province was of the most friendly and agreeable character, and had never suffered by the slightest unpleasantness of any kind. But his relations towards his late colleague, Mr. Locke, were those of an intimate friend of many years standing, who knew him well, and had many opportunities of witnessing in public and private life the many high qualities that adorned his character. A warm friend, an agreeable companion, a generous opponent, a man of sterling integrity, a gentleman in every thought and impulse, who was there that knew John Locke that did not admire him? He never could have an enemy. As a public man, while moderate in the expression of his views, he was always unflinching in maintaining them, so that even in times of the bitterest controversy, he was as much esteemed by his opponents, as he was beloved by his friends. Mr. Locke belonged to a family that early settled in the County of Shelbourne, in the Province of Nova Scotia, where they acquired much influence. He was elected by that county to the Legislature of his native Province when quite a young man, over twenty years ago. He continued to represent the same county until 1867, when called to the Senate by the Royal Proclamation, having been several times returned by acclamation. During that period he was twice a member of the Government of Nova Scotia. He possessed much influence in the councils of this country, enjoying at all times the entire confidence of his political associates, and the respect of all parties. Since 1867, he had been a member of that House, and he felt sure those whom he now addressed did not require to be reminded of the genial and solid qualities by which he had secured the respect and good will of all with whom he came in contact. Mr. Locke was extensively engaged in commerce, and as a merchant, enjoyed a high and stainless reputation. He was one of that class whose enterprize had done much to promote the prosperity of his native Province—a class among whom his own name was synonymous with everything that was straitforward and honorable as a merchant. He had gone from among them. This House had lost one of its most worthy and intelligent members—the country one of its most public spirited and useful citizens, and he regretted that, called upon without previous notice, his own feelings prevented him from paying a suitable tribute to his memory. His earthly career had too soon ended for his country and his friends, and the grave had closed over one whose memory, from personal associations, he could not allude to without emotion.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said, I would do injustice to my feelings, did I not add a few words to what has been spoken in memory of our departed friends. Although my acquaintance with most of them has been comparatively short, yet nothing has been said in honor of their memory, but what meets my hearty concurrence. My hon. friend who has last spoken has done but justice to the memory of our deceased friend, Hon. John Locke, whose departure we all lament. In social and political life he was well known to me. We sat together for some years in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia. Although representing largely the same interest, we often took opposite sides on public questions, yet, I can sincerely say, that I ever found him, what many of you here have found him, one of the kindest in advice, and the gentlest in censure—unselfish and liberal. He never seemed to speak in public or social life simply for display or effect, but from the flow of his spirits, the vigor of his imagination, and the stores of his memory, he ever was the champion of his social and political friends, without ever a word of fulsome insincerity. He relished a joke or a trail of humour in social intercourse, always bringing freshness with him. Death came to him in the full tide of life, The ship came to anchor suddenly under full sail in mid stream. Most of us well

knew the sweet frankness of his disposition and the playfulness of his bright and airy spirit. He will long be remembered by honorable members with the kindest feelings, and by those of us who knew him best, he will ever be named by that soft and affectionate word "dear" Locke.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS fully endorsed all that had been said by previous speakers of all the deceased honourable gentlemen. They were men of sterling character and strong convictions. He knew Mr. Blake better than he did any of the others, and he could say that a more upright and conscientious man than Mr. Blake he never met. He did not think when he shook hands with him last that it would indeed be the last time. He had no doubt that his death was in accordance with his life. He lived well, and there could be no doubt that he died well.

Hon. Mr. McCLELLAN said it was a melancholy duty to pay this mark of respect to our lamented colleague. The late Hon. Mr. Steeves belonged to a respectable family whose ancestors were among the first permanent residents of the district to which he (Mr. McC.) belonged. He formerly represented that district in the Assembly and Legislative Council—held a department in the Government of New Brunswick—took part in the delegations and deliberations which led to Confederation, and he displayed in all these positions considerable ability and energy of character. He must be remembered as having evinced a lively interest in all public questions, and as materially helping to work out results of great moment to Canada. The cares of his extensive business and his failing health have of late prevented his taking a very active part in politics; but his loss will be felt and deplored.

With reference to the other gentlemen, so properly alluded to, he (Mr. McC.) agreed with all that had fallen from the other speakers, and especially did he deplore the decease of Messrs. Blake and Locke, with both of whom he had become intimately acquainted.

After some observations to the same effect from Mr. WARK, the motion was put for adjournment, and it being carried, the House rose.

WEDNESDAY, April 1st.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock, when petitions on various subjects were presented.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL rose to move the following motion, of which he had given notice:—

"That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before the House copies of all despatches between the Government and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and the Police Magistrate of that Province, on the subject of the murders alleged to have been committed by American citizens in the Northwest Territories, and on the subject of the alleged establishment of trading posts by them within those Territories." He said he had been induced to ask for these papers because he had heard that some Americans had, followed by some Indians, committed some frightful murders near Cypress Hills, on the Canadian side of the line, and the United States Government were anxious that proceedings be taken on this side of the line for the extradition of the offenders. Some Americans had established armed trading posts in which were rifles, on our side of the line, and were carrying on illegal trading with the Indians, selling them liquor and firearms. There were four or five such posts. The circumstance was brought before the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba by the late Government, and he was anxious to know whether any steps had been taken to prevent these murders and to reduce the trading posts. He hoped to obtain that information from the correspondence between the Government and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and the police magistrate. He therefore begged to move the resolution of which he had given notice, seconded by Mr. Allan.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the Northwest had been in a very lawless condition for some time, and the subject had been under the consideration of the Government. He believed that some difficulties had arisen out of the sale of intoxicating liquors by the Americans to the Indians, and the United States Government were doing all in their power to confiscate all liquors on their side of the line. We have the same power of confiscation. A very considerable force was required to keep down this lawlessness, and the Government was now in the act of increasing the force that is at present in Manitoba, and he hoped that order would soon be restored.

The motion was then put and carried.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL, in accordance with previous notice, asked when the present contract with the Gulf Port Steamship Company expires, and whether it is proposed to renew the existing subsidy

to that Company? He said the contract with the Gulf Ports SteamshipCompany was made some time ago, and at a time when there were no steamers running between the Gulf Ports and Quebec. Since the line had been opened it had been a very successful line of steamers, and the Company had very good vessels, which carried great numbers of passengers and goods, and kept up intercourse with this part of the country and the Lower Provinces. But other lines of steamers have been established, and one or two more were about to be established, or were in contemplation; so that, at all events, there would be three next season. Now the service which the subsidized vessels render is simply that of carrying the mails, and when the subsidy was given to the Gulf Ports Company it was substantially to give encouragement to the line, but he thought the time had arrived when the subsidy might be reasonably dispensed with, and he thought it well to call the attention of the Government to the subject. There was also another matter in relation to two lines of steamers on Lake Superior and Lake Huron. A line had been established from Collingwood, and afterwards another from Sarnia. Both these companies were subsidized, and though it was somewhat illogical and unreasonable that it should be so, the late Government were obliged to yield when the second company put in a claim for a subsidy, though they had been building up the Company at Collingwood. However, in granting these subsidies, he endeavoured to make engagements with the companies that the subsidies would only be of a temporary character, in the hope of making the arrangement somewhat business-like, and he hoped the present Government would be able to make satisfactory arrangements, and that it would not be thought necessary to subsidize the two companies but select one or other, he did not care which, when the existing contract expires.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said as to the Gulf Ports Company, when the contract shall expire it was intended to renew it, but with far less subsidy than was originally granted, and as to the other two companies it was intended to ask for tenders from them, and if both were very low, and their services required, both would be retained.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER was of opinion that the services of both companies should be retained, as they were a great public convenience to the people in the West.

Hon. Mr. WARK knew what the effect of the subsidy to the Gulf Ports steamers was. He knew that people who lived at the smaller ports suffered great inconvenience in consequence of the steamers calling only at the principal ports and neglecting the small ports. The trade used to be done by schooners, and they could be got at a moderate rate of freight for freights seldom went up to 50 cents, but so soon as the steamers were subsidized, they charged what they pleased, and their rate was 50 cents. The effect of the steamers being subsidized was to drive the schooners out of the trade, and as the steamers did not call at the smaller ports great inconvenience was felt. He thought that when steamers were subsidized there ought to be a tariff fixed. He had got freight down for 30 cents and 40 cents, but now the steamers were charging 50 cents. He thought that there should be some limit set to the charges, if a subsidy was to be granted to this company.

Hon. Mr. BENSON was acquainted with the trade of both lines, and he hoped every consideration would be given to both when the subject came before the Government.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER said that he was aware there were quite a number of holidays during the next ten days, and they were not likely to have any business of consequence before them for some time, so that it appeared to him that the public business would not suffer if they were to have an adjournment for two weeks; but as his motion was for an adjournment for eight days, he had to move "That when the House adjourns this day, Wednesday, it do stand adjourned to Thursday evening the 9th inst, at half past seven o'clock."

A lengthened discussion took place as to whether the adjournment should be for a fortnight or for a less period even than that proposed by the Hon Mr. McMaster's motion; and in the end it was resolved that the House do adjourn until Wednesday evening the 8th instant, at 8 o'clock, it being intimated that it was the intention of the Commons to adjourn until Tuesday the 7th instant.

The House then adjourned.

OTTAWA, April 8, 1874.

The SPEAKER took the chair a 8 o'clock p.m., when petitions in favor of a Prohibitory Liquor Law were presented by the Honorable Messrs. Skead, Leonard, McDonald (Toronto), McClelan (Hopewell), and Alexander.

A message arrived from the Commons,

and the Speaker having received the message at the Bar, returned to his chair.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he had the honor to present an address from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by himself, which read as follows:

"Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

"I received with great satisfaction the assurance conveyed in your address of your readiness to consider the various important measures which will come before you.

"DUFFERIN."

Hon. Mr. READ gave notice that on Friday next, he will move that Mr. Speaker be desired to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Senate restaurant.

Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria), gave notice that on Monday, 13th April, he will move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, for copies of all instructions given to any engineers or other persons to examine into the practicability of a mixed land and water transcontinental communication with British Columbia, and for copies of any reports received from such engineers or other persons, and for copies of any other reports or papers on the subject; of the feasability of using the water of the Saskatchewan river for navigation purposes during a portion of the year.

Hon. Mr. PENNY gave notice that he will move for copies of all communications addressed to the Minister of Customs, within three years, complaining of the conduct of the late Collector of Customs at Montreal, and in case such complaints were made of any correspondence relating thereto, and any reports indicating the result of any inquiry made by order of the Minister of Customs into the truth thereof.—For Friday.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER gave notice that on Monday next he would move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency declaring that it is the opinion of this branch of the Legislature that it would be desirable in the interests of this country, if the treaty existing between Great Britian and the United States for the mutual extradition of fugitive criminals could be extended to embrace fugitive debtors who have absconded from one country to the other, owing sums over and above $2,000.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT presented the report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1873.

The SPEAKER announced that the message from the Commons was to ask for a committee of both Houses on the subject of Printing. He also presented a return from the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bureau, that the House do now adjourn, and the motion was carried.

The SPEAKER then declared the House adjourned until Thursday at 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 9.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock, when a large number of petitions in favour of a prohibitary liquor law were presented, some of which had as many as 5,700 signatures appended; and His Honor, the Speaker, submitted a list of the stock-holders of the Bank of St. John.

Petitions were also presented in favor of the amendment of the tariff so as to provide for the protection of the manufacturing interest, and upon other subjects.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD gave notice that he will on Monday next move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a return showing the amount expended upon the South East pier of the Intercolonial Railway bridge over the Tantamae river, specifying whether or not tenders were advertised for the work, and if not, whether any public notice was given to invite competion for such repairs as were contemplated, stating the nature and necessity of such repairs and under whose superintendence the work was done.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD, (Victoria), in accordance with previous notice asked:—Do the Government intend to grant to the Province of British Columbia £50,000, or any less sum, in lieu of the interest guaranteed for ten years on £100,000, under clause 12 of the terms of the Union, for the purpose of a Dry Dock, and if so, on what terms and conditions? He said: At some future time I will enter into the history of the matter, but before asking the question I would remark that the Local Legislature of British Columbia have passed an act by which they propose to take from the Dominion Government—£50,000 in lieu of the guarantee in clause 12 of the terms of Confederation—and we have seen supposed copies of telegrams and portions of correspondence which passed between members of the Dominion Government and the Local Government, which partake more of a private than an official character. Now the actual value of

this guarantee is over £28,000, and it appeared strange to a large number of people that our Province should receive £22,000 more than it was entitled to, without giving some equivalent, and now we would like to have some information on the subject of an official character.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT in reply, said it was the intention of the Government to submit a proposition for consideration to commute the whole.

Hon. Mr. MILLER remarked that if British Columbia were satisfied with the £50,000 he supposed the extra £22,000 would not be forced upon that Province.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria), had given notice of the following motion :—

"That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency may be pleased to furnish this House with a copy of the instructions given to Mr. Edgar, Agent or Commissioner, recently sent by Dominion Government to the Province of British Columbia." The motion, however, was postponed.

Hon. SCOTT in the absence of the Hon. Mr. Lettellier De St. Just, who, he regretted, was in ill health, moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bureau, that the Standing Committees of the present session be appointed, and composed respectively as follows :—

BANKING, COMMERCE AND RAILWAYS.

The Hon. Messieurs—Alexander, Benson, Bureau, Campbell, Chapais, Chinic, Ferguson, Ferrier, Foster, Hamilton, [Kingston], Howlan, Kaulbach, Kenny, (Sir Edward,) McClelan [Hopewell], McDonald, [Toronto], McMaster, Macdonald [Victoria] Macpherson, Malhiot, Robertson, Ryan, Scott, Simpson, Skead, Sutherland, Vidal, Wark, Wilmot, Wilson, Price.

LIBRARY.

The Hon, Messieurs—Allan, Baillargeon, Bellerose, Bourinot, Brown, Chaffers, Chapais, Cormier, Cornwall, Ferguson, Girard, Haythorne, Hazen, Holmes, Lacoste, Macfarlane, Leonard, Malhiot, Miller, Montgomery, Odell, Reesor, Scott, Trudel, Wilmot, Price.

CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS.

The Hon. Messieurs—Aikins, Armand, Botsford, Campbell, Carrall, Dickey, Dickson, Dumouchel, Girard, Hamilton [Inkerman], Leonard, Leteilier de St. Just, McClelan [Hopewell], McDonald [Toronto], Macfarlane, Macpherson, Miller, Panet, Read, Ryan, Scott, Seymour, Shaw, Wilson, Skead.

PRINTING.

The Hon. Messieurs—Aikens, Brown, Bureau, Carrall, Cochrane, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Haythorne, Kaulbach, Muirhead, Penny, Reesor, Scott, Simpson and Glasier.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The Hon. Messieurs Allan, Archibald, Armand, Bellerose, Botsford, Bourinot, Cornwall, Dever, Dickson, Ferrier, Flint, Girard, Guevremont. Haviland, Haythorne, Hazen, Letellier de St. Just, Macfarlane, Miller, Northup, Odell, Panet, Perry, Scott, Trudel, Vidal, Aikins.

The motions for the appointment of the respective Committees, as above, were adopted.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria) had given notice of the following motion :—"That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House, returns shewing the number of engineers, surveyors, and other persons, specifying their different grades, sent from the eastern portion of the Dominion to British Columbia in connection with the Pacific Railway during the year 1873, together with the cost of transportation each way." He said :—In moving for these returns, as to the cost of surveyors from this part of the Dominion to British Columbia, my object is not so much to get the returns, as to bring to the notice of the Government the fact that last year many of the subordinates in the surveying corps were sent from this part of the Dominion, while persons able to fill their places could have been found in British Columbia. This being the case, it will be seen that the country was put to unnecessary expense, and at the same time many in our Province deprived of employment. I therefore beg to call the particular attention of the Government to this matter to avoid further mistakes, as I believe in a few days surveying parties will again be leaving for the west, and as a matter of economy, those in our Province who are qualified, ought to be employed. I would call the attention of the Government to another matter, as to the advisability of establishing a permament railway office in our Province where the labor and field notes of the summer could be worked up without having to be sent back to Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT could not be answerable for the proceedings of the late Government in sending parties to British Columbia, but all we could say was that the

present Government would be governed by a sense of what was right in the interests of the people, and in a fair representation of all parts of the Dominion.

Moved by Hon. Mr. SCOTT, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bureau, That the Committee appointed to superintend the printing of this House, during the present session of Parliament, be instructed to act on behalf of this House with the Committee of the House of Commons, as a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of printing, as desired by the House of Commons in their message of Wednesday, the 8th instant.

The Speaker said he had the honour to submit the following resolution from the House of Commons:—"That a message be sent to the Senate informing their honors that this House has appointed the Hon. Messieurs. McKenzie, Abbott, Cartwright, Cameron, (Cardwell), Cauchon, Dorion, Holton, Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Hon. Messrs. Smith, (Westmoreland,) Tupper, and Messrs. Baby, Brouse, Delorme, Frechette, Kirkpatrick, Laflamme, Mills and Young to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned; and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. SCOTT, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bureau, that the Library Committee as already constituted be appointed a committee to assist his Honor the Speaker in the direction of the Library, and to act on behalf of this House as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library as desired by the House of Commons in their message received this day.

These motions were adopted, and it was then resolved on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Scott, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bureau that the foregoing resolutions be communicated to the House of Commons by one of the Masters in Chancery.

The House then adjourned on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Scott, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bureau.

FRIDAY, April 10.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

The House sat with closed doors until 4 o'clock. When the public business commenced, a large number of petitions were presented, most of which were in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, some for acts of incorporation, and others for the amendment of the tariff and the establishment of a permanent tariff to protect Canadian manufactures. These were presented by the Honourable Messrs. Skead, McMaster, Alexander, Penny, Scott, and the Speaker. The reading of sundry petitions was afterwards proceeded with; after which

Hon Mr. SIMPSON submitted the following report:—

"Committee Room, 10th of April, 1874. The Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, beg leave to submit the following as their first report:—The Committee beg to recommend that their quorum be reduced to nine members, all of which is respectfully submitted." He might state, on presenting this report, that the Committee originally consisted of twenty members, but they had reached the number of thirty, and it was now thought advisable that the quorum be nine. He belived that it would be for the convenience of both Houses that this should be adopted now. They meet again for business on Monday, and he thought they ought to adopt the recommendation of the Committee that the quorum be nine. He therefore moved that the report be adopted; seconded by Mr. Aikins.

The SPEAKER then put the question as follows:—"That the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament on printing, be reduced to nine members as a quorum."

The motion was adopted.

Hon. Mr. Simpson then moved that the report as presented, be now adopted, and on being seconded, it was agreed to *nem. con.*

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE, who spoke in French, wanted to have all reports read in French as well as in English, as it was not convenient to all the members that the reports and recommendations of Committees should be read in English only.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that no doubt the Chief Clerk would read any document in French as well as in English when it was applied for in the French language. If, however, it were found to be any inconvenience for the Chief Clerk to do so, it would be the duty of the Senate to provide other means for the translation.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON said that for the future he would endeavor to arrange that the reports be made in duplicate, and that all inconvenience would be avoided.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU complained that the reports were not received as early as they should be, and he considered that it was a matter of importance that all reports should be delivered in good time.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON said he hoped that by the concurrence of other honorable gentlemen what was desired could be effected, and for the future there should b eno such grounds for complaint.

Hon. Mr. WILSON thought it might be a great inconvenience for Mr. Lemoine to have to translate everything that might require translation. If he could not accomplish what was required from him in this respect, it would be well to name some person for that duty.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Will Mr. Lemoine give the French translation of the report?

Mr. Lemoine then read the report in French.

The motion was then put as moved by Hon. Mr. SIMPSON, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Aikins, "That the first report of the Committee on Printing be now adopted," and it was carried unanimously.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT submitted a statement of all bonded securities registered with the Secretary of State.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT gave notice that on Monday the 13th April he will enquire whether any correspondence has taken place between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government, relative to the disallowance of the Act for the examination of witnesses on oath before Committees of Parliament, and if not, whether the Government intend to take any action in this matter?

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN gave notice that on Monday the 13th April, he will ask if it is the intention of the Executive Government to submit during the present session, a measure for enforcing prepayment of postage on all letters?

Hon. Mr. ODELL gave notice that on Monday the 13th April, he will move for an humble address to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a return showing the date of sailing of each of the Allan steam packet ships under contract for carrying the English mails on their westward voyages from Liverpool, Great Britain, and the date of their arrival at Halifax, Quebec, and Portland, Maine, during the year 1873, specifying also the time occupied by such ships in each voyage.

Hon. Mr. READ had given notice that he would move that Mr Speaker be desired to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Senate Restaurant, but the motion was postponed until Monday.

Hon. Mr. PENNY, in accordance with previous notice, rose to move:—

"That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House, copies of all communications addressed to the Minister of Customs within three years complaining of the conduct of the late Collector of Customs at Montreal, and in case such complaints were made of any correspondence relating thereto: and of reports indicating the result of any enquiry made by order of the Minister of Customs into the truth thereof; also of all petitions and correspondence relating to the pension which had been granted to the late Collector of the Port of Montreal." He said he made this motion for papers, because it was a matter of public notoriety that complaints had been made against the late Collector. It was proper for him to say at the outset that these did not directly affect the integrity of the administration of the customs law as between the Government and the importers; but if what was said of the Collector was true, there was no doubt that there was great demoralization in the office under his care. He did not desire that they should now ente into the character of the charges that had been made, but he wanted to call the attention of the Government to the manner in which the charges had been treated. He understood that there had been some kind of an inquiry, but he did not know what the nature of it was, though he thought it was of importance that it should be made known, because the charges were of a grave nature. * * As the case now stood, there seemed to be one of two alternatives open to explain; the conduct of the Customs Department. Either it had consented to retain under the nose, as it were of the Collector, a subordinate officer who had grossly libelled him, and lied about him. Or it had shown no interest in ascertaining whether the most important officer in the country in respect to the collection of the revenue had been guilty of acts which must place him wholly in the power of those whom he ought to control. Either alternative was most disastrous to the public service.

The motion was carried, and it was ordered that such members of the House as are members of the Privy Council do wait on His Excellency with said address.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN gave notice that on Monday next he will move an address to His Excellency the Governor-General for a copy of the advertisement for the winter steamer to Prince Edward's Island, as well as a copy of all tenders received for said service.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Letellier De St. Just, seconded by Hon. Mr. Scott, the House adjourned until Monday at three o'clock.

MONDAY, April 13.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock, but for an hour and a half the business was conducted with closed doors. When the representatives of the press were admitted, the Speaker submitted a list of the stockholders of the Bank of Montreal, as well as petitions in favor of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and petitions for the amendment of the tariff so as to protect the manufacturing interests of Canada. Several hon. members also presented petitions of a similar character, and for acts of incorporation, and amendments of acts of incorporation.

After the reading of petitions, the first reports of the Committees on contingent accounts, on the Parliamentary Library, on Standing Orders, and on Commerce and Banking, were submitted, which simply amounted to the recommendation that the quorum of each should be reduced to nine members.

The following notices of motion were then given:

Hon. Mr. READ gave notice that he will enquire of the Government on Wednesday next, if it is the intention to extend the system of postal deliveries, and if so to what extent?

Hon. Mr. GIRARD gave notice of his intention on Wednesday to ask have the plans for the erection of a bridge over the Red River, in Manitoba, in continuation of the Dawson route, been submitted to the Government, and does the Government intend to begin the building of such bridge at an early date?

Hon. Mr. WARK gave notice that on Wednesday he will ask is it the intention of the Government to bring in during the present session a bill to authorize the same increase to the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of New Brunswick, as were made to the salaries of judges in other Provinces of the Dominion by the 36th Victoria, Chap. 31?

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN gave notice that on Wednesday next an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all appointments to and dismissals from office in Prince Edward Island, as well as a copy of all petitions and other papers connected therewith, since the 1st day of July last.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD gave notice of an enquiry, which he will make on Thursday next, does the Government intend to take the necessary steps to ascertain the possibility of rendering the river Assiniboine navigable by leading into it the waters of Lake Manitoba by means of a canal between the two at the place where they are nearest to each other?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria) had given notice "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, for copies of all instructions given to any engineer or other person to examine into the practicability of a mixed land and water trans-continental communication with British Columbia, and for copies of any reports received from such engineer or other person, and for copies of any other reports or papers on the subject of the feasibility of using the waters of the Saskatchewan River for navigation purposes during a portion of the year," but he requested that the motion be allowed to stand until the 24th inst. The motion was postponed accordingly.

It was then moved by the Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER "That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, declaring it as the opinion of this branch of the Legislature that it would be desirable in the interests of this country, if the Treaty existing between Great Britain and the United States for the mutual extradition of fugitive criminals could be extended to embrace fugitive debtors who have absconded from one country to the other, owing sums over and above two thousand dollars." He desired to elicit the opinion of the House whether it would not be advantageous to extend this provision of the Extradition Treaty, to embrace also a certain class of "fugitive debtors." As the Treaty now stands, it only provides for the surrender of fugitive criminals. A party to be extradited must be chargeable with one of the crimes enumerated in the Treaty. Whereas, cases are from time to time occurring, of debtors, who are not chargeable with any crime, absconding from one country to the other owing considerable amounts, perhaps from $10,000 to $30,000, suddenly and unexpectedly crossing the lines, and if they are not chargeable with any breach of the Criminal Laws, under the present state of the Extradition Treaty, it has been found almost impossible to recover anything from them. And it will be admitted that the very fact of the law affording no power to bring back such a debtor, is a strong

incentive to fraud; when men become somewhat embarrassed, it affords such a facility of evading the payment of just debts. It will, no doubt, be argued, that by obtaining a judgment in the courts of the Dominion, you can collect elsewhere. But men of legal experience know how much more difficult, in fact, how impossible it is to collect upon a judgment in a foreign country. And if it really can be shewn and is generally felt, that the exclusion of the provision, now proposed has the tendency of encouraging small and large debtors when they become embarrassed, to think of leaving the Dominion, it would surely be wise, so to amend the treaty in this particular. It may, perhaps, be argued, what can be gained by bringing back a debtor so fraudulently disposed? Why, under the pressure which might be brought to bear under requirement of bail, an equitable settlement of the debt would in most cases be obtained, while the debtor would not be driven to another country. He (the mover) could not but feel that, upon different grounds; it was in the interest of both countries, that the treaty should be thus extended, and if no weighty objections could be advanced, he ventured to hope that those views would meet with the concurrence of this branch of the Legislature, and also of the Government, and that they would see fit to solicit the Imperial Government to accomplish the object desired.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY seconded the motion, and when it was put,

Hon. Mr. MILLER did not think that the adoption of the motion would be followed by any practical result, and it would, therefore, in his opinion, be injudicious to assent to it. (Hear, hear.) The law of extradition, as founded on treaty, had only had a very recent application in England, the treaties with the United States and France in 1842 and 1843 being the first ever negotiated by that country, and, with the exception of some arrangement of the same kind with China, they continued to stand alone until 1862, when a similar treaty was negotiated with Denmark. In Great Britain, however, within the last few years, the subject of extradition had received greater attention than had ever before been given to it. Since 1862, treaties of this nature had been entered into by England with the chief European powers. The subject must, therefore, have received careful consideration in all its aspects from the Imperial statesmen during that period; but he was not aware of any case in which the policy of extending those treaties to civil liabilities had ever been mooted or discussed. (Hear, hear.) Certainly, in none of the numerous treaties of extradition entered into with foreign States, had debt or civil causes of any kind been included. The right of a State to demand extradition for any cause, from another sovereign State, in the absence of treaty obligations, was a point on which the best writers on the subject differed. It is true that Vattel, among other high authorities, asserted that right far beyond criminal offences as one of international obligation, and contended that even in cases of ordinary transgressions, which are only the subjects of prosecution, either with the view to the recovery of damages or the infliction of a slight civil punishment, the subjects of two neighboring States are reciprocally obliged to appear before the magistrate of the place where they are accused of having failed in their duty. In those European countries where the law of extradition had always had a much wider scope, as well as a much earlier application, than in Great Britain, that doctrine may have been assented to, but it had never been accepted or acted on by the British authorities. In the latter country, there had always been exhibited a remarkable caution and sensitiveness in infringing on any pretext whatever of a civil or political character, on the right of asylum, and even in the highest criminal offences, extradition as a general rule had only been granted, under treaty arrangements. It was also now a settled law in the United States that a fugitive criminal could only be given under express legislative enactments. Those countries most distinguished for their political freedom had always been the most cautious in interfering with the privileges of those living under the protection of their laws. It was only under despotic Governments that minor crimes, civil liabilities and political offences had formed the subjects of extradition. (Hear, hear.) In England and the United States the question had never been entertained, except in relation to persons charged with crimes contrary to the laws and safety of all nations. In the numerous treaties entered into by both countries with foreign powers, and especially by England within the last twelve years, this policy had been rigidly adhered to, as much so by one country as the other. He did not mean to say that some offences had not been omitted that might have been provided for with benefit to both nations. No doubt in countries bordering on each other like Canada and the United States, greater facilities and a more comprehensive category of offences should exist in regard

to extradition than in countries separated by great natural barriers, rendering inter-communication difficult. Some offences might reasonably form the subject of extradition in the one case, that could not properly do so in the other, but debt or civil liabilities of any kind could not be so included. The duty of extradition was a surrender, in some degree, of the territorial rights of a Sovereign State, and was only submitted to in the interests of humanity and good government. Those interests demand that crime should not escape punishment, and that the criminal wherever found should be delivered up to justice. The principle of English jurisprudence was that the administration of criminal law was absolutely local—that crime must be tried by the law of the place at which it was committed. There were, perhaps, one or two exceptions to the general rule, such as crime committed on board of ships. This principle was founded on reason and justice, as the criminal should only be made amenable to the laws he was charged with having violated. Hence the necessity of extradition for crime. But it could not be said that the interests of humanity, or the welfare of nations, required the application of the same rule to civil liabilities. Both England and the United States offered the protection of their laws to every man untainted with crime that choose to live under them, and neither, he was sure, would consent to any interference with that protection on grounds of a civil or political character. An unfortunate debtor seeking a home in either country would always do so with safety. But if it were possible to extend the law of extradition to debtors, he (Mr. Miller) contended that it would be inexpedient and unnecessary to do so. The civil process of our own Courts easily secured the property of an absconding debtor within their jurisdiction, and the courts of the United States were open to a creditor wherever the absconder could be found. This was the great distinction between civil and criminal cases. (Hear, hear.) Extradition would be a much more tedious and expensive process than the remedy the courts of both countries already afforded. Then, he (Mr. Miller) would like to know how the extradition of debtors was to be effected? Would the same steps be necessary that were now followed in procuring the surrender of fugitive criminals? At present a private individual could make no claim for extradition against any one; the demand must be made by the Government of either country, and, before successful, receive the sanction of that of the other. Could any other course be adopted in civil cases? Would the hon. member, then, make the Government of Canada or the United States an agent or attorney for the collection of the claims of private individuals against absent or absconding debtors? It was too absurd to suppose that the civil process of either country would be allowed to run into the territory of its neighbor. If the proposition of the hon. gentleman became law it would be attended with endless vexation and difficulties, but of that he had not the slightest apprehension. He considered it his duty, however, to make these remarks, lest through inadvertence the motion might receive the assent of the House. He thought his hon. friend had better have leave to withdraw his motion. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that he had seconded his friend's motion for the purpose of having it discussed, but at the same time he thought it right that he should guard himself from any sympathy with the object of the motion. He could not look at it in any other light than as a motion for changing the international law, and as such he thought it was unnecessary, because you could follow a man anywhere for debt. It was quite true that there were difficulties in the way, but the same difficulties would always present themselves, no matter how far the Extradition Law was extended. For instance, if a man claimed that an absconding debtor owed him a certain sum, he would have to establish his claim in a United States court before he could ask for the exercise of any extradition law in his favor. Now, as an illustration, in Nova Scotia they did not allow an arrest for debt unless it could be shown that the man was going to leave the country; if, therefore, the man left Nova Scotia and went to the United States, and he was followed there and brought back he would be imprisoned for what he could not have been imprisoned for if he had remained at home. He (Hon. Mr. Dickey) could fancy that was such a treaty in existence it would do no good. If a person committed a political offence he could not be followed into another country, because any other country having regard to her independence and self-respect would not submit to such interference. Suppose there was a Fenian raid, or an expression of Southern sympathy on the part of any number of persons and a demand should be made that they were to be brought back into the

country to which they were hostile, it would be impossible to expect that such a thing could be done. It could not be supposed that such an anomaly could be submitted to. He therefore hoped that his hon. friend would not embarrass the Government by pressing such a motion as the one he had brought forward, and that he would not ask the Senate Chamber to decide on such a matter, because he must feel that the overwhelming sense of the House was against him.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT felt quite sure that his hon friend would not press his motion, because even if it were carried, it must amount to nothing. If a man left this country owing any sum, and leaving any amount of property behind, the creditor could go into the adjoining country and bring his claim. No doubt he was under a disadvantage by having to go to a foreign country, but still he had the same facilities for the recovery of his money as he would have even if the motion of the hon. gentleman was passed. Under all the circumstances, he hoped that the motion would be withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER, after explaining that it was in no spirit to embarrass the Government that he brought this matter forward, but merely from the fact that a person charged with an embezzlement even to a small amount, could be extradited, he thought that the law of extradition should be extended so as to include what was often a far more criminal act against society than the embezzlement of a small sum of money. He agreed to withdraw his motion.

Hon. Mr. ODELL, in the absence of the Hon. Mr. Botsford, who had given notice: "That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a return shewing the amount expended upon the south east pier of the Intercolonial Railway bridge over the Tantamar River, specifying whether or not tenders were advertised for the work, and if not, whether any public notice was given to invite competition for such repairs as were contemplated, stating the nature and necessity of such repairs and under whose superintendence the work was done," asked that the motion be postponed, and the request was complied with.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT, in accordance with previous notice, asked whether any correspondence has taken place between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government relative to the disallowance of the Act for the examination of witnesses on oath before Committees of Parliament, and if not, whether the Government intend to take any action in this matter?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said in reply, that some correspondence did take place with the late Government, but he was not prepared to say what action the present Government would take in the matter.

Hon. Mr. McCLELLAN (Hopewell) asked—Is it the intention of the Executive Government to submit during the present session a measure for enforcing pre-payment of postage on all letters.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST JUST replied that the Government had the question under consideration. It was a subject that deserved great study, and that was being bestowed upon it.

Hon. Mr. ODELL moved that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a return shewing the date of sailing of each of the Allan steam packet ships, under contract for carrying the English mails, on their western voyages to and from Liverpool, Great Britain, and the dates of their arrival at that port and Halifax, Quebec, and Portland, Maine, during the year 1873, specifying also the time occupied by such ships in each voyage.

The motion was seconded by the Hon. Mr. RYAN, and it was ordered on its adoption, that the address be presented by members of the Privy Council to His Excellency.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the advertisement for the Winter steamer to Prince Edward Island, as well as a copy of all tenders for said service.

The same order was made in this case, but the question was postponed for a week.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER introduced a bill against the adulteration of food, drink and drugs, and moved the second reading for Monday next.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL moved the suspension of the 28th rule of the Senate, in order to the formation of a joint committee with a Committee of the House of Commons, and after some discussion the motion was agreed to.

The House then adjourned on the motion of Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just.

TUESDAY, April 14.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock, when a number of petitions were presented by several honorable members in favor of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and for the incorporation of several companies.

The following reports of committees were then presented :

The Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills reported as follows :

"The Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills have the honor to present the following as their second report : —Your Committee have examined the following petitions and find that sufficient notice has been given in each case, viz. : Of the British American Assurance Company, praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Company to make investments in the stock of the incorporated monied institutions of Canada and in Dominion, Provincial, Municipal and Foreign securities as well as on bond and mortgage of real property, and to make deposits of the same in other countries when necessary, to enable the company to do business. Of George A. Dartnell and others, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, praying for an Act of incorporation as the London and Canada Bank. Of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, praying for power to consolidate all their pre-preference capital ranking before the first preference shares, and to convert the same into one perpetual debenture stock; also to raise further capital for improving and extending the company's business, and to establish among the employees of the company a superannuation fund and a system of insurance against accidents and death, with power to manage the same. Of the Great Western Railway Company, praying for the passing of an Act authorising the construction of a branch railway from some point on the line of the said railway at or near the town of Clifton to a point at or near the village of Allensborough in the County of Welland, and the extension thereof to some point on the Canada air line branch of the said Great Western Railway, and for other purposes. Of the Hon. Charles Wilson and others of the city of Montreal, praying for an Act of incorporation as Le Credit Foncier Royal. Of Wm. A. Thompson and others, praying for an Act of incorporation as the Niagara Grand Island Company; and of the Confederation Life Association, praying for the amendment of their Act of incorporation so as to provide for the holding of the general annual meeting at a different period of the year, and to alter the provisions contained in the 18th and 19th sections thereof and for other purposes."

Hon. Mr. DICKSON, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Skead, moved that the report of the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills be now adopted.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU made a motion to the effect that a Bill to be entitled the Credit Foncier du Bas Canada, for an amendment to their Act of incorporation be read a second time on Monday next.

The SPEAKER announced that it was now the time for the presenting further reports of Committees, when the following report was read :—

COMMITTEE ROOM,

14th April 1874.

The Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, beg leave to submit the following as their Second Report ;—

Resolved—That as by the tenth report of the Committee of 21st May last, it was recommended to issue advertisement for tenders for the printing services of Parliament, and which recommendation was concurred in by both Houses, such tenders to be sent in to the Clerk of the Committee, not later than the first day of the next session of Parliament to be submitted to the committee at the first meeting thereof ; but as no committees were appointed during that session held in October last, and the tenders remained unopened in the clerk's hands, it is now considered expedient to return such tenders unopened to the parties who handed in, and to issue advertisements for new tenders for the printing, binding and printing paper required for the printing service of Parliament ; such tenders to be separately for each service, sent in not later than the 11th day of May next, the tenders for printing, binding and paper, to be each separate and distinct.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON in moving the adoption of the report of the two Houses on printing, said that according to the rules, it was usual for the report to lay on the table for a few days. But he thought it should be adopted now for the reasons that at the time the tenders were sent in, and for presenting them, they had no committees, and therefore it was thought better to return the tenders to the tenderers. The tenders had not been opened, and they requested that new tenders might be

sent in by the eleventh of May. It was hoped that they would have a short session, and every Senator desired that he should go home as soon as possible. And it was also hoped that the Government would forward business with all facility. He asked that the report now submitted be adopted, and that they might have tenders issued at once. He might say that the report was very long, and although it had not been read in French it was presented in both English and French. He wished the report especially to be adopted now so as to give those who intended to tender, the full advantage of the limited time at their disposal.

His motion was seconded by the Hon. Mr. Penny and with that hon. gentleman as his seconder he begged to move that the Report of the Joint Committee on Printing be now adopted.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE begged of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, to explain to the House who were those who had tendered for printing.

Hon. Mr. MILLER could not see in what way the tenders could be returned to the persons who had sent them in, if their names were not known.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON did not know the names of the parties tendering, but he believed there were fictitious names attached, by which the tenders could be returned. The impression of the Committee was to throw the matter open to competition.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said it was a very important thing that this report should be adopted, as now presented. He did not see that there had been any complaints made with regard to these tenders that were recommended to be returned. And it shewed there was little cause of complaint, or at least that no complaints had been made with regard to the tenders, or they would have heard of it through the press. There could be no doubt that those who tendered, and who had their tenders returned would be in the same position as those who now tendered anew.

Hon. Mr. CARROLL, as a member of the Printing Committee, had sought for all information. He was one of those who said he protested against the tenders being sent back, because he considered it as a breach of faith. He said they should do it as quickly as possible so as to give to all intending tenders the benefit of the short time that was at their disposal.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE doubted whether the majority of the House would agree with the majority of the Committee.

The Hon. Mr. BUREAU in reference to this report spoke with regard to the official report of the Senate, and the best means of avoiding difficulties, which he thought might be obtained by the appointment of a permanent committee to superintend the publication of the debates.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST found certain inaccuracies in reports published; but he did think that his hon. friend could not do better than allow the matter to stand as it was. The whole of his answer to a question asked was not given. The words "that the Government intended to take some action" were not given. But it might be more wanting to his facility in using the English language than any want of the reporters construing what he intended for the public. The reports would be judged on their merits, and he had no doubt satisfactory arrangements would be obtained.

A question arose with regard to whether an official report should be under the supervision of the Printing Committee or the Committee on Contingent Accounts, and it was left there, some scarcely audible strictures being made with regard to reports appearing in newspapers before they were presented to the House, which might very properly be considered a publication that would be well construed into a breach of privilege.

A few expressions from several members, in which it was said that the Speaker would take care of the privileges of the House, ended the debate.

Hon. Mr. DEVER gave notice for Monday 20th April, that he will ask whether it is the intention of the Government during the present session of Parliament, to introduce any bill or measure for the regulation of a common rate of interest on all monetary and mercantile transactions within the Dominion of Canada?

It was then moved by Hon. Mr. SKEAD, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Foster, That when this House adjourns to-morrow, that it stands adjourned until Monday next at eight o'clock.

The Motion was accepted as a notice of motion for Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that they had been promised by the Government that it would be a short session, and if they ad-

journed to the twentieth of April, they would literally have done nothing, and now they had already been twenty-four days in session without having done anything as yet.

Hon. Mr. RYAN gave notice for Wednesday, the 27th April, that he will ask whether an Act to amend the Act respecting copyright reserved for Her Majesty's approval on the 14th June, 1872, has been as yet assented to by Her Majesty?

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Victoria) in proposing the motion of which he had given notice as follows:

"That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency may be pleased to furnish this House with a copy of the instructions given to Mr. Edgar, Agent or Commissioner recently sent by the Dominion Government to the Province of British Columbia," said:

The day on which I gave notice of this motion, it appears that a motion something similar, or at least bearing on the same subject was made in the other branch of the Legislature. And as this might look like unduly pressing this matter, I beg to assure the honorable gentlemen there was no such intention, and that there was no understanding betwen myself and the mover in the other House. I hope that the Government will now see fit to comply with the motion, and have the instructions given to Mr. Edgar, placed before us. That Mr. Edgar has been sent on some mission to our Province, I know, for I had the pleasure of calling on him, and whether he has gone to report on things generally, or to negotiate with our Local Government for a modification of the terms of Union, or to enquire into our recent constitutional-political disturbances the results will, I think, be beneficial in placing desirable information before the Government for its guidance. In the first place he will gain a fair knowledge of a portion of the country, and secondly, he will ascertain the opinion of a majority of the people on the great question of the day, as to a modification or relaxation of the terms of Confederation, and that nothing will satisfy them but a determined and vigorous carrying out of these terms. Thirdly, he will find that the recent troubles were brought about by the action of the Assembly of the Province, and that the movement was in no way directed by the Government of the Dominion, and he will find that those who took part in that demonstration represent the most conservative, intellectual, industrious, and wealthy members of the community, firm in their allegiance to this country and their Queen. He will also find that all the members sent to Parliament, were elected, not so much to support men or party, as measures, and that the political platform throughout the country was the same, viz: The fulfilment of the terms of the Union. The Dominion Agent arriving in our Province so soon after the disturbances, it is only natural to suppose that he came to enquire into the cause which led to them, and unless it would be trespassing on the time of this Honourable House I would briefly state the cause of our political troubles. Our Local Government in looking round for the means of obtaining of money, conceived the very improper idea of capitalizing some of the subsidies guaranteed to us by the Dominion under the terms of Confederation, and appointed the Provincial Premier a special delegate to carry out negotiations on that basis. These negotiations were commenced with the Government of the Dominion, and on its resignation this special agent opened negotiations with the present Government. Honourable gentlemen would bear in mind that the people knew nothing of all these transactions until some time after the meeting of the Provincial Assembly. And it so happened that the general elections throughout the country came on at the time when our Assembly had a bill under consideration to open our terms of Union and capitalize certain subsidies, and at different parts of the country speeches were made by members of the Government having reference to a relaxation of some of the clauses in our terms of Union. At this juncture of affairs the people became alarmed. The Local Government wanted money and the Dominion Government wished for a modification of their obligation to us lest an arrangement would be come to which might deprive the province of a large portion of the revenue, and delay the construction of the Pacific railway, and thereby cast a damper over the dearest hopes of the country for an indefinite period. A meeting at which people from all sections of the country were present, was held at Victoria to obtain an expression of opinion on the doings of our Assembly, at which a resolution was passed unanimously to the effect "That the terms of Confederation should not be interfered with, or any of the subsidies capitalized, at least until such time as the intention of the Hon. the Premier of Canada shall have been explicitly made known to your hon-

orable House and approved of by the people of this Province," and this resolution was embodied in a petition, a copy of which I have before me Now I ask honorable members is there anything in the petition or resolution breathing a spirit of insurrection, rebellion or treason? We find a member in the other branch of the Legislature calling those who took part in this movement a "mob." If that was a mob commend me to mobs for orderly, temperate and constitutional behaviour. It being about 10 o'clock at night, and the Assembly in session, the conveners of the meeting quietly proceeded to present the resolution just passed, in the form of a petition, at the Bar of the House, but before this was accomplished the people at the meeting somehow got intimation of what was being done, whereupon they also went to the House to witness the presentation of the petition. The galleries and passages were filled. Some of the members became frightened, and ordered the House to be cleared The people did not, or could not move from the pressure in the rear, and the Speaker at this time left the chair. Then the chairman of the meeting and a few others had an interview with Mr. Speaker, at which it was agreed that on the following day at 2 o'clock the petition would be received. The people on being informed of this withdrew in the most good natured manner to their respective homes. No one was molested, and no breach of the peace committed. On the day following at the appointed hour, probably about 600 or 700 persons went to the House to witness the presentation of the petition, and they conducted themselves in the most orderly, respectful manner. The effect of this demonstration was that the Assembly were obliged to add a saving clause to the Bill, the substance of which is that the taking of any money by British Columbia, or the giving of any money by the Dominion should in no way interfere with the terms of Confederation. Here ended what has been called a "rebellion," and I trust that I have made it plain to hon. gentlemen that the source of all the evil lay within our own Province; and that we wished to crush it there and then, least the Government of the Dominion should come to erroneous conclusions as to public opinion.

Hon. Mr. CARROLL, who was very imperfectly heard, was understood to say that he was persuaded that he could give some information to the Government and "point a moral and adorn a tale." The objection of the people of British Columbia was to tamper with the treaty that made them an integral part of the Dominion of Canada, for if they opened the door in the smallest degree, there might be no means of closing it. Mr. Edgar had been appointed to treat with the people, but the question was asked of the Government when they intended to bring down the railway policy; and that policy, they were told, was not quite matured yet. He warned the Government that they must meet the wishes of the people, but he said this in a kindly spirit.

Hon. Mr LETELLIER DE ST. JUST did not see any necessity for such an address, inasmuch as the instructions given to Mr. Edgar were quite of a private character, and could not be made public without injury to all parties concerned. He could simply state that there was no ill-feeling towards the Province of British Columbia, and that the present Government were most anxious to keep faith with that Province, and all that had been guaranteed on the part of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD replied that there was no hostility towards the Dominion Confederation, but rather that there should be unanimity. The only wish he had in moving for the address was to know what had occured with regard to the Local Government.

The motion was adopted.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD in accordance with previous notice of motion moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a return showing the amount expended upon the South East Pier of the Intercolonial Railway Bridge over the Tantamar River, specifying whether or not tenders were advertised for the work, and if not, whether any public notice was given to invite competition for such repairs as were contemplated, stating the nature and necessity of such repairs and under whose superintendence the work was done.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that all information could be got from the office of the railway companies, and unless the hon. gentleman might desire to make some official use of the information, that would be the speediest way to get at it.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD explained that it might be necessary to make some further comments on the information when it was received.

The motion was then adopted, and it was ordered that such members of the Privy Council as were members of the House present the address.

The House then adjourned, on the motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST.

WEDNESDAY, April 15.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock, when a number of petitions were presented and read, in favor of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Hon. Mr. READ in accordance with previous notice, asked whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the system of postal deliveries, and if so, to what extent?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said in reply that the subject is under the consideration of the Government, but it was quite impossible for him to say whether any decision would be come to or not.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD asked, in accordance with notice of motion to that effect: "Have plans for the erection of a bridge over the Red River, in Manitoba, in continuation of the Dawson route, been submitted to the Government? Have any of these plans been adopted, and does the Government intend to begin the building of such bridge at an early date?" In putting this question he said:—It is not through curiosity that I am now making that enquiry. I have a more noble motive than that—the improvement of my Province. It is a well known fact that the town of Winnipeg, in these last three years, has progressed and taken proportions which are not to be compared with any other town in the world. Three years ago was to be seen there a little fort with a population of about 400 souls lodged in a small lot of poor houses. To-day the population of that same place exceeds 3,000, with miles of good and comfortable houses, and a display of all trades, industries and occupations, nearly equal to what is to be seen in the most advanced parts of the Dominion. Point Douglass, to the north, and Fort Garry to the south-west, furnish their large contribution to the progress of the town, and St. Boniface, on the east side of Red River, opposite Winnipeg, wants to enter into competition, but there is a great disadvantage; there is no communication by a bridge from one bank of the river to the other, and I am sure if that bridge is built, before a year, not less than thirty good houses will be built on that side of Red River. The funds were voted last year, they are put on the estimates this year, but I want to know if the Government has the intention to do more this year than has been done in the past?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied that thus far the Government had not decided as to the particular point on which this bridge would be built. No very serious delay would take place, but it was very important that the Government should decide as to the location of the bridge, and that was the only answer he was prepared to return at present.

Hon. Mr. WARK asked "is it the intention of the Government to bring in a bill during the present session, to authorize the same increase to the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of New Brunswick, as was made to the salaries of the Judges in the other Provinces of the Dominion, by 36th Victoria, chapter 31?"

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the Judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick had not suffered, because there had been paid to them the increased salary, although there had been a clerical error in the Act of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. MILLER was very glad to see an hon. gentleman not connected with the legal profession taking up this question. What was complained of was that Judges of the same status were unequally paid. The Act of last session gave an increase of 25 per cent. to certain Judges, and 20 per cent. to others according to their salaries, and yet it did not appear that the Judges of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were to receive that increase. He was therefore pleased to hear that the question had been asked why this injustice had been committed. He could not see why the Judges of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia should be paid less than the Judges of the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. He considered that those other Provinces had just as hard working Judges as any other in the Dominion, and he considered it unjust to pay them less. He was not here when the Bill went through the Legislature and he did not feel disposed to interfere much in the matter now, but he did not think that the system of paying different salaries could long exist.

Hon. Mr. WARK believed that the salaries of the Judges should be on the same scale, and that they ought to be equalized.

The question as answered was then allowed to drop.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN moved in accordance with previous notice of motion as follows:—

"That an humble address be presented

to His Excelleecy the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all appointments to, and dismissals from office, in Prince Edward Island, as well as a copy of all petitions, and other papers connected therewith, since the first day of July last." He continued to say that the reason why he asked for this address, was that he wished to know from the 1st July last, when Prince Edward Island entered into Confederation, how these appointments and dismissals had been arrived at. The officer of Customs at Charlottetown was appointed by the Dominion Government, and he was also the auditor and manager of the Savings Bank. There were no complaints made against him as Collector of Customs so far as he (the hon. gentleman) was aware, and he was convinced that the collector had in every way complied with the duties of his office; that he was a conscientious man, who had given unvarying attention to the organization of his office, and all the duties appertaining thereto, was well known; yet without any complaint, he was summarily dismissed and replaced by another since the present Government came into power. As the auditor of public accounts and the manager of the savings bank, any gentleman in that position for years was one who must have acquired a knowledge of the affairs of Prince Edward Island, but it must be added in the present case that he was a man who should be considered the best fitted for such a position, inasmuch as he had successively filled the offices of Treasurer, Speaker of the House of Assembly, and the leader of a Government. It was from his great knowledge of the affairs of the country and his qualificatians to fill the position—perhaps the best qualifications of any man on the Island—that he (the hon. gentleman) was disposed to make the present motion. Immediately after the dismissal of the Collector of Customs was also dismissed the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, who was also a capable man. These gentlemen felt necessarily aggrieved that they should be dismissed without it being made known to them that they had inefficiently fulfilled their duties, and they also naturally believed that some complaints must have been made against them or the Government would not have taken such high-handed measures. Recently he had received a petition which had been placed in the hands of the Minister of Customs, in regard to an officer in Prince Edward Island, who to his [the hon. gentleman's] knowledge was a sober, steady, and adequate officer, and would be found when the papers were placed on the table, to be recommended by the leading merchants and bankers of the place in which he lives. Now the reason why the motion was brought forward, was to ascertain wi ether such proceedings met with the approval of the authorities and the wishes of 'his House and the country. This was a matter that should be borne in mind when it was stated that it was the intention of the Government to increase the tariff, and that being so there was the greater necessity that the Custom House should not be deprived of the services of men filling responsible positions who were competent to fulfil their duties. He did not see why Prince Edward Island should be singled out for the purpose of inaugurating what he considered an unfortunate system which he was sorry to say had prevailed in that island, but which he believed, with many other leading men, would be altered when they entered into Confederation. He had been given to understand by a gentleman connected with the Customs for some years that this course had never been before pursued, but he could not help remarking that if this course was to be pursued in the case of Prince Edward Island, there could be no exception made with regard to the other Provinces, which, however, would inaugurate a very bad system, as a Government like individuals did not live forever, and it was therefore to be presumed that the next Government would follow in the same steps as their predecessors. He had only to add that when the papers came down he would be prepared to move a resolution on the subject and make some other observations with the view of giving further information.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that the Government had no objection to the motion for an address passing, and for a discussion to take place when the papers came down.

Hon. Mr. MILLER thought it would be right to postpone the discussion until the papers were brought down, and if the Bill of indictment that had been preferred by the honorable gentleman could be substantiated it appeared that the dismissals complained of had been made without any investigation. He thought that not only the House but the country should be made aware of the facts in such a case. However, he should not now attempt to discuss this question, but reserve his fur-

ther observations for the production of the papers.

The motion was then put and carried, when it was ordered that such members of the House as are members of the Privy Council do wait on His Excellency the Governor General and present the address.

On the motion of Hon. Mr HAMILTON seconded by the Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just, the House adjourned until Monday.

MONDAY, 20th April, 1874.

The House met at half-past seven.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE, Speaker, in the chair.

After routine,—

Hon. Mr. MILLER moved, seconded by Mr. Shaw, that the name of Hon. Mr. Penny be added to the Committee on Contingencies.—Carried.

THE ASSINIBOINE.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD, whose remarks were imperfectly heard, called attention to the importance of improving the water communication of the North West. He spoke of the practicability of rendering the Assiniboine and affluents navigable for boats of a considerable tonnage, for 800 miles west of Fort Garry, and thence to near the Rocky Mountains. He also read notes given him by persons competent to speak on the subject, all confirmatory of this view, and concluded by putting the questions of which he had given notice:

Does the Government intend to take the necessary steps to ascertain the possibility of rendering the river Assiniboine navigable, by leading into it the waters of Lake Manitoba by means of a canal between the two at the place where they are nearest to each other.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the Government have not yet decided upon the scheme that probably will be submitted for the improvement of the Northwest Rivers, and until they have finally made up their minds as to the true policy in the interest of the public, it would be premature for me to promise any enterprise in the direction the honorable gentleman indicates.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN, in submitting his motion on this subject, was understood to speak of the engagements entered into by Canada, with reference to the putting of a steamer on the route between Nova Scotia and the Island. It was contemplated that this year at all events this service would be established He believed the Government had done all in their power in the matter. But the question with him and others was—did the advertisements calling for a boat, mention the winter service required? He thought the best boat for this purpose was one that could break through the ice, but experienced persons stated that one of that kind was not sufficient, that the boat must go on the top of the ice; and if the Government secured a vessel according to the terms of the advertisement they might spend a sum of money for a service which afterwards might not be performed, by reason of the unfitness of the steamer: It was an important matter to the Islanders, who were comparatively isolated four to six months of the year. At all events, the attempt to establish this service should be made in an intelligent manner, in order to the acquisition of a suitable boat, and the avoidance of fruitless outlay and complaint. Tenders should be asked for a steamer that could perform two services—summer as well as winter—thus, in summer she might attend to the lighthouses in the Gulf. The vessel called for in the advertisement would not, he believed, be able to do the work desired, which was the reason why he asked for the submission of the advertisement to the House, that the matter might be properly discussed. He hoped that the Secretary of State would not now send it to the public press, but give the House a copy first, so that the question might be discussed on its merits. He moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Vidal, that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the advertisement for the Winter Steamer to Prince Edward Island as well as a copy of all tenders received for said service.

Hon. Mr SCOTT said the Government had called for tenders for the performance of this service, and the lowest was accepted. The party was notified to complete his security. But the securities had not been put in, nor all the contracts signed. Till that was done, it would be premature to bring down the tenders. Government had no objection in the meantime to the advertisement coming down. The hon. gentleman might make some observations on it then. Possibly in a few days the Government might have the opportunity of deciding on the question. If so, the

tender accepted would be submitted to the House with the advertisement.

Motion carried.

RATE OF INTEREST.

Hon. Mr. DEVER, before submitting a motion on the above subject, referred to the fact that there was not, in reality, a common rate of interest throughout the Dominion. It varied in different provinces, of which the Lower Provinces had had experience. He spoke also of the importance of some measure for assimilating the rates, for the advantage of trade everywhere. He did not see why there should not be the same rate in New Brunswick as in Quebec. The present state of things was undesirable, and called for a remedy. He concluded by asking whether it was the intention of the Government during the present session of Parliament, to introduce any bill or measure for the regulation of a common rate of interest on all monetary and mercantile transactions within the Dominion of Canada?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that the Government did not intend to take any action with regard to the matter.

CONTINGENT COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved that the time for receiving petitions for private bills be extended to Monday, the 11th day of May.—Carried.

PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked if, in view of the large number of petitions for a prohibitory liquor law that were being received, Government intended to bring down such a measure this session.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the Government did not intend to bring in such a measure.

LIBEL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH introduced a bill with respect to the law of libel, which was read a first time.

The House then adjourned.

TUESDAY, April 21, 1874.

The House met at three o'clock, the SPEAKER in the Chair.

PETITIONS.

A large number of petitions, from different parts of the country, in favor of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, were presented.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD, of Toronto, submitted a petition praying that Thunder Bay be made the terminus of the Lake Superior and Winnipeg section of the Pacific railway.

After other routine business,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT laid on the table the report of the Secretary of State for the financial year 1872-3.

PROHIBITION.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL enquired if any answer had been received to the message sent to the House of Commons, asking the appointment of a Select Committee, to act with a committee of this House in reference to the scheme of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

The SPEAKER replied that, so far as he was aware, no answer had yet been received from the other House.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—Inasmuch as our branch of the committee have assembled, and that we find ourselves unable to proceed with the work desired, it were well something were done towards the action contemplated. We are embarrassed with a sense of the importance of those petitions for a prohibitory law, and of the necessity of giving them that consideration which they deserved. The petitioners probably number 50,000 to 80,000 persons in this Province Our hands at present seem tied. I observe from outside sources that action is taken by the committee of the other House without any reference to our House. I presume it has declined to accede to our request. If this is the case, I trust there is some way of ascertaining the fact, and that we may appoint our own Committee and act independently.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—The hon. gentleman has found out by this time that the friendly criticism which I ventured to make on his action was not altogether without foundation. The embarrassment may be accounted for by the fact that this Committee was asked for after a Committee had been appointed in another place and had actually reported. This fact may give him the means of remedying the difficulty. I apprehend that was one great difficulty in the way.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—My action was prompted by the Chairman of the Committee of the other House. He suggested I should make a motion in this Chamber, on the question. I understand from the present Chairman that that Committee is anxious to work with the Committee of this House, as suggested, that the members of the Commons Committee think this is the most desirable

method of dealing with the question. I should like, exceedingly, to know whether we are to have assistance, or to work by ourselves. We are fully prepared to work alone.

The matter then dropped.

NEW BILL.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN, of Toronto, introduced a bill entitled, an Act to amend the Act incorporating the British American Assurance Company, and other acts affecting the same.

First reading.

THE TARIFF.

Hon. Mr. SMITH asked if it was the intention of the Government to make any change in their tariff scheme, or reconsider any portions. He said his reason for enquiring was that a large portion of the trade of the country was somewhat disturbed by the prospect of changes, and many business men were anxiously waiting to see the matter settled. Great numbers of people were flocking to the capital from all parts of Ontario, and telegrams and letters, soliciting information, poured in continually. If these tariff matters were settled, so that people could understand what was to be had and done, there would be great satisfaction. If the Government should say, we will make no changes, trade could go on, but, at present, trade was paralysed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that subjects of this kind exclusively appertained to the other branch of the Legislature. It was scarcely to be expected the Government should answer this question just then. It was quite impossible to say what the sentiment of the House might be. It was quite usual, however, to alter details of the tariff. The hon. gentleman knew well that the Finance Minister had given audience to very many gentlemen from all, even remote parts of the country, and noted their suggestions. He (Mr. Scott) was not prepared to say whether those deputations had exercised any influence upon the Finance Minister, but, he doubted not, all their propositions would be adequately considered. The Government did not pretend to be infallible, and might accept some of the advice tendered. They had the responsibility in the matter, and were anxious as far as possible to meet the wishes of the country. At the same time, the Finance Minister required a very considerable sum of money, and all felt that money must be raised. It was desirable to raise it in the way that would least cripple the energies of the Dominion. He doubted not his hon. friend would be relieved from his position of uncertainty in regard to this subject in a few days, probably hours. At the worst the present embarrassment could last but a few days.

The House then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd April, 1874.

The House met at three o'clock,

ROUTINE.

Among other routine business, a number of petitions praying for a prohibitory liquor law were received, including one from the Six Nation Indians.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT laid on the table the return to an address, of 13th April, with respect to the dates of the sailing of the Allan steamships, under contract for carrying the English mails.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. RYAN, that the Hon. Mr. Smith be added to the Standing Committee on Banking, as also to the Committee on Contingencies. The mover said that Mr. Smith was one of the largest merchants in Western Canada, and was also connected with several monetary institutions, yet his name did not appear on any of the committees relating to those interests. He had been for several years a member of the Committee on Banking, therefore, he presumed, the House would restore him to the same position. He felt satisfied his name must have been omitted by mistake.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said he had no objection whatever to the motion—quite the contrary. He thought it was by mistake the hon. gentleman's name had been omitted. His intention was to put him on the Committee, but it had been frustrated by some clerical error or other accident.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD BILL.

On the order for the second reading being called,

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER requested the honourable gentleman in charge of the measure to postpone it till to-morrow or the day after, so as to afford more time for its consideration.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER replied that as it was desirous to have the support and co-operation of the Government in this important matter, he would consent to the delay most cheerfully. He moved the

discharge of the order, and that the second reading be fixed for Friday next. Carried.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN asked that the second reading of the British America Assurance Company Amendment Bill be allowed to stand over till to-morrow, as it had not been distributed. Agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, of Kingston, the House then adjourned till Thursday.

THURSDAY, April 23, 1874.

The House met at three o'clock.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN NEW BRUNSWICK AND NOVA SCOTIA.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a return showing the total gross expenditure and revenue of the Government railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for the years ending on the 30th June, 1872, and the 20th June, 1873, respectively. He said that, in moving for this return, he disclaimed any intention or thought of reflecting either upon the past or present Government with regard to the management of those railways. At a moment when the Minister of Finance had declared it necessary to raise three millions of additional revenue, the members of both Houses were all naturally anxious to see how the expenditure could be met by the income of the country, or how they could be brought to approximate more nearly without increasing the burdens of the people. This result could only be accomplished by one of two ways—either by reducing the public expenditure, or by pursuing the course which the Minister of Finance was about to adopt, of placing additional burdens upon the people. In looking over the various items of public outlay, his notice was especially called to the working of our Government railways in the maritime Provinces; and he had to confess he was surprised, on examining the figures, to find that the excess of expenditure over the revenue was so very large. During the past year ending 30th June, 1873, the disbursements for construction, chargeable to capital, reached $192,055, and to income, $182,210, making in all $374,266. The ordinary working expenses amounted to $1,011,842; item of stores, $221,918—making a total expenditure, on those railways, of $1,608,076. The receipts of the year were only shown to be $703,458, showing an enormous deficit of $904,618. Doubtless, Ministers would say it was unnecessary to call for the returns, as those figures were found in the Public Accounts, but he hoped some explanation might be given by them, to show that if this expenditure was necessary during the past year, it must have been one of no ordinary character; and that they might not expect such a large deficit every year. In referring to the estimates for the present year, he found figures which almost confirmed the view he had entertained, that as large an expenditure might be necessary,—at all events during the coming year; for the Finance Minister asked an increase over the former year for repairs and working expenses of the Intercolonial and other railways, to the amount of $196,000. These figures went to prove that whatever circumstances might have led the Government of the Dominion to undertake the operation and running of railways, it was a most unsound and unsatisfactory policy as a general principle. They all knew the history of the manner in which the Maritime Provinces became a portion of the Domnion, and that the railways were built by the local Governments as a means of developing those young Provinces; no doubt the commercial facilities and advantages thus afforded accomplished a large amount of good. They knew, further, that the Dominion accepted those railways, to work them, at the time of Confederation. But while they had undertaken to do this, it did not necessarily follow that the Government of a rising country such as this was to continue to operate those roads. He would specially call the attention of the House to this subject as affecting, so deeply, the future railway policy of the Dominion. He thought that with their present experience of the pecuniary results of the Government of a young country, like ours, running railways, itself, it wound be a most unsound and unwise course, if the Intercolonial should be finished in two years, or the Pacific Railway at some future time, for our Government to undertake to run either of those roads. He was sure it was the duty of this House with regard to the Maritime Provinces and every other part of the Dominion, to endeavour to foster their interests and develop their resources, but it was no less their duty to attempt in the way least calculated to cripple the resources of the country, or stem its inward progress and development. The United States Government did not own or run a single railway in the whole Union, nor did

any State, in so far as he was aware. Their policy had been to ensure railway extension by bonuses of money and lands. It was far wiser liberally to give a helping hand to the construction of those works, and charter companies to undertake the future running of the roads He had lived in foreign lands and was aware that the Governments of despotic countries like Russia and Austria, where labor was cheap, could construct and work railways to the advantage of their citizens; but in countries like the United States no such example could be shown, though their Government studied all methods of securing the greatest advantage to the citizens. He hoped that the Government of Canada would take, in regard to the Maritime Province railways, and the railways to be built in the Dominion, in future, the necessary steps to free themselves of all responsibility for the working of them. He impressed upon them the importance of avoiding that most disastrous obligation, the running of railroads at a great commercial disadvantage to the country generally.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said the hon. gentleman had taken a very incorrect view of the case. Confining himself to the consideration of the deficit in question, was proceeding on a wrong principle. He should have considered the earnings of those roads previous to Confederation. As to the Intercolonial, it was a condition of the Union. It was constructed, in his opinion, by a route disapproved by three-fourths of the people of New Brunswick, and at an expense of twenty millions or more, and now a road is being built by private enterprise, that would open up a shorter route to the sea; there were some 80 odd miles constructed. A subsidy of five millions would have carried the road down the valley of the St. John, the shortest road to tide water. This country was pledged to build the Pacific Railway (hear, hear,) and he would like to know whether the people of Ontario would like to have its cost charged against them. The hon. gentleman's argument that the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia railways were worked at an enormous cost, created an entirely erroneous impression. In New Brunswick the Government railways had not only paid their expenses, but a certain amount on their cost, which would continue to increase. The great bulk of her debt was in consequence of those railways.

In the course of a conversation between Hon. Mr. Campbell and other members as to the period at which sections of the Intercolonial had commenced working,

Hon. Mr. McLELAN—one of the Commissioners—said the portion from Painsec to Sackville was purchased from a company, and thrown in as part of this line, and was worked with the New Brunswick roads; in November, 1872, the connection was made; the work which the Government was engaged in constructing from November, 1872 to 1873, would be included in the Intercolonial.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Previous to June, 1872, no part of the Intercolonial was worked?

Several Members—Yes.

Hon Mr. CAMPBELL said whatever the facts, he apprehended it would turn out that the working of the Maritime Province Railways was a very expensive and very losing enterprise.

Several Members—Not at all.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Perhaps not with regard to one particular railway, but the whole, excluding the Intercolonial, the others had been worked at a very considerable loss. He did not wish to blame the Maritime Provinces for this, but merely to state a fact. He thought the proposer of this motion was right in expressing his anxiety, and he was sure it was shared by the people of the country, who must desire that the Government should in some way be divested of their responsibility for those roads, in order that they might be worked by private enterprise. The late Government had every belief that that would be a most desirable policy. What induced them to postpone their action in this respect, was the stage at which the Intercolonial stood. It was thought that its completion would be a more opportune time for dealing with the whole of the Government roads; that the Intercolonial might be divided into sections, or dealt with as a whole, or to be added to other roads, and one or two companies formed, so that the country might be relieved of charges for those railways which could not be worked by it as advantageously as by private individuals. He believed that would be the ultimate policy adopted by this, or any Government that may be in existence, with regard to these roads. His hon. friend from New Brunswick (Senator Wilmot) had animadverted upon the course of the late Government with respect to the route of the Intercolonial, stating a shorter interior route should have been preferred. This question had been amply discussed, and the conclusive statement made to the House, that the St. John Valley route did not re-

ceive the sanction of the Imperial Government, and that they were obliged, as a matter of defence and Imperial policy and interest, to run the line along the coast instead of in the interior. Whether the coast line was taken for business purposes was another question. On that there was a difference of opinion He had heard it urged by gentlemen residing in that part of the country, in Gaspe, Bonaventure, and on the north shore of New Brunswick, that that was the best line for trade. The Imperial Government thought it best only for the defence of the country. Besides, it was only by adopting it we could obtain the Imperial guarantee of the loan necessary to build it. He trusted when the hon. gentleman got his papers, he would be able to point out to the House in what way we could most readily approach the transfer of this railway into the hands of private individuals. He hoped and had some reasons to think Government were enquiring into that subject, with the view to discovering the best means of dealing with those works. He hoped a measure would be submitted, at another session, for putting them into the hands of private companies.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY thought the remarks of the hon. mover, as regards the object of the motion, had been of a limited character. He had taken but a very limited view of the subject. If he understood the hon. gentleman, the principle which he desired to assert by his motion was, that all those public works must necessarily be productive, or receive the condemnation of this House and country. If that be correct, he thought the hon. gentleman would find some public works nearer home that might be affected by the same principle, and that they might have to shut up some of the canals in the West. The railways in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were built for great public ends and aims. [His Mr. Dickey's] whole public life had been a continual protest against the Government building, owning or having anything to do with railways. At the same time it was but fair to his native Province to say that while Governments of both sides conscientiously aided any private enterprise that attempted to build railways, many people thought that, had it not been the policy of the Government to construct railroads itself, they might have been many years without them. The honorable mover ought to have accompanied his motion with statements of facts and figures. According to the explanations of the Railway Commissioners to the other House, the whole of the running expenses incurred, so far as the Intercolonial was concerned, was confined to the period between Nov., 1872, and June, 1873—eight months. The hon. gentleman upon this information asked the House indirectly to pronounce the opinion that those public works were unproductive, and ought not to be carried on by the State—merely from the results shown by eight months' operations. But he presumed the hon. gentleman was not aware that that was a period of entirely exceptional circumstances; that the region had been visited by most unprecedented snow storms. The result was that the Intercolonial, as far as it was worked through Nova Scotia, was constantly stopped, and enormous expense had to be incurred. These conditions were proved to be exceptional, for this year, we had no trouble of the kind. Was it not fair to state this fact to the House, when seeking to create the impression that those works had been unproductive, and also that there had been no connection with certain portions of the road so far, that there was no bridge over the St. John, and the traffic was, to a large extent, mere way traffic? He ought to wait and see what those works would do, before condemning them as unproductive. As yet they had not the elements of a through traffic, or the means of judging of the character of those works. But consider the result when a through traffic came over those roads and increased the local trade and traffic produced by them. With regard to the other portions of the Intercolonial, the space between Amherst and Moncton or Painsec, some 50 miles, it would have been nothing more than fair for the Railway Commissioners to have told the House that the road had been open some three or four years, and, he believed, was profitable and paying. A very large amount of traffic went by it. He was perfectly willing any enquiry should be made regarding it. He had every sympathy, however, with the views expressed as to the working of those railways in the future. They had been of immense benefit to the Lower Provinces and to the Dominion. If the Government was very anxious to get rid of them, it would have no difficulty in the matter, and that was the very best test of their present value or productiveness. He hoped the day was far distant when those great main lines of communication would be handed over to any private speculators. He trusted the Government would take a broad view of the question, and not decide upon it by a year of exceptional snow

storms, entailing great expense—that it would also remember the road was hardly in working condition yet, and look to the future of the country—at the benefits this work would confer on the provinces through which it would pass, and indirectly upon the Dominion, of which they formed a part. (Cheers)

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said he was one of the delegates to England, with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, and there was no such determination on the part of the British Government, as alleged to run it by the North Shore. The whole matter had been fully discussed.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL contradicted that impression, asserting that a despatch to the effect that the Government wished the road to go by that shore route had been read in this House.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said, taking up the public accounts, and referring to the abstract on which the hon. mover had based his calculations, he was at a loss to conceive how that hon. gentleman could have arrived at such extraordinary and erroneous results. The impression the hon. member's remarks were calculated to leave on the House and convey to the country, was that the Government railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were an annual burden to the Dominion of about $900,000 He (Mr Miller) felt it his duty not to allow this statement to go to the people without showing from the very abstract on which he (Mr. Alexander) had founded that assertion, and from the figures under the hon. gentleman's own eyes when he made it. But his statement was, he could not say intentionally, but certainly grossly inaccurate. It was well known to every hon. member of the House from the Maritime Provinces, that previous to Confederation, the railways in those Provinces that were assured by the Dominion Government at the time of Union as one of our assets, had paid a slight profit, about one per cent, over their working expenses. He believed the New Brunswick roads paid even more than that amount over their working expenses; being main lines, they were more paying than those in Nova Scotia. He wanted Western members to understand that it was only since Confederation, since the extension of the Intercolonial, that their lines had proved comparatively so unproductive. It was true, after the Lower Provinces entered Confederation, a good deal of money had to be laid out on construction and repairs, the local lines having been allowed to get somewhat out of order. What did he find from the tables, from which his hon. friend made his motion and drew his conclusion that, last year, those Government railways produced a loss to this country of $900,000? His hon. friend had made up his estimate largely from construction chiefly connected with the Intercolonial Railway. It was very unfair to charge such construction to the working expenses against the profits of the railways, when that construction outlay was absolutely necessary in connection with the Intercolonial and not with the old Provincial lines. From the 1st July to the 9th November, 1872, when the Intercolonial was consolidated in the public accounts with the old lines the working expense of the New Brunswick railways was $126,145, while the earnings were $136,590, leaving a surplus of receipts over expenditure, on account of working, of $10,445. He admitted the Nova Scotia road was not so remunerative. During the same period the cost of running our road was $181,458, while the receipts were $136,961, leaving a deficit of 48,497. Now, as the honourable gentleman had made a joint motion connected with those two Provinces—if we took the whole deficit connected with this one railway in Nova Scotia—leaving out the Intercolonial, we found but $38,052 deficit for that portion of the year; and in the face of that fact his honourable friend wished the startling statement to go to the country, that our Government railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—for that was the impression intended to be conveyed—were costing the country over $900,000 a year. Instead of that, these Government railways cost but $380,052. He thought there was a very wide difference between the result which might be come to by any one desirous of putting no more than the facts before the House and that arrived at by the honourable mover. He knew if construction was spoken of it was a different matter. On the 9th of November, 1872, the portion of the Intercolonial which affords connection with the European and North American Railway, was opened to the public. From that time the expenses of those Government railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, including the Intercolonial, were very much increased. The consolidated lines, from the 10th of November, till the 30th of June, 1873, cost $704 238, and yielded but $433,906 revenue, leaving a deficit on account of the Intercolonial, of $270 382, and a total deficit, including the period from the 1st of July, of $603.434, for the two Provinces; a deficit of $270,382 accrued in consequence of the con-

solidation of the roads with the Intercolonial. In the face of those facts, patent from the public accounts under his hand, how the hon. gentleman could wish the assertion sent to the country, that there was a deficit of $900,000, was perfectly surprising. There was no other inference to be drawn from the figures and facts but what he (Mr. Miller) had stated. With regard to the question of policy, it might be that his hon. friend had made his motion, to give an expression of his opinion on another subject—that of Government railway, which might, at a future time, engage the attention of the House. He spoke of the cost of the railways in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as facts that ought to prove a warning to any Government, in undertaking the construction of railways as public works. He (Mr. Miller) could only say that circumstances must, in every case, control the policy and dictate the prudence of a Government undertaking public works. It would not do to apply the principle in every case which we might apply in any isolated or exceptional case. With respect to public works, one principle might be good in regard to one subject and not so good in relation to another. If it was not sound policy that a Government should undertake, under any circumstances, the construction of a railway, would it not be as sound policy for a Government not to undertake the construction or enlargement of canals, or the completion of works which private enterprise was insufficient to achieve. He could not perceive a difference between these cases. He would be sorry by his vote on this motion, or by his silence, to lead to the conclusion that he was opposed, under any circumstances, to a Government undertaking public works, whether railways or canals. (Cheers.) With reference to the remarks of the hon member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), he had admitted that in the majority of cases, if private capital could accomplish and complete public works, it would be far better to leave them in the hands of private enterprise. But where it was not sufficient, then it might become the imperative duty of a Government to take the construction of these works into its own hands. As regards Nova Scotia, he differed with his hon. friend (Mr. Dickey) as to the policy that had the sanction of its people. Although a young man at the time the railway policy was initiated, and although that hon. gentleman figured, to some extent, in the railway discussion of that day, he could not agree with his version of the circumstances connected with the initiation of the policy of constructing railways in that Province as Government undertakings. He could recollect that the Government had exhausted all the means in its power to induce private companies to undertake the construction of our railways, and had failed. On that occasion the party to which his hon. friend belonged, led by the late Judge Johnston, contended for the very policy which had been advocated by his hon. friend today. He and others then said it would be possible, and he undertook to induce British capitalists to come into our Province and build our railways as private works, if the Government would give the opportunity of doing so, by putting the requisite legislation on the statute book. The Hon. Mr. Howe, the leader of the Government, said he would accept the proposition of the hon. gentleman and his friends, and let his own policy stand over for a twelve month, and if the capitalists came in he would be satisfied. A year passed away, and was lost, when it was found indispensable on the part of the Government to take this subject into its own hands. The result had proved a great boon to the Province. Though he had lost money directly by those railways, they had been indirectly of incalculable benefit to Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.) Not alone as to the expenditure of money in the Province had they been advantageous, but in opening up facilities for trade, and developing the country. Within a few years after the construction of those short lines of railway our tariff was doubled, and our people did not feel the increased taxation in consequence of the increased stimulus given to trade. In fact, when we commenced the construction of our railways our *ad. val.* duties were 6¼, and when they were raised to 12½ per cent, to meet our railway debt, they were borne as easily as the lower rates, for the reasons he had stated. Therefore, he did not believe it was unsound policy for the Nova Scotia Government of that day to construct our railways as public works. With regard to our branch lines, however, if the Government of Canada had any desire to get rid of those portions of the N. S. roads, which were not, now, he believed, paying a profit, although run at but a small loss, there was an easy way of doing so. The late Government, with great advantage to a large section of Western Nova Scotia, agreed to give to a company that portion of the road extending from the junction of the Intercolonial to Windsor, as a bonus, to help them in extending further westward the Annapolis and Wind-

sor line. Without the assistance, the company would not have been able to do what it is doing—prosecuting the work of western extension with vigor and success. He believed they could get their railway extended from New Glasgow to Canada so, if they had the road between the Junction at Truro and New Glasgow. He was happy to say efforts were being made to secure that bonus to Nova Scotia, to promote eastern extension. He thought they had a right to it. They had as much right to ask, in connection with the construction of an inter-oceanic railway, that they should not shut up the eastern end at Truro or New Glasgow, as had the people of British Columbia to ask that the western end should not be stopped 100 miles from the best ocean outlet on the Pacific side. He had spoken at this length, because very anxious that the impression which the speech of the hon. mover was calculated to make, should not go to the country. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. DICKEY desired to make some explanations. He had stated that while he was, and had always been a strong advocate of private railways as against Government, the Nova Scotia Government, years ago, had set their faces against building railways, and had stated also, with a great deal of frankness, that very many people in Nova Scotia believed that, had the Government not undertaken the railways, it would have been many years before they would have been built. Mr. Dickey then explained the circumstances connected with the failure of the private companies to build the Maritime Province roads. When Messrs. Peto, Jackson and Co., wanted to proceed with the Nova Scotia lines, the Government of Mr. Howe refused permission, and when they yielded afterwards, to the pressure of the Opposition, led by Judge Johnson, the Russian war broke out and prevented their raising the money, upon which the contractors backed out. The contract as to New Brunswick was likewise abandoned because, on reaching its eastern border, the roads could not have been run into and through Nova Scotia. He had stated that the Government of Nova Scotia had stepped in and crushed out the Company, and on a subsequent occasion they prevented it from building the roads. They might have a similar chapter to write about this great Pacific Railway, which had first been in the hands of a company, but was now in the hands of the Government. Whatever might be the fate of it he hoped that his hon. friend's explanations, after his own statements, would show this House that this matter had not been put by the mover of the resolution fairly before the House, and that a wrong impression, doubtless unintentionally, had been made on the House. He trusted the House would see that when construction and working expenses were mixed together, the matter was not properly put before the country. He was quite sure the hon. gentleman would be willing to acknowledge, after a full consideration of all the facts, that the Confederation did not get such a bad bargain, when this little Province of Nova Scotia, railways included, entered the Union (Hear, hear)

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said he was happy that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Miller) had made the explanations just heard. The charge of a deficit of $900,000 sounded very strong, and would have created an effect, if it had been correct. The figures given by that hon. gentleman, were about the real result. He did not turn to the figures on this occasion, for the reason that the result of the working of the last year or two was no guide for the future. It had been correctly shown that the connection between the two sections of the Intercolonial was not made till the fall of 1872. His honourable friend had also shown from the returns that the portion of the road in New Brunswick earned a profit of some $10,000, while that in Nova Scotia was worked at a loss of only $48.000, leaving for the two sections a loss of some $38.000 after the connection was made. As truly asserted by the member for Richmond, the result at the end of the year in which the two sections were connected was an expenditure of some $300.000. The honourable member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) had given some explanation of the cause of the difference between expenditure and incomes in the exceptional circumstances of that winter. It should be borne in mind, also, that the road was not finished. When the road was opened a considerable portion was unballasted, and there were no snow fences or snow sheds. The extraordinary winter of last year had stopped the trade for days and weeks, occasioning enormous expense to get the trains through. But those defects had been remedied as the road was finished. During the whole of last winter over the 300 miles of road, there had not been greater delays than a few hours at the worst time. True, the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia portions were worked at a small loss, but when the traffic of one section was carried over the other a large increase of expenditure became necessary

to supply additional accommodation. The expenditure was thrown on the working of the road, and not charged to capital, because much of it was in a number of small sums. The large expenditure was set down to construction account, but the great increase of capital towards both ends of the line, in consequence of connection being made in the middle, necessitated many expenditures along the road which resulted in a loss on the whole of some $300 000. It had been stated that both New Brunswick and Nova Scotia worked their roads previous to Confederation at a profit, which the records show to be true. In both they were completed and finished, and the whole cost was charged to construction account. They required but very little repair; the outlay upon them was much smaller than afterwards, when they became worn down. They might be run down again if they passed into the hands of private individuals, after having been put in first-class order. What security would they have for companies running and equipping them and handing them over to the Government afterwards, if required, in the same good state in which they received them. That was the difficulty the Government would have to meet in dealing with the question of their transfer to a private company.

Hon. Mr. MILLER thought that there would be satisfactory security to be found in case of such transfer.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said that companies would insist on roads being put in first class order before taking them, while Government would not be able to get any security for the lines being maintained in the same condition. Private parties would run them purely to make money—that was the great danger. He thought the hon. mover of this motion would find the figures of the hon. member for Richmond correct, and that the actual deficit was less than one-third the amount he had stated, and that for the reasons already given, the figures were of no use in guiding them in forming an opinion as to the cost of the working of these roads hereafter.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said the discussion had been useful in bringing out the opinion of the late Government in reference to these roads, including the Intercolonial. He would regret very much the leasing of these roads to individuals. He agreed with what his hon. friend had just said, that any company would take these roads when finished and thoroughly equipped, and run them a certain number of years, probably 15 or 20, which was the life time of those steel rails now laid. He did not think from his experience in the Grand Trunk, that the Government would be justified in entertaining such a notion. The Grand Trunk had leased the section from Quebec to River du Loup for a number of years to a company, which had already run it four years. The Grand Trunk paid, he thought, $15,000 for that management, providing cars, locomotives, and everything required. A short time after he was called to the Board he gave them notice that, according to the terms of the lease, their control of the road would terminate when the period expired. What was the consequence? They offered him very nearly the same premium or rent to allow them to continue the running of the road. No stronger proof was necessary that they were making a very handsome thing of it. It would be the same in the case of these Government roads. He would like to impress upon the House the fact that though they at present showed a deficit, they should remember that the country had benefitted by them. If any one would reflect upon the amount of business transacted between those Lower Provinces and the Western before Confederation and compare it with the present, he would see that it exceeded the former by nearly twenty times. Look at the steamers engaged in the Lower St. Lawrence trade in summer, plying to Halifax and St. John and at the goods sent down by the Grand Trunk in winter, and think of the trade done with those Provinces before Confederation. The whole of them went to Boston to the benefit of our neighbours. He remembered during the discussion of Confederation at Quebec the difference of opinion entertained respecting the Intercolonial. He had taken a favourable view of it, and had not changed his mind yet. If the Government would wait till the whole road was opened, and all its connections formed with the Lower Provinces, so that the amount of trade it would command could be ascertained, he believed they would be fully satisfied. Many people were in the habit of expressing opinions without consideration. Before leasing the Intercolonial, the Government ought to test it by a year or two's experience. The benefits they would receive would, he believed, justify this trial. He did not see why Government should not run a railway as well as any company, or why a railway department could not be formed by Government as well as a Board of Works department. They should be able to manage better than a company, for if

they had the line wholly in their own hands from River du Loup to Halifax, they could control through freight and business better than one or two individuals leasing a portion of the road. He was sure the Government would have no difficulty in making themselves acquainted with this work. Consider the facilities enjoyed by merchants in the carriage of their goods by the Grand Trunk, from Detroit to Portland, as compared with those furnished by the roads from Montreal to New York. There were four or five companies concerned in them, and there was no end to the difficulties as regards freight and passengers. The trains hardly ever arrived on time. The Government ought to try to work this Intercolonial, an exemplification of the probable benefits of which he had given in his reference to the portion of the Grand Trunk between Quebec and River du Loup. He was sure they would witness a similar result should the Government lease the Lower Province roads to private parties.

Hon. Mr. WARK said the difference between private and Government management was seen in the presssure put on Ministers to reduce freights, which pressure would not be applied to companies. He gave instances of abuses which crept up under the Government system in Nova Scotia when cars used to carry not only drivers, but their horses and wagons, to market, instead of merely the produce to be sold With regard to the road between Shediac and St. John, there was a pressure brought upon the Local Government to reduce the fare as low as possible. Under the competition with the Gulf Port steamers and other carriers, the freight on flour had been reduced to 15 cts. per brl. between Shediac and St. John. No private company could carry flour 100 miles at that rate. If Government could resist such pressure and keep rate up to a fairly remunerative point, without charging either too high or too low, and could get honest men to run those roads, they should be able to manage them as well as private companies. If men were as careful in spending the Government money as their own, those railways might be worked as economically under the Government as under a company. The 107 miles from Shediac to St. John, was gradually improving every year, under the Commissioners appointed by the Government. It yielded for some time before they entered Confederation $25,000 a year clear of all expenses.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—One year nearly $40,000.

Hon. Mr. WARK knew it was paying very handsomely, as well as yielding indirect benefits quite equivalent to the cost of the road although it must be admitted it had cost more than it should have cost. The Government were in a manner forced into building it. They had got others by the aid of subsidies, some for 10,000 acres a mile The railway from Fredericton to Riviere du Loup had been so far entirely constructed by private capital and 70 miles were already made. With regard to the Intercolonial, he believed the British Government were decidedly desirous of keeping it as far as possible from the American Boundary. But the proper line was not selected. If they had intended to remove it as far as possible from the best route for traffic, they could scarcely have been more successful. It was carried over an elevation of 500 feet, and through as bad a country as could have been selected, while the cost of the Miramichi and other bridges would be enormous. After crossing the Miramichi the road entered a wretched region of barrens and swamps, while it might have been carried through a country cultivable and containing 20,000 inhabitants.

After some further remarks by Hon. Messrs. Ferrier, Wark, Miller and a few observations from Hon. Mr. Ferguson, who thought that a portion of the Intercolonial might have been better located.

Hon Mr. MCLELAN replied that the task of location had given the engineers and Commissioners a great deal of anxiety, as every one was interested in having the line run properly. After much examination the line was located. The engineers and the Committee of Public Accounts of the other House, had had the subject of the construction of the Intercolonial before them for a number of years, as also the subject of the location, not so much as a question between the Northern and Central Route, but as regards the proper location of the Northern, and after ample investigation, he thought the Committee was satisfied that, taking the Northern route, they had got the best line in the general interest, both as regards the element of expenditure and the traffic likely to be obtained.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said the question of the right of Government over railways had occupied the attention of Congress as well as that of the English House of Commons. It had been distinctly laid down by that House that it was not to the interest of any country that any great thoroughfare should be put into the hands

of the Government. This being the case he should be sorry were the experience of Great Britain and the United States to be lost on this Dominion. He felt surprised that hon. gentlemen should either place to the credit or discredit of any particular province the Intercolonial Railway, which was for the benefit of the whole Dominion. It was designed to connect the manufacturing portions of the country with the non-manufacturing. It was for that object alone the great expenditure on it had been incurred. The great buildings at Moncton, at present, struck the stranger with surprise, being equalled only by the Grand Trunk workshops at Montreal It was at Moncton the whole of the business of the Intercolonial would be done. He hoped their railway system would be developed, and properly managed, so that the Dominion would not be dependent upon the neighbouring Republic for seaports in winter. They had now to travel round by American territory to get to St. John. With direct connection with that port and Halifax, he did not see why Canada should not have all the carrying trade of the West, the value of which could scarcely be exaggerated. He thought that, whatever might be said as to short lines, that to put the main trunk lines into the hands of corporations, to make what tariffs they saw fit, would be a mistake. It would be one of the most unfortunate things that could happen to a country to place its trade and communications at the mercy of private organizations. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER in reply to the charge of having unfairly stated his case, and used incorrect figures, maintained that his resolution related to the question as to what was the excess of the expenditure as compared with the revenue of the Government railways. He had made no distinction between those railways. He merely drew from the public accounts the figures which he challenged the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Miller) to say were not correct. He did distinguish between construction account and working expenses. As to the requirements of the Intercolonial in the course of next year, had it not been finished with steel rails independent of local management? Surely it could not, after a few months running require any expenditure for construction or repair. The object of his motion was to shew that the working of those roads by the Government entailed a large annual expenditure over receipts. He felt sure they would have the same tale every year under this system. He granted the honest management of those roads, believing that a more upright man than Mr. Carvell did not exist, but he believed Government possession or management was not wise or sound policy. If the Grand Trunk had been worked as a Government enterprise it would have come year after year to Parliament for millions of money. The Government did right, after giving it twenty millions, to place it in the charge of a powerful company. They saw how, under the able management of Mr. Brydges, a road which was nearly bankrupt a few years ago had been brought to a state of efficiency without costing the country anything It was only in despotic countries that railways could be worked by Government to advantage.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said the construction of the Grand Trunk had cost the country but little. The Dominion would never make such a bargain again as was made in the building of that railway. There was no comparison in this case.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said the hon. mover had not touched his figures in the slightest degree. Although a section of the Intercolonial was in running condition in Nov., 1872, it was not finished; it had not been ballasted.

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE referred to the successful working of postal routes and telegraph lines in England, as instances of what might be achieved by good management. In the Lower Provinces the railways paid their working expenses, and more previous to Confederation, while they had all the time indirectly made a liberal return in assisting the settlement of the country and development of its resources. Though not now paying back, directly, what was spent on them, they were doing good service to the trade of those Provinces. There was not in the whole of America a superior road to that portion of the Intercolonial between Truro and Amherst, or one safer or more agreeable to the traveller. The present connections of the Western with the Eastern Provinces, had immensely enhanced the trade of the former, which had risen from $400,000 before Confederation to many millions, a large portion of which was carried on by cash payments to the west. The eastern men rejoiced at the progress of the west, and desired to see all parts of the Dominion flourish alike. They did not grudge the improvement of the Western Canals or the St. Lawrence. The more they did to develope the large means and resources which Providence had placed within their grasp, the better would be the position of

this country, and the more contented and happy all classes of its people. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. READ thanked the honorable gentleman whose motion had elicited this discussion, which had put a little life into the Chamber, and led members to compare notes, also raising the question of what was best for the public interest. He believed Government could manage a large interest, and compete successfully with private enterprise. He thought that the railways would be better in their hands than in those of private companies. There was a growing desire in England that the Government should assume the railways, now that they worked the telegraph lines successfully. If the roads under Government management did not pay, the whole country would bear the loss

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the Government had no objection whatever to grant this address. Much had been said about the proper policy for the Government in regard to the management of those public works, but it would be absurd to expect them to announce any policy on the subject before their completion. At present only some links of this Grand Trunk road from Quebec to Halifax were made. Some of the sections had been open for a short period, and some not mentioned in the address, including that from Trois Pistoles to Rimouski, in operation for a few months, had been worked at a decided disadvantage. Large sections might be worked to advantage, but not small ones, which required as large an amount of plant, and as many officers as the others, though the duties would not occupy all their time. The Government were unable to say what would be the loss by the working of the Intercolonial; but there was no reason to expect anything else for a long time than an excess of expenditure as compared with earnings. But on the other hand this road had been accepted as one of the necessities of Confederation. There was, of course, a difference of opinion as to the good or bad location of the line. He had his own opinion on the subject, really believing that the present location had the approbation of the Imperial Government, without which we should not have obtained the guarantee of the loan, by which the money had been procured at a lower rate than was otherwise possible.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT was understood to express disbelief as to the Imperial Government's action respecting the location.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied that the hon. gentleman, who was a Minister at the time (Mr. Campbell) had stated that that Government had something to do with it. The completion and working of the Intercolonial would doubtless entail a large expense, but he thought the hon. mover was mistaken as to the largeness of the difference between outlay and income of these Government roads. Putting it at $900 000 was going too far by a half. He did not believe that, up to the time this road would be fully open, it would be possible for Government to work it themselves. The section from Riviere du Loup to Rimouski was worked by the parties who had the contract for building them. It cost less to have such sections worked by companies, which had all the plant, than by the Government. He did not believe the N. S. and N. B. sections had created as large a difference against the Exchequer as was represented. (The hon. gentleman concluded by making a suggestion with a view to secure regularity of procedure in the conduct of the business of the House as well as economy of time.)

Motion carried.

BRITISH AMERICAN ASSURANCE CO.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN moved the second reading of the British American Assurance Company Amendment Bill, and briefly explained its objects, one of which was to amend their old Act of Incorporation, to allow them to invest their funds in Dominion Municipal, and foreign securities, bonds and mortgages, and in monetary institutions of the Dominion. By the original Act they were only allowed to invest their surplus funds in municipal debentures and mortgages or real estate. They asked also to be allowed to make deposits of money or securities in foreign parts. They were desirous of doing business in the United States, but by the laws of some of them they required, as a preliminary to make a deposit of a certain amount in money or securities, which they wanted to be able to do. The Company further wished power to call on additional stock, and were desirous of doing so, of enlarging their capital before going into an extensive business. The last thing they asked was an amendment permitting a Director of the Company to accept office in any other insurance company that might appoint him.

Motion carried.

HURON AND OTTAWA RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. RYAN presented a petition from the Montreal Board of Trade, setting forth that this railway would form the

shortest line between a safe and convenient harbor on Georgian Bay, and the head of ocean navigation at Montreal, and praying for a thorough exploration of the country before any route was decided upon.

On motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER, the House adjourned at a quarter to six o'clock.

FRIDAY, April 24.

The House met at three o'clock.

COMMUNICATION WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD, of Victoria, B C., moved "That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, for copies of all instructions given to any Engineer or other person to examine into the practicability of a Mixed Land and Water Trans Continental Communication with British Columbia, and for copies of any reports received from such Engineer or other person, and for copies of any other reports or papers on the subject of the feasibility of using the waters of the Saskatchewan River for navigation purposes during a portion of the year." The mover said he merely asked the House to pass the resolution as it stood. If the Government had any information on the subject he should be obliged to them for giving it.

The motion was seconded by the Hon. Mr. CORNWALL.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied—The Government had no objection to grant the address, but he was not aware that any instructions had been given to any of the engineers to report on the subject in question. Mr. Sandford Fleming was preparing a report which would very shortly be submitted. He thought it was now in print, and that in it was discussed the feasibility of the proposed scheme of the Government. They would be very happy to bring down any papers that bore on the question. There were none in the form contemplated by the motion.

In reply to Hon. Mr CAMPBELL, Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the information to be submitted was the result of Mr. Fleming's observations in years past, not of observations since the Government scheme was proposed. It would have been utterly impossible to have obtained surveys and a report within this last period.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—Do I understand you to say the Government have prepared a scheme?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes; a scheme for the connection of this country, by land and water, with British Columbia. He thought the hon. gentleman was aware of it.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL - I was not.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is generally known, however.

THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION.

Hon Mr RYAN said—The subject to which I have to call the attention of the Government by my enquiry of to-day, is a very old one. It is one which has been before this House since 1868, and, I regret to say, without much effect having been produced in the direction which the House desires. I hope that the House has not lost its interest; I am sure the country, generally, has not lost its interest in the subject of giving to Canadian printers the same facilities and privileges which are enjoyed by the printers of other parts of this Continent. I regret very much to see that my honourable friend, to whose department my enquiry more particularly applies, the Minister of Agriculture, is not in his place, because from him, when sitting on the opposition side of the House, I always received a great deal of encouragement and assistance, when, from time to time, I brought this subject before it. I will just recall some circumstances connected with the the subject of reprinting British copyrights in London, and the action taken in regard to it here and elsewhere, which, without troubling the House with many details, will elucidate the present position of the question. After striving for four years, from 1868 to 1872, against very adverse circumstances, we induced the Government of that day, which indeed, always gave assistance in promoting the object in view, to introduce a bill which would have settled the question most effectually, completely and satisfactorily to Canada. That bill was brought up in this House and went down and passed also in the House of Commons, and subsequently was with other bills submitted for the Royal assent at the close of the session of 1872. But I regret to say, that for reasons which, I suppose, were deemed sufficient the bill was reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure, and has been left in abeyance ever since; now, although I have more than once asked the question whether any despatches as to the Royal assent having been given, had been received, by the Dominion Government. I am sorry to say up to this period, no intimation has been

made to this Parliament or by Royal Proclamation or otherwise, that the Royal assent to this bill had been obtained. The effect of no Royal Proclamation issuing, or any Government announcement of the bills having received the Royal assent being made before the 14th June next, will be that this Act will fall as a dead letter, will be inoperative, and no longer of any value or avail. I think it, therefore, most incumbent upon the Government, whose leader in this House, when in opposition, sanctioned and assisted in passing this bill—to bestir themselves, and ascertain before the 14th of June has been reached, whether Her Majesty's Imperial Government may not be induced without further delay to consider this measure in the interest of Canada, that it may receive the Royal assent before the expiration of the period required by law. The bill is very short, but it amply provides for the wants which the printing industry of Canada feels it is necessary to supply. It gives our own printers under certain conditions and restrictions, and with certain provisions, saving the interests of authors, publishers, and copyright holders, in Great Britain and Ireland, the same privileges enjoyed by printers on the other side of the line. It places the Canadian printer, subject to those conditions, in the same position as the American, with regard to the printing of British copyrights. Any hon. gentleman can see from the bill, a copy of which I hold in my hand, that it provides amply and carefully for the remuneration of copyright holders or authors; that it precludes the printers of this country from republishing works of British copy right without a license from Government, and subject to paying certain amounts stipulated in the bill, which conditions would have been perfectly satisfactory to the great majority of British authors. But unfortunately the question has been opposed by a powerful interest, an influential association of publishers in England. I discriminate between publishers and authors. A very powerful combination of publishers in England have exercised the influence which they probably most deservedly possess, with the Imperial Government, to oppose our bill, and the consequence is that if the Royal sanction is withheld for two months longer the bill will fall a dead letter, and thus after six years of hard work to get the grievance this bill deals with remedied, we shall find ourselves no further advanced than at the outset of our labours, and the American publishers can continue to send in works without any, or small remuneration to British authors, and can put upon the Canadian market articles which our own people are prevented from producing. There is one feature in this matter which I can not help referring to. Formerly we had the assistance of a very able agent in London, who went heart and soul into the views of this House, the House of Commons and the country, exerted himself to promote the passing of this bill, or to procure the adoption of some other measure by the Imperial Government which would have reached the same end, if not in so satisfactory a manner, yet in a manner at least approximately satisfactory to Canada. But, I am sorry to say, I believe we shall lose the advantage of that advocacy now, in London and that the gentleman who has lately been appointed as Agent-General for Canada is, if I am rightly informed, adverse to the objects of this bill—(Hear, hear and a laugh)—and adverse, in this particular, to promoting the interests of the printers and publishers of the Dominion, which he now represents in England. Without further trespassing upon the time of the House, I shall make the enquiry standing on the orders of the day.

Hon Mr. SCOTT—The bill has not been sanctioned. I believe I am safe in saying that one of the reasons was the intention of the Imperial Government to introduce a new bill, which it is desired to bring all the Colonies under. Whether such a bill can be framed—one that would satisfy the authors as regards this country and the other colonies, I am unable to say. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the historical sketch, which my hon. friend has given, of the difficulties of putting on the Statute book the measure of 1872; but I heard with some degree of regret the strictures on the new Agent of the Dominion in London. I was not aware he could be quoted in any way inimical to the interests of the country, or of Canadian publishers.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—I have my information from a gentleman who heard the objections stated by Mr. Jenkins to this particular bill, and to the concessions it asks for Canada.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—He had nothing to do with the refusal of the royal assent to the bill.

Hon. Mr RYAN—I never attributed this to him. I merely stated he was adverse to it. Sir John Rose, who preceded him, according to the general understanding, had advocated a measure of arrangement on this subject, very warmly and strongly; and I was sorry to hear, from a gentleman who said he had it from

Mr. Jenkins himself, that he was opposed to granting the concessions to Canada which she asked for, and which would be secured by the bill. I am quite aware of the different bills which emanated from official sources in England; and, indeed, have copies of some of them, but unfortunately nothing practical in regard to them has yet been done. Bills will come, and bills will go, but the disability remains, I am afraid forever. (Laughter.) My only object in introducing this question, and in making the remarks which have fallen from me, was to induce the Government to take strenuous and immediate action in this matter. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said, I simply rise to impress on the Government the importance of endeavoring to procure the assent of the Crown to legislate in this country. The legislation, or views formed in the Imperial Parliament on this subject, it seems to me—I speak with great deference to the views of legal gentlemen—are adverse to the rights given to this country, which included legislation with regard to all matters concerning the weal of the people. The view taken by the Imperal Government is, or was, that copy right remains a subject for legislation, exclusively by the Imperial Parliament, not only in reference to Great Britain and Ireland, but to all the colonies. When this bill was sent home it was urged by the then Government, that that was not the legal view of the Parliament of this country as to the powers of the British Parliament, but that the right to legislate on copy right, as well as all other subjects, was given to this Legislature by the constitution, and that the bill we had passed was in strict conformity with our powers and position, and that we ought to be allowed to legislate on the subject. I hope the present Government will not lose sight of this matter, but will endeavour, as the last did, to assert and maintain the rights of the Parliament of the people of this country.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—I rise to support as strongly as I can the proposition of the hon. gentleman beside me (Mr. Ryan)—that the Government should assist in every way in their power the demand of the people of this country for the privileges which this Copyright Act confer on them. I think no conflict of interests need arise under it, but that publishers and authors could arrange the matters of their respective right among themselves, without hurting anyone. So far as the British Government is concerned, they have taken the view that copyright is a thing they should protect on account of the piracies so common all over the world; and if this bill was an attempt at this offence, or designed to encourage it, I should be the last person to give it any support. As I understand, it leaves the matter of republishing between the Canadian printer and British author, and they are the parties who should deal with it. There is one other point I wish to notice, and that is as to the English agencies. I never understood that Mr. Rose was an agent of these Provinces, in London. If he was, his was an appointment not made public. If he was what is called by the French an officious agent, instead of an official agent, I hope we shall still have the advantages of his friendly services. As to the present agent, Mr. Jenkins, whatever his own views may be, he must make them subservient and subordinate to those of the Government which he represents; he must set forth only our opinions. Whether his own be reasonable or unreasonable, it seems to me they can't possibly interfere with his action as the agent of this Government, at least they should not be allowed to do so. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Campbell) is now so ready to support the desire of this country to legislate for itself without reference to the British Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I introduced this very bill.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Well, I think there are some historical events to show that interference on the part of the British Government has taken place, with far less constitutional warrant. As to the views of the British Government on these matters, I think that acts have been disallowed on the opinions of the Crown officers as individual lawyers without remonstrance from the late Government, and this seems to me to have less constitutional warrant than the failure to assent to the law.

Hon Mr. CAMPBELL—I shall be very glad to defend the course of the late Government with regard to any of its acts, when they come up in proper time.

PRINCE EDWARD'S ISLAND.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN enquired whether it was the intention of the Government to repair and finish the breakwater at Tiguish, Prince Edward Island, this year, in accordance with the report of Mr. Perley, Civil Engineer of the Public Works Department?

Hon Mr. SCOTT replied the subject was brought under the attention of the Min-

ister of Public Works by gentlemen who represent the Island, and others, some ten days ago; and the order, he thought, was given for commmencing the repairs immediately.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said he was glad to hear it.

NEW LIGHT HOUSES.

HON. Mr. HOWLAN asked whether it was the intention of the Government to cause light houses to be erected at Kil- are Cape, West Cape, and Miminogash, rince Edward Island, during the present , and if not at these points, then e in said island it is intended to erect n? He said he spoke in the interest of the trade of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, also. At some harbours there were white lights, so that mistakes were made during fogs, in some instances with the result of great loss. Proper lighthouses at those points were needed by all the shipping frequenting the Gulf.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said it was intended to erect lighthouses at West Cape and, possibly, in the future, at some other point or points indicated on the paper, and at such other places as necessity might dictate. But for the present it was decided to commence immediately only at West Cape.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN urged the necessity of lighthouses at the other points also, as, without them the one promised immediately would but tend to complicate matters.

LOWER PROVINCE RAILWAYS.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD rose to propose the motion on this subject, standing on the paper in his name. He said it was intimately connected with the motion passed yesterday with regard to the European and North American and Intercolonial roads. The subject of these roads deserved the anxious care and consideration of the Government. Notwithstanding the able explanations and statements given by several members from the Maritime Provinces, yesterday, in regard to the working of the Government railways there, having note of all the facts, he had to confess he was not satisfied with the returns shown for the year ending June, 1873. No doubt it was a year of exceptional circumstances, for it was known that during five years previous, the cars of the European and North American road had not, at any time, been delayed twenty-four hours. The year of exceptional snow storms had greatly increased the cost of working. There was, perhaps, a good deal of mismanagement in the two unfavorable years, still the average receipts on only a small portion of that road, not half, being worked since Confederation, amounted to some $25,000 a year over and above working expenses. There were abuses in the management under the Government of that time, which he hoped did not now exist. Still that prompted the enquiry why, since those abuses had been done away with, the returns were unfavorable as regards the net proceeds of the working of the road? Under the former management 1,000 persons had the right to travel on that road free, and within six months some 575 availed themselves of it The working expenses for 1873 were a much larger sum than the returns, but the freight and passenger traffic had wonderfully increased. A few years ago there was but one first-class passenger car on the road, and twelve passengers were considered an average number. Since this road had been connected with Halifax, however, by a portion of the Intercolonial there were generally two passenger cars, well filled, besides second-class cars; and on parts of that road they were seen running twice a day. The facts in respect to this road were of a nature to warrant the expectation of a more favourable return than had been made for 1873, allowing for all drawbacks. He thought this road would pay in a few years 84 per cent, besides working expenses It was one of the most favourable lines in the Dominion, in excellent repair, and connected with the United States, Nova Scotia, and other Canadian lines. One explanation of the deficient returns of the road was its having been allowed to run down by the Superintendent, probably with the sanction of the Department of Public Works. The locomotives were out, and were insufficient in number, also. It was likely the authorities desired to avoid expenditure, to show that the railway was a profitable one. There was therefore inadequate accommodation for the freight and other business offering. He mentioned this fact because he saw a very large item in the public accounts, $330,108, spent, during the year, for maintenance of way and works. He was convinced that if properly managed, this railway would prove to the Dominion a most valuable and profitable public work. He moved, that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a Return shewing the respective rates of the tariff imposed on passengers and goods on the European and North American and Intercolonial Railways in the

Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, stating the differences of such tariff, if any, between St. John and the boundary line, and from the said boundary to Halifax, and between any stations thereof. Also, a Return of any regulations or instructions as to the issuing of family tickets or free passes, if any, and by whose authority.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he had no objection to it. The attention of the Government would, no doubt, be directed to the management of the roads in the Lower Provinces at a very early day. As to the free passes spoken of, he had learned that they were confined to the members of the Local Government, when travelling on official business.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON said he heartily endorsed every word as to the capabilities of this railway and its advantages. There was not a better hundred miles of road in the Dominion, nor was there any that would pay better if properly attended to, if the accounts were properly kept, and if a connection was made with the United States roads by bridge across the River St. John. (Hear, hear.) He was perfectly satisfied when this road was thus connected with United States and Canadan lines, it would pay more than six per cent, and far from being a burden to the Dominion would be a bonus of a little over the full cost of the road.

After some conversation the matter dropped.

SECTIONS 4 AND 7 INTERCOLONIAL.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY explained the circumstances connected with the abandonment of those sections by the contractors who undertook to build them, in 1869, and the consequent sudden discharge of hundreds of workmen, many a long way from home, and the non-payment of their wages. Some were owed for from one to three months' labour. A report of the sums due had been made, but up to the present all the claims had not been settled. He would move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before the House a statement of the amount of unpaid claims on Sections 4 and 7 respectively, of the Intercolonial Railway presented to and reported on by Mr. C. Schreiber, C. E., also a statement of the amounts in all, paid on account thereof by the Intercolonial Commissioners and by Mr Schreiber, respectively.

2. Whether the balance of these claims or (if any) what proportion thereof will be paid, and whether labourers' unpaid claim for work done under sub-contractors will be respected?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT requested the hon. gentleman to allow the matter to stand over for the present, his attention having been called to it only at three o'clock today. He was consequently unable to give any answer.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY consented.

DISMISSALS.

Hon. Mr. MILLER moved that an humble address be presented to the Governor General, praying that His Excellency cause to be laid before the Senate all letters. petitions, or papers, relating to the appointment or removal of Emile Mouchette from the office of keeper of the way post office at Acadiaville, in the County of Richmond, N. S., and also of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor, or praying for the removal of the latter. The dismissal of Mr Mouchette, of which he [Mr. Miller] complained, was made by the late Government. Two years ago the way office in question was held by a Mr. Bosdet, from whom it was taken in consequence of the inconvenience of the locality, and for no other reason, as nothing could be alleged against Bosdet, who is a very respectable man. When the removal of the office was decided on, the late Postmaster General had asked him (Mr. Miller) to name his successor, although he had no desire to do so. The office was, therefore, given to Mr. Mouchette, as the most suitable person in the District, and the latter took it more to oblige his neighbors than for personal advantage. Last winter it was rumoured in the settlement that Mouchette was going to be removed, and the people got up a remonstrance, signed by three-fourths of the inhabitants, against such a step, and sent it to him. He spoke to the late Postmaster General, and was assured that nothing of the kind was intended, and the petition was not, therefore, presented. Early in the summer, however, Mouchette was removed without notice or charge made against him, he believed, at the instance of the member for the county. Mouchette then applied to the Department for the grounds of his dismissal, but no attention was paid to his application. He did not care for the office, and would not take it again, but he considered that his dismissal implied mal-practice, and might be so looked upon by some people. The dismissal was a mean and unjust action, and

discreditable to the Government that made it. It had no other cause than to please a political partisan, and this the papers would show. It was a small business for a Government to dismiss a way office keeper, with a salary of a few dollars, on political grounds. He (Mr. Miller) understood that an attempt was now being made, but not in the interest of Mouchette, to remove the present incumbent, Mr. Poan, who was also a very respectable man, but might not, perhaps, be a favorite with some people in the District. But no charge to justify removal could be laid against him. His object in making the motion was to vindicate Mouchette, and put the Government on their guard against being led into the mistake towards his successor, that the late Postmaster General had fallen into, the three men who had held this petty office during the past two years were among the best men in the township, and he did not want to see the Government of the country brought into further contempt by another removal till there was something to justify it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he was sorry he could not throw any light on the complaint which the hon. gentleman had made. He would have to claim the usual refuge or exemption of Ministers, themselves, in the shape of silence till the papers came down. (Laughter). He remembered nothing of the subject, and prayed for a suspension of judgment till the papers arrived. (Hear, hear and renewed laughter.) Motion carried.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER moved the second reading of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food. He pointed out the necessity of some measure to prevent the adulteration of the food and drink of the people, in the interest of honesty, morality, and public health. The practice, in question, was an old one, known to all countries, and it involved a fraud upon the purchasers and consumers of commodities, in addition to other evils. He commented upon the ills produced by a free indulgence in drink, the deleterious effects of which were largely due to the presence of foreign and poisonous substances. There were frequent cases of delirum tremens, many patients at the hospitals and asylums, and much misery of all kinds in the homes of the people. In bread alum, alkali and plaster were put; milk was reduced with water and chalk, and pickles and other articles of food and liquors were mixed with hurtful substances, by which the consumer was cheated. He advocated the framing of the bill in a manner to characterize adulteration a fraud, and hoped it would be completed and perfected in the other branch of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. ARCHIBALD seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said he was entirely in accord with his hon. friend the mover as to the aim of this bill, if they had the constitutional right to pass it. He was much impressed with the hon. gentleman's observations touching one part of the bill, that relating to drinks. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) The subject was certainly important, but he had doubts as to the constitutional rights of the House to pass this act. The matter was not only within the competency of the Local Legislatures, but had been actually dealt with by them. The constitution placed all classes of questions relating to the public health within the power of the Provincial Legislatures. With regard to that class of questions, no legislation could pass in this House. He would probably be answered that this bill gave the power of imprisonment, but the Union Act declared that the imposition of penalties by fine or imprisonment should be one of those rights belonging to the local legislature. In Nova Scotia, at any rate, there had been stringent legislation as to all matters of food. If this was a subject of legislation for this Parliament then the local legislation in question was mere waste paper.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU said he thought the bill was within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. In the first place the criminal law lay within the functions of Parliament. The author of the bill proposed to class adulteration among criminal acts. What was a criminal act? One punishable by fine or imprisonment. The bill provided that adulteration should be punished by fine, penalty or imprisonment. In libel cases, also, the punishment was by fine or imprisonment. He argued that the local legislatures had concurrent jurisdiction with Parliament in offences like adulteration, and cited the Union Act to show the extent of the powers of the smaller bodies. They could set up municipal institutions, and confer upon them power to try offenders, and punish by fine or imprisonment. Municipal authorities had power given them to inspect meat, bread, milk, and such necessaries, and to punish frauds in connection with them. He contended Parliament had a right to pass this bill, or enact any other criminal law. He thought the soul of the bill was omitted, because it provided no

machinery for applying or enforcing its provisions. In this respect it differed from the Imperial Act of 1872 after which it was copied. Without this machinery it would remain a dead letter. Before the bill was passed, it would have to be amended in the direction of the Imperial Act in this respect. He believed a remedy for the evils it struck at must be adopted.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH made some useful suggestions for the improvement of the bill, and pointed out that it recognised no difference between the person who sold adulterated articles unwillingly, and him who sold them with a knowledge of their condition. He commended the attempt to put a stop to this class of offences, and urged the importance of supplying the people with pure articles of diet. He was glad to see this bill introduced, but hoped it would be amended and rendered more effective. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. WILMOT also bore testimony to the evil effects of the common practice of adulteration. Much of the injury produced by liquors was due to it, as the old fellows of the Lower Provinces who formerly got good old Jamaica rum, who drank it freely, so that they might be described as preserved in spirits—(laughter)—enjoyed excellent health and lived to a good old age. The present forty-rod sold and got from the States created great mischief. Bread and snuff were also adulterated the latter with ground glass which, though capital for killing rats—(laughter)—was not good for taking into the head. He hoped this bill would become law.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said he thought there was little or no difference of opinion with regard to the objects of this bill; the only point on which there would be any difficulty, was the constitutionality of the action of the House in the matter. Had the House power to deal with the measure? The only way to judge of the question was to look at the essence of the offence. The best test of the line that divided criminal from civil offances was the old common law. The hon. gentleman here quoted English legal authorities which showed that the offence of food adulteration, or the giving of unwholesome food was indictable at common law before there was any statute law on the subject; also the decision of the judges to the same effect in the case of the furnishing of unwholesome food to the French prisoners of war. He argued at some length that this subject came within the purview of the criminal law, the offence aimed at having been always one at common law, and that if an act was a crime, on the highest legal authority, it could only be dealt with by this Parliament. The Local Legislatures might have the power of dealing with other matters, outside of the criminal code, and of imposing fine and imprisonment, but that did not give them any criminal jurisdiction where the offence to be fined and imprisoned for was not in its nature or *per se* a criminal offence. It was not because fine and imprisonment might be inflicted by a Local Legislature, that all offences, involving fine and imprisonment must come before it. He believed it was the general opinion this bill should be passed. Its defects, its lack of the necessary machinery to carry it into operation, it might not be competent for this House to supply, as this would involve expenditure and taxation. There was more than one way in which the provisions of the measure might be carried out. In the machinery of the weights and measures bill, a change could be made empowering inspectors to get samples of the goods supposed to be adulterated, and carry them to a Provincial analyst, who could easily report on their character. The Act might be worked in a way to cost the country little or nothing.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY replied to the last speaker's legal argument, contending that though this Parliament had a right to deal with crimes and indictable offences, it might not interfere with those to be dealt with summarily, which came within the scope of the Local Legislature. He instanced cases of assault and battery, for which persons might be tried on an indictment or summarily. In the latter case the Provincial Legislation was the means applied. He failed to find that in matters like adulteration the two legislatures had concurrent jurisdiction. If the local legislatures had no power to legislate on this subject, then they would have a very considerable portion of the revised statutes of Nova Scotia swept away. In a word legislation, with regard to crimes tried by indictment, was with the Federal Parliament, but that with regard to offences punished summarily belonged to the local Houses.

After some further remarks from Messrs. BUREAU and MILLER,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he believed that adulteration would be a crime at common law, and fell within the jurisdiction of this House. But he thought the matter clear from the B. N. A. Act itself, which gave the Dominion Parliament jurisdiction in all matters not specifically assigned to the

local. The regulation of trade and commerce was assigned to the Dominion, which fact, in connection with the indictable nature of this offence, at common law, warranted the conclusion that legislation upon subjects of this kind was within the power of this Parliament. He thought it would be better the bill should pass here, when it could be amply discussed in the other branch of the Legislature. The Clerk of the other House, and Mr. Todd, were of opinion that the measure was fairly within the privilege of this House. He was disposed to let it go to a second reading.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said he knew its defects would have to be supplied in the other House.

Motion carried.

CONTINGENCIES.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR the second report of the Select Committee on Contingent Accounts was adopted.

On motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER, the House adjourned at a quarter to six, till Monday.

MONDAY, April 27th.

The House met at three o'clock.

After routine,

UNPAID CLAIMS, SECTIONS 4 AND 7 INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY proposed the following motion, and then put the appended question: That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before the House a statement of the amount of unpaid claims on Sections 4 and 7 respectively, of the Intercolonial Railway presented to and reported on by Mr. C. Schreiber, C. E., also a statement of the amounts in all, paid on account thereof by the Intercolonial Commissioners, and by Mr. Schreiber, respectively.

Inquiry by the Hon. Mr. Dickey:—

Whether the balance of the above claims or [if any] what proportion thereof will be paid, and whether laborers' unpaid claims for work done there under the contractors will be respected?

The hon. gentleman said he was induced to put this question, not from any doubt on the subject felt by himself, but from information he received as to the doubt entertained by others as to whether these claims would be respected. He hoped the answer would confirm his own opinion.

Seconded by Hon. Mr. Botsford.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied he had no objection to the motion. As to section No. 4, the contract was for $438,000 odd, of which $438,000 had been paid. There was a small balance in excess of this amount, the payment of which, he thought, the Commissioners recommended, but the Engineer in charge reported against it. At all events, there was a want of harmony in their reports. The price for No. 7 was $557,750, and while it had been paid, it was claimed in this case, also, that the contractors lost, and had a further sum due, a small amount. The engineer reported that he did not acquiesce in that view, however. At present, so far as the Department was concerned, there was not sufficient evidence before them, to justify the recommendation of the payment of a further sum.

In reply to Hon. Mr. Dickey's further remarks and interrogatory, as to whether the claims under the sub-contractors would be placed in the same position as the others.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT answered—If there was nothing coming to the contractors, there could nothing come to anybody under them, to persons not recognized by the Department. If the contractors were paid the full amount of their contracts, nobody outside them had any legal claim on the Department. The engineer differing with the Commissioners as to the verdict of the claims Nos. 4 and 7, it necessarily followed the Department would not pay the money, particularly if there was reason to believe there was nothing justly due the contractors.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY explained that his question related not to the contracts lately closed, but to the contracts made five years ago, and afterwards abandoned.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said in respect to his enquiry for the contracts, at the Department, the only ones handed him were those to which he had referred. Would it not be better to allow the motion to pass, reserving comments till the papers came down. The documents given him by the departmental officers bore exclusively on the existing contracts.

Hon. M. McLELAN said the motion referred to the old claims for work done under the contracts given out when the Commissioners first undertook the supervision of the Board.

TESTING COMMODITIES.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked whether it was the intention of the Government to establish a Laboratory in connexion with the Inland Revenue Department of the

Dominion and to employ a practical Analytical Chemist for testing the quality of Gas, of Drugs and of articles of food and drink, if required, and for determining questions which may arise, respecting manufactures subject to Excise and in Bond ?

The hon. gentleman was understood to observe that the powers now vested by the recent Weights and Measures Act in the Inland Revenue Department, and the duties now imposed upon it thereby, were of a nature requiring its assistance by a Chemist of high character and professional qualifications. For instance, a great many questions as to the quality of gas might arise, and if there was no authority on the subject, at head-quarters, whose decision could be considered final, disputes might be frequent and troublesome. It was important, also, to have at hand a man well educated and trained as a practical and analytical chemist, whose opinions and duties would properly come within the purview of the Internal Revenue Department. His aid might be found very important in reference to the subject which was before the House the other day—the adulteration of drugs and necessaries in general use. It would require some high authority, also, to decide quetions respecting articles subject to excise, which often arose, by reason of doubt as to their real composition. It frequently happened that only a chemist could decide what articles were subject to a duty. The establishment of such an authority was almost a necessity. He hoped the answer of the Secretary of State would afford a prospect of early action towards the appointment of such an officer.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied that the Government had not yet determined the mode by which those tests should be conducted ; but it was felt necessary to provide the means of deciding questions respecting the quality of gas and other articles, for which persons morally and professionally qualified to apply the tests should be chosen.

COPYRIGHTS

Hon. Mr. RYAN said that since entering the House it had been intimated to him that the notice on this subject, in his name, was not sufficiently explicit. With the permission of the House he would read what he intended proposing to-day, but in deference to the wishes of the hon gentleman who had mentioned the matter to him, he would be happy to postpone discussion on the motion till to-morrow. It read thus :—That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General on the subject of the bill intituled "An Act to amend the Act respecting copyrights," passed by the two Houses of Parliament of Canada, in the session of 1872, and reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure on the 14th day of June of that year.

LIEUT. GOVERNOR OF P. E. ISLAND.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY gave notice that he would ask, on Wednesday, if Sir R. Hudson had accepted the Lieut. Governorship of P. E. Island, and, if so, why he had not been sworn in.

FIRST READINGS.

By Hon. Mr. AIKIN—Bill to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Mortgage and Investment Company, limited.

To amend Chap 74, 36 Vict., entitled —an Act to incorporate the Imperial Bank.

PROHIBITION.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL was understood to say he desired to recall to the recollection of the House the fact that about a fortnight ago a Committee was appointed by this House to act with a similar Committee of the Commons in reference to the numerous petitions before both Houses for a prohibitory liquor law. He had waited with considerable patience, but as yet no answer had been received by this House on the subject of their message. He commented on the importance of the object in view, in favor of which petitions from fully 100,000 inhabitants of this country had been received. He refrained from passing any opinion upon the course of the other House in this matter. Doubtless, it was entitled to whatever time it thought proper in the formation of its judgment; but as this House might wait long for the Commons' answer, he would move for the appointment of a committee to examine and report upon the several petitions praying for the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, and that the rules of the House be dispensed with so far as relates to this motion.

Several honourable members pointed out that there was at present a Senate Committee instructed to deal with this subject, and that it would be inconvenient to have two. In accordance with the suggestion of an honourable gentleman, supported by several others, and after Hon. Mr. Scott had pointed out a notice on the order paper of the Commons for that day

for communication with the Senate on this subject,

Hon. Mr. VIDAL gave notice that he would move, to-morrow, that the other Senate Committee be discharged.

LIBEL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH rose to move the second reading of his bill respecting the crime of libel.

Several members objected that the bill was not printed in French, when the honourable gentleman consented to postpone it till Wednesday.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the first reading of the bill, from the Commons, respecting the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. He explained its chief provision, which was to remove the present powers of the Commissioners, and vest them in the Public Works Department, under the supervision of whose head the work of construction would be henceforth prosecuted. He believed the House had, at this advanced stage of the Intercolonial the strongest reason to approve of the principle of this bill, which would operate from 1st June next.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said the bill contained no provision protecting the rights of the contractors. It gave all the powers and duties assigned by the contracts to the Minister of Public Works. The bill should put the contractors in as good a position before that Minister as they occupied hitherto.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the effect of the measure would be simply to place the Minister in the position of the Commissioners. The position of the contractors would not be altered in the slightest degree.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL thought that public works contractors, having a claim, could under the present bill apply for an arbitration. He assented entirely to the bill, but he would draw attention to the fact that this railway was very nearly completed under the Commissioners appointed by the late Government, and under very considerable adverse criticism. It was said time and again that this was the very worst method of construction that could have been adopted. It was alleged against the late Ministers that, in proceeding as they had, they contemplated abuses, or that such would result, and that they would act so as to secure from the road, great political influence; that, in fact, they had chosen the last way of obtaining the work required. Now, the road was almost finished, having been built well and economically, and the country was getting a work as good as could have have been secured under any other management. As to track, rails, bridges, and so forth, it would compare favorably with any otner in the country, and it had been acquired at a price below that of other railways constructed under similar circumstances. It redounded to the credit of the Government that adopted that mode of building it. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. WARK disputed the theory of the efficient and economical construction of the Intercolonial. From the very beginning there had been difficulties, mistakes and failures. The first differences of opinion arose between the engineer and Commissioners. The engineer proposed to pay for the work by quantity. The Commissioners condemned that plan. Then he said he was not prepared to let the tenders by lumps sum. The Commissioners replied there was no difficulty. They differed again as to iron bridges, the engineer's recommendation of this sort having to be afterwards accepted. The hon. gentleman censured the first report of the Commissioners as sadly lacking in information as to the character of the work wanted, the description of bridges, the width of the track, the depth of foundations, and also read their remarks on the proper method of letting the contracts. The Commissioners were sure the contractors could easily ascertain the nature of the work to be done, and proceed with it satisfactorily. In the face of that, out of the first five contracts let, four had to be abandoned, and the then Government introduced a measure to pay them for the work performed and expenses incurred. All four contracts had to be let over again. Notwithstanding the Commissioners spoke so positively of the impossibility of claims for extras, he would like to know how many of the original contractors had gone through their work at the original prices. Numbers had been allowed to abandon their contracts; Government took them off their hands, and some were being completed in a most extravagant and objectionable way. He believed the railway would cost when finished far beyond what would have been necessary under a different system. More than that, this Government would commit a great mistake if they did not avail themselves of the authority given in the Intercolonial Rail-

way Bill, and appoint a commission to enquire into the manner in which this work had been conducted and executed up to the present. The Minister in taking this work into his charge, ought to know what the Commissioners had done, and what task lay before himself. He ought to be able to inform Parliament when the road was finished whether he had succeeded or failed in comparison with the Commissioners, and to what extent. He thought the Chief Commissioner would regret if he did not take this step.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT thought the House had not been satisfied with the manner in which the road had been constructed. But he protested against the Intercolonial being charged to the Maritime Provinces. It was one of those public works constructed in the general interest, for the benefit of the whole Dominion. He protested against the TIMES, which was supposed to be an organ of the Government, charging the extravagant cost of the Government roads to the Maritime Provinces. People might just as well charge Ontario with the cost of the canals, and Manitoba with that of the Pacific Railway. He stated the other day that the Intercolonial could have been constructed by the shortest route to the ocean, the valley of St. John, for a subsidy of five millions, while by the present route it would cost twenty-five millions. If the Imperial Government decided for this route, why did the Canadian Government send engineers to examine the country of the shorter, the central route, and report it was impracticable. A private company, with the aid of people in New Brunswick alone, had built seventy miles of the road by this line, and they would soon have it constructed up to the Little Falls.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said when the hon. member for Kingston [Mr. Campbell] claimed that the Intercolonial was constructed in a proper and economical manner, what had he to answer with regard to the piece known as the Grecian Bend? [Laughter].

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—It is out of fashion now. [Renewed laughter.]

Hon. Mr. MILLER said the cost of any road by this line must have been very great. He was told by engineers that a much shorter cut might have been found, and had heard this selection characterised as a job. He also was struck with the paragraph in this morning's TIMES—a paper supposed to be in the interest of the Government. It was a deliberate misrepresentation of the sense of the House—in the discussion that took place the other day. It was a most unjustifiable paragraph, and that it was unfortunate it should have appeared in such a journal. He did not know if it was inspired by the Government.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said it was not inspired by Ministers, nor were they in any way responsible for the paragraph.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said he was glad to hear it. He also protested against this Intercolonial being charged to the Maritime Provinces. It was not they but Canada that wanted it, and particularly in view of the possibility of difficulties in the way of her reaching the sea over the territory of the Americans. She it was that needed a road to it through British soil. (Hear, hear]. It was most absurd to charge this railway to the Maritime Provinces, or to excite sectional feeling against them by describing it as a burden to the whole Dominion.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said he must disclaim any Government responsibility for the paragraph that appeared in the TIMES, which was not the organ of the Government, but which sometime might act friendly towards them. The article was not in consonance with the tone of the debate the other day; but if there was anything wrong in the article, the paper corrected itself, since the same day, in its columns, the discussion appeared, which had been correctly reported. As to the member for Kingston (Mr. Campbell) he was happy to see that he had more confidence in the present Government, in regard to this railway bill than he (Mr. Letellier) was able to place in the Ministry of which that hon. gentleman was a member. (Laughter.) True, he had changed his views, to some extent as to the best manner of conducting public works, but he had great confidence in the Minister to be entrusted with the completion of this work. He differed entirely with the hon. gentleman as to the excellent and economical construction of the Intercolonial, believing the system of letting the contracts was vicious, and that the road has proved far too costly. He disapproved of the late system of letting contracts below the fair value of the work, and thus occasioning demands for extras. Not only should work be properly done, but at fair prices. Because the nature of the work to be done in the case of the Intercolonial was not known, in many instances, prices less than fair had been asked, with disastrous results. There had been no, or insufficient explorations, and a system of giving out large sections of road at great bulk sums. No wonder extravagance and failure

had been so conspicuous in connection with this railway.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—Were not the Commissioners obliged to take the lowest price?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—Certainly.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—Then they were left helpless.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Though left in that position, it was the duty of the Government to ascertain the nature of the work to be placed under contract. Had they known it, they might have safely let the contracts, and when sham offers were made, could have rejected them, or any unprovided with adequate security. As a consequence of the system followed, the late Government had been obliged to pay extras, which should not have been necessary. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Campbell) was just trying a game with the object of placing the present Government in a similar position to that occupied by himself. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL remarked that he did not say there were no difficulties connected with the work, or that the contracts were at all times given to persons who had succeded in fulfilling them, but he had observed that, notwithstanding all the difficulties, some of which could not have been avoided, and notwithstanding the manner in which the contracts were awarded, and all the changes that might have taken place in regard to the line, the course followed by the late Government in appointing a Commission, had resulted and would result in giving the country a railway as cheaply constructed and as good as could have been obtained in any other way—aye, perhaps a better road.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said on the part of the Commissioners he would state that they would be most happy to have any enquiry with regard to their action in superintending the construction of the road. The question of location by the central or northern route had been fully considered. The object was not to reach the sea in the shortest way, but Halifax, and to connect that city with the Canadian railway system. The present line to Halifax was about twenty-five miles shorter than the Central, spoken of. With respect to the Grecian Bend, referred to by the hon. member for Richmond, the railway connecting New Brunswick with Nova Scotia had to cross that range of mountains. It was a question of route altogether. One engineer stated that by going by a certain line and making a cutting of seventy feet deep over a mile in length a more direct route could be secured. Another engineer pointed out that by choosing a different direction a more direct route could be had than the Grecian Bend. Mr. Fleming reported that route almost impracticable, on account of the amount of work necessary, and he adopted a route between them, the more easily to reach the height of land and get clear of the mountain. Mr. Fleming found the lowest point, and made the road wind to the top to suit the requirements of the ground, which suggested the name given the mountain, the Grecian Bend. (Laughter.) The railway to California often followed a winding course, almost crossing itself sometimes in order to scale the mountains. This Grecian Bend runs along the high land, then turns and joins the summit without a greater grade than the engineer prescribed as the maximum. The Chief Engineer recommended this line as cheaper and better than the others. On these mountains it was difficult to keep the road clear of snow. On the other hand the expenditure and time necessary to make an excavation of seventy feet, for a mile, could be understood.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said the seventy feet cutting was Mr. Fleming's line.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said the Government had considered the whole matter, and adopted Mr. Fleming's subsequent recommendations, to make the road follow the Grecian Bend. As to the charge that all the contracts were let before full information as to the nature of the work was obtained, it was not correct.

Hon. Mr. WARK said that five contracts were let before any preparations were made.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—Many contracts were let.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN—Five or seven contracts were let, in the first instance, before the surveys were completed, tenders having been asked for. The tenders were very low, so low that even had there been the fullest information at hand, they must have resulted in failure. After five contracts, he thought, had broken down, they were re-let, little work having been done. But, before re-letting, the engineers had completed the fullest surveys, and furnished all the information possible. Those contracts are now all but completed.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Did the honourable gentleman say the engineers had made sufficient explorations as to No. 5, when a change was necessarily made after the letting of the contract?

Hon. Mr. McLELAN—The engineers had made sufficient surveys to ascertain the quantity of work to be done on the line laid down. It was reserved, however, for changes to be made one way or the other. In finishing a line, one never ceased to make changes in the location. At every step, almost, the possibility of improvement was seen. The question of the mode in which contracts should be let was the first decided by the Commissioners. If the Chief Engineer's plan had been adopted, he thought it was almost a matter of certainty that every contractor on the line would have broken down. The rate of wages had almost doubled since the contracts were first given out, and the price of materials had greatly risen, also. If the contractors had been asked to tender by the yard for excavation, they would have mentioned certain rates, based on the former scale of prices, and the Commissioners would have had to accept the lowest tenders from persons of sufficient experience. It would have been impossible for them, under these circumstances, to complete their contracts, and the result would have been a continual suspension of work and loss of time. In some cases extras had been paid, such as those of the Restigouche and Miramichi bridges, whose foundations had to be laid much deeper than was at first contemplated by the engineer. The contractors found it impossible to proceed without this additional allowance.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—What do you say about the section at Trois Pistoles, No. 5?

Hon. Mr. DEVER said, as a Newbrunswicker, I am very much surprised by the information that that Province had any voice in the location of the Intercolonial, I have been under a different impression.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I assure the hon. gentleman that New Brunswick had a very strong voice in the matter.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—Hon. gentlemen, I rise to say that, I certainly have got today some information that, is really surprising to me. It is the first time I ever received the information and from so undeniable a source (the Hon. Commissioner of Railroads from N. S). It cannot be doubted by any gentleman of this House, that really New Brunswick had no voice in the location of the route of that great work, the Intercolonial Railway, that it was simply a matter of the shortest route bewteen Canada and Halifax, and that the present route being some 25 miles the shortest to that point Halifax, it was chosen by Canada and Nova Scotia. Now, gentlemen, surely this is a full answer, and, I wish it taken down by all those gentlemen who have been making complaints about the great expenditure on the Intercolonial in New Brunswick, my Province, and I trust that a work wholly constructed as my hon. friend says without any great reference to the well being of that Province will not be pointed at in future why we should not complain against rising our tariff from 15 to the contemplated outrageous prevailing one. It is well known if our will had been taken in the location of the Intercolonial which we are called on to pay our share of, we never would have located it where it is, and this is farther seen from the fact that our own people now, are building a railway through the middle of our Province, and where we expected before the union the Intercolonial should have gone, to be of any great use to us. Besides, gentlemen, it was a loyal desire to connect the several British Provinces under one Government that brought us into this union, and not any idea that you Canadians ever can benefit us as much as we can benefit you. Our real profit and trade being in other directions which you now by the construction of your tariff are turning in to yourselves, and preventing us from obtaining goods in the cheapest markets.

Hon Mr. ALEXANDER said he desired to remove an impression which appeared to prevail among certain members from the Maritime Provinces as to the motive which led himself and other hon. gentlemen to bring up this question of their railways. He disclaimed any intention of reflecting upon them by the motion he had made, nor had his remarks borne that offensive character. Had those roads existed in Ontario, he would have been the very man to call attention to their working. The Governments of the Maritime Provinces deserved credit for having constructed those railways, which had done a great deal to develop the country.

Hon. Mr. MILLER asked if the hon. gentleman would repudiate the paragraph on the subject in the TIMES.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER, laughing, thanked the hon. member for having called his attention to this subject. He had nothing to do with the editorial, at which he had been more surprised than any member of this House. (Laughter.)

After some further discussion, in which Hon. Messrs. FERRIER, DICKEY, and REESOR, took part, the bill was read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole for Tuesday.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST moved the seconded reading of the Bill to amend the Act respecting the prompt and summary administration of criminal justice, in certain cases, in New Brunswick. He said it appeared that New Brunswick Magistrates had not the powers in regard to summary jurisdiction, possessed in the other Provinces. The bill was designed to explain that any Recorder, Judge of the County Court or Police Magistrate should possess such powers.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY suggested that the improvement should be extended to Nova Scotia, also, she being in the same position as New Brunswick, in this respect. The Bill should include Justices of the Peace, because they had power to arrest parties for any indictable offence.

Hon. Messrs. MILLER and PENNY also suggested amendments, the latter observing the Act might be made to include P. E Island.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST promised these suggestions should be considered in Committee of the Whole. Of course one Act would be preferable to two or three.

The House adjourned at five o'clock on Hon. Mr. Letellier's motion.

TUESDAY, April 28.

The House opened at three o'clock.

COPYRIGHT.

Hon. Mr. RYAN rose to propose the motion on this subject, of which he had given notice. He said that after the debate on it which had already taken place, he would not trouble the House with any further remarks, but would urge upon the Government the necessity of pressing upon the Imperial Government the desire of the people of this country to see the act passed in 1872, made law. It only required the sanction of Her Majesty to give it effect. He would move seconded by Hon. Mr. ODELL —That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to convey to Her Majesty's "Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies," the respectful expression of the anxiety of this House that a bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act respecting Copyrights" passed in the Session of 1872, and reserved on the 14th of June in that year for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon, should not be allowed to lapse by the expiry of the two years' limitation specified in the 57th Section of "The British North America Act, 1867," and further to assure His Excellency that important interests in this Dominion are prejudiced by the absence of Legislation such as this Bill contemplates.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said there could be no objection to the adoption of the Address, but he understood that the reason why this bill was not assented to was that it conflicted with an Imperial Act. The Act of 1868 did not, he assumed, interfere with the British law on the subject. That passed in 1872 did, however, conflict therewith. That was the reason, he believed, why the Bill was not assented to. The Imperial Parliament had been anxious, for some years, to meet the wishes of the people of this and the other colonies, and with that view they had, various times within the last five or six years, submitted to the Governments of the Colonies drafts of Bills, under which they proposed a uniform system not only for Great Britain, but the colonies. Those drafts had never been acceptable to the Governments of the colonies—he spoke more particularly as regards Canada. The provisions had been elaborate without meeting the conflicting interests. The interests not only of publishers but of the public had to be consulted. We had always been accustomed to cheap literature in Canada, and were unprepared to accept the British view to its full extent. The Canadian Government would, during the next few months, correspond with the British Government on this subject, with the view to such Imperial legislation as might prove acceptable to this Dominion. It appeared the Bill of 1872 would not be assented to. That was the decision a year ago when the late Ministers were in office. But the passage of this address would show the deep interest felt in this subject by the people of this country, and would assist in bringing about a settlement.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU was understood to say that when this bill was first presented he drew attention to the importance of the measure, and particularly of its success. The great difficulty with the bill, however, was its retroactive power. Now the law of England granted certain privileges and rights in regard to copyright and other matters for a certain number of years. In England the right of authors in respect to the publication of their works, was a property like any other property, which could not be tampered with. Conse-

quently, it was impossible to obtain any legislation on the subject unless the authors themselves agreed to it. If the Imperial Legislature conceded them certain privileges and protection, how could it now interfere with them prejudicially? In his opinion, for the settlement of this question by legislation, it was necessary to have the consent of all the authors, and to confer the right on the Canadian Parliament to make with them, or others, interested, the most advantageous arrangements possible. If we had the power it would be necessary to deal with the authors or their heirs. He greatly regretted our inability to legislate on the subject, and thus to facilitate the introduction of the sound and useful literature of England.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL hoped his hon. friend (Mr. Ryan) would ultimately succeed with regard to a measure in which he had taken so active, zealous and praiseworthy an interest. He thought that gentleman would succeed sooner or later. He was of opinion that the Secretary of State was wrong in believing, as he appeared to do, that the course which the English Government was to pursue, with respect to this bill, was intimated to the late Canadian Government. He [Mr. Campbell] was aware of no such intimation. He believed the Secretary of State was mistaken in resting the right of this country to deal with this subject, on the B. N. A. Act of 1867. He was convinced that this right existed in these Provinces and in the Province of Canada, anterior to that Act. It turned upon the powers granted by the Imperial Parliament in the constitutions given these several Provinces. He was certain this was the case as regards Ontario. The Imperial Parliament conceded it power to legislate on all matters affecting the weal and prosperity of the country. There was no exemption of copyright. Therefore, he thought the Legislature of Ontario and that of the Dominion had a right to deal with this subject, which was one of those affecting the weal and prosperity of the country. The hon. gentleman argued there was no distinction between the subjects of patents and copyright, yet the former was admittedly within the legislative right of the people of this country. The very great influence which the publishers and authors wielded in Great Britain had created the difficulty as to copyright. The bill of 1872 would deal with copyrights as they exist in Canada. The English public and Parliament did not assume to decide whether English patents should come here or not, though they did as to copyrights.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER thought the hon. gentleman misapprehended what the Secretary of State had said. He did not deny the right of the Provinces in the matter, but remarked that the act passed by the Dominion Parliament had been to a certain extent checked by the Imperial, in the refusal of the royal assent. Copyright might be compared with patent rights. He himself saw no difference, and admitted that the power to deal with copyright existed in the provinces, before Confederation, as well as that respecting patents. They could not tell the reasons for the refusal of the royal assent, but when this motion was passed they would likely have a correspondence with the Imperial Government, which would elicit the explanation of its unwillingness to advise that assent. He thought, if it were possible, it would be better to have an Imperial Act that would satisfy the colonies and all parties. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ryan) deserved the gratitude of authors, and the Canadian trade, for his efforts in this matter.

Hon. Mr. RYAN pointed out the mistake of supposing that it would be proper or judicious to allow time to elapse before taking action. It was just to avoid delay he had brought forward the motion presented; because if time was allowed to slip, as in previous years, and if, on the 14th of June next, the Act was not sanctioned, it would fall to the ground a dead letter, so that any advantage it promised the country, would be lost. The object of his motion was to secure the prompt action of the Canadian Government, with the view of securing Her Majesty's assent before the 14th of June. He failed to see how it could be refused without the Imperial Government stating its reasons therefor. He hoped, therefore, the Secretary of State would give the House an assurance that no time would be lost in acting upon this motion. There had been no act of the Imperial Legislature on this subject. Drafts of bills had, however, come out from the Board of Trade. The proposed amendments all emanated from our Legislature. He concluded by again urging the Canadian Government to obtain an early answer from the Imperial on this important subject, and sat down amid applause.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said there was an important constitutional principle involved in this question. It was very undesirable there should be any doubt in the mind of the House or country on the subject. He

went beyond the hon. member for Kingston, (Mr. Campbell,) and contended that by the B. N. A. Act the question of copyright was exclusively within the power of this Parliament. The Imperial Parliament had no more right to legislate upon copyrights extending to this country than upon patents. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. SCOTT was sorry there should be any misapprehension as to his remarks. The subject affected both Canada and Great Britain. We desired for Canadian authors protection in the British market, and the English authors wanted protection in Canada. There were thus mutual interests to be considered. Any legislation in England on the subject would have to be accepted here, while our legislation, if it encroached upon the assumed rights and privileges of British authors would be checked in England. The best possible evidence that the matter was, in some particulars, outside our jurisdiction, was the evidence before us, which was the disallowance of the bill. A despatch was written by the hon. gentleman opposite, (Mr. Campbell) when a Minister urging this measure upon the Imperial Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.—And to which there was no answer.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—An answer having been previously given that it conflicted with British Law.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.—I never heard of any answer.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said if a copyright bill applied simply to Canadian authors, and them alone, it was within the powers of this Legislature. But it has been proposed here to enact laws affecting British authors.

Hon. Messrs. CAMPBELL and DICKEY.—Only here in Canada.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—British authors wanted protection, and we, in our turn, sought it also. He simply rose to explain that, in cases where the civil rights of parties outside Canada were affected, and where Imperial Legislation was involved, the Imperial authorities desired a measure that would protect the rights of their subjects at home, and prove acceptable in Canada.

After some further remarks from different members,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT promised the address should be sent to the Imperial authorities at once.

PROHIBITION.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL said it was quite unnecessary for him to make any explanations, or resort to any argument in connection with the motion on the orders, in his name; his simple desire was that the petitions of some one hundred thousand persons, on this subject, should not be allowed to lie on the table of the Senate. He would move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Ferrier, "That the Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the House of Commons to consider and report on the petitions presented to the Legislature praying for the enactment of a law to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating liquors, be discharged and that the Honorable Messieurs Flint, Bureau, Ferrier, Lacoste, Girard, Benson, McClelan, (of Hopewell) Aikins, McDonald (of Toronto,) Alexander, Wark, McDonald (of Victoria), McLelan (of Londonderry,) Montgomery, and the mover, be a committee to examine and report upon the several petitions presented to the Senate, praying for the enactment of a law to prohibit the traffic of intoxicating liquors, to meet and adjourn as they please."

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER could not help saying it was a matter of very deep regret that his honorable friend from Sarnia (Mr. Vidal) had not succeeded in his efforts to secure a Joint Committee to consider this most important question. It was essentially a question for the consideration of such a Joint Committee of both Houses. The motion referred to a very great evil existing in the country, with which the Senate could not deal either partially or completely. It could not, of itself, pass a prohibitory Act, nor could it otherwise effectively deal with this question. But in connection with the other House useful and desirable action might be achieved. The hon. gentleman went on to depict the evils of intemperance, and to urge the need of legislation with a view to their great diminution, if not their complete suppression. He suggested, among other desirable experiments, that the selling of liquor in ordinary saloons be abolished, leaving the right with hotels and lodging-houses only. He cordially sympathised with the action of the hon. mover in this matter. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. WILMOT asked the member for Sarnia whether he had seen some reflections, by a clergyman, at a temperance meeting, published in one of the newspapers, with regard to what occurred in this House, while its doors were closed, in relation to the internal arrangements of the House.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL replied he had seen those remarks, and he thought they were of such a character as, if made by a

minister of the Gospel, to justify his being brought before the bar of the House. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—What bar? The bar here, or below? [Laughter].

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I am happy to say I know but one bar—it is the only bar I have ever seen. [Hear, hear, and laughter]

The motion was carried.

FIRST READING.

Hon Mr. CAMPBELL introduced a bill entitled—An Act with regard to Corporations and Institutions incorporated without the limits of the Dominion, for the purpose of lending and investing moneys.

On motion of Hon Mr. LETELLIER, the House then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 29.

The House met to-day at three o'clock.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MAILS.

Hon Mr. HOWLAN was understood to enquire when the Government intended bringing down the reply to the Address for information as to the mail service in connection with this Island, and the operations of the steamer to be employed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied he would enquire. The Address passed here, was referred at once to the proper department.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. CORNWALL said that at present steam communication between San Francisco, California, and British Columbia was kept up by means of a steamer which made trips to and fro once a month, in return for a Dominion subsidy of $48,000 a year, granted for the carrying of the mails. The service was satisfactory so far as it went, but the boat was a small one, and it took her four days to cross the 800 miles between the two places. Now steamers belonging to the China Trans-Pacific Steamship Company had been put on the route between San Francisco and China. The opportunity of buying their coal cheap would probably tend to induce them to call at a British Columbia port twice a month, on the outward and the homeward trips. These steamers would, doubtless, encourage numbers in San Francisco to visit British Columbia, and with great advantage in the building up of the Province. The facilities which would also be afforded in opening up communication between it and China and Japan, were not the least inducement to encourage those steamers to touch at British Columbia ports. In view of the ultimate destiny of that Province, which was to be the terminus of the Pacific Railway, it would be unwise to let any opportunity of establishing this steamboat connection pass. The interests of the Dominion would thereby lose heavily. He would move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Macdonald, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House copies of all letter memorials from the Chamber of Commerce of Victoria, B. C., or other papers in connection with the offering of a subsidy or other inducements to the ships of the "China Trans-Pacific Steamship Co.," running between San Francisco, Japan and China, to call at Esquimault, British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT had no objection to the address, a similar one to which was, he thought, moved in the other House a day or two ago. What delay would be occasioned by a steamer *en route* from San Francisco to Yokohama calling at British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. CORNWALL understood it would not be beyond a day.

GOVERNORSHIP OF P. E. ISLAND.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY asked whether Sir Robert Hodgson has accepted the Governorship of P. E. Island, and if so, why he has not been sworn in? The hon. gentleman said there was no Chief Justice in the Island, as Sir Robert Hodgson, the late Chief Justice, having been offered and accepted the Lieutenant-Governorship, could not fill the two positions at the same time. He (Mr. Montgomery) wished to know why, if that gentleman had accepted the Governorship, he had not been sworn in, so as to enable the Government to appoint a Chief Justice.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—The reason why he has not been sworn in is, he has not yet accepted the office.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY—He was offered the situation some time ago, and it was time he gave an answer. If he did not soon decide to accept it, the Government should appoint some other person.

THE LATE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT MONTREAL.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he wished to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that the return respecting the Custom House at Montreal appeared to

be incomplete, and that he perceived this defect, not from what was not produced, but from the papers that had been submitted. It seemed, on the face of them, that the only complaint made, and the only report thereon, was a complaint by Mr. Lacroix, and that Mr. Bouchette had reported upon this complaint; and that it was then too late to enter upon the investigation, because Mr. Delisle had left the Custom House. Yet, though Mr. Bouchette did not report upon the complaint, nor upon the complainer, he had reported upon the person who was only incidentally mentioned by Mr. Lacroix—namely, Mr. Barry. He (Mr. Penny) had no desire to go into a complaint of a very disagreeable nature, but he was anxious to ascertain in what way the business of the Department was controlled in Ottawa. He was made the more anxious in the matter by what appeared to be the curious nature of this report. Mr. Bouchette had reported not only that it was too late to make an enquiry, but that if such complaint were made it ought to have been preferred in a charitable manner—a thing that he (Mr. Penny) did not quite understand in connection with such a subject. The other curious circumstance was that he accused Barry of having been convicted of misdemeanour and other offences, although Barry was not, as stated already, in the case. What he wanted, was—as Mr. Barry had evidently made a complaint—that this House should be informed whether it was within the time of Mr. Delisle's service at the Custom House, and be furnished Mr. Bouchette's report thereupon, which, he presumed, had been made.

LIBEL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH moved the second reading of the bill relating to the crime of libel. He spoke at length in explanation of its scope and objects, which were indicated in the preamble. There was no intention of introducing any novel or sweeping legislation on this important subject, but merely to bring in the law now in force in England, which had existed there for the last thirty years, and which prevailed in Ontario. He proposed that this should be the law of the whole Dominion, thereby securing for our guidance the rules, precedents and decisions of England, on the subject, for at least 30 years. In the other Provinces the law of libel was peculiar, as neither the truth of the charge of libel, nor the reasons for publishing it, were allowed consideration in Court. He gave the definition of libel, or written defamation, by 'Chitty,' as follows: 'Any act, other than spoken words, which sets a person in an odious or ridiculous light, thereby diminishing his reputation.' 'Blackstone' described it: "A censorious or ridiculous writing, picture or sign, made with a malicious or mischievous intent towards Government, magistrates, or individuals." The doctrine laid down in provinces where the English and Ontario law did not prevail was—the greater the truth the greater the libel; that, in fact, the truth was an aggravation of the offence. It seemed to flow therefrom that, no matter how true the statement was, or how much it was in the public interest to print it, or how great the provocation might have been, or no matter that there was no malice on the part of the publisher, all that the jury was instructed to discuss was the fact that there had been a publication which was libellous. This appeared strange and questionable doctrine, indeed, at this period. It seemed singular that the truth of the allegation should not be allowed to be proved, or proper reason for its appearing. There might be an old skeleton in many a neighbor's cupboard—which ought not, in the interest of society, be brought to light. He showed that the bill met this. In a civil suit the truth could be set up as a full answer, and the rebuttal of the presumption of malice could be pointed to in mitigation of damages. The honourable gentleman referred to this law as a great anomaly, and then sketched the course of legislation on this subject since 1792, before which year there had not been any. Under the act introduced by Fox, known as Lord Erskine's Act, the whole truth could be left to the jury. Judges had differed, however, in its application. He instanced two cases in 1811. The King *vs.* Hunt *et al.*; Idem *vs.* Drakard. The indictments were for the same newspaper articles, published in different papers. In both cases defendants were represented by the same counsel. In the first case Lord Ellenborough took high ground in favor of the press, and defendants were acquitted. In the other, Baron Wood took narrower views, and the defendant was convicted. That law, in principle exists now in the Dominion. This law introduced by Fox was a declaratory law. His attention had been called to this subject at some length by a case lately in the Dominion in which the Judges properly took the Act 22nd, George III, as law, but prevented the accused going into the proof of the charge of libel, or rebutting the presump-

tion of malice, leaving to the jury little else than the publication. In England further legislation than the Act of 1792 was felt to be requisite, and the consequence was, Lord Campbell's Act 6th and 7th, Vic. Cap. 96, was passed, fixing the law in such absolute terms, that judges could not substitute their own notions for the law. That Act provides that the truth of the libel can be pleaded, and that the publication was in the public interest. The hon. gentleman then went on fully explaining the different clauses of the bill, and showed they tended to check the licentiousness of the press, and indicated and urged the need of the reform the bill contemplated, resuming his seat amid applause.

Hon. Mr. PENNY seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said he had patiently awaited explanation from the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg as to the tenth clause, but without receiving any. They could readily understand that the press should receive the fullest consideration in a measure of this kind; but, at the same time there should be some protection or safeguard against an unbridled press. The first seven or eight clauses distinctly stated that if a newspaper libelled the character of any public man, such as charging him with dishonesty, or the like, the owner should be indicted for a misdemeanor before the public courts of the Dominion. But the tenth clause almost nullified that power in effect enacting that, if any editor happened to be absent from his desk, and if his substitute maligned any public man, the publisher, owner or editor, in court, might shelter himself behind the fact that he was not aware the libel was published. No editor or publisher should appoint to write editorials, either temporarily or permanently, a person not regarded fully responsible for any leading article on any public question. The writer, whoever he might be, should be as answerable before the public tribunal, as the regular editor. While willing to give every reasonable latitude to the press, they should be very careful not to insert a paragraph in this bill that would allow to be published sometimes, articles of which the editor might be afterwards ashamed. In the two or three libel cases now before their courts, this paragraph of the bill might be pleaded, and a verdict asked on the ground of the absence of the editors. The assailed party should not be expected to know the internal arrangements of an office, but merely that on a certain day a libel on his character appeared; nor should the editor be permitted to plead, in justification, or with a view to exemption, his absence from home. The clause should be so wide as to bring in editor, proprietor and publisher just as responsible in cases of libel as if they had known all about it beforehand.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that was a matter more properly appertaining to the bill when in Committee. He entirely concurred in the general aim and scope of this bill, and the history of it as given by the Hon. Mr. Kaulbach, the introducer. It was, perhaps, rather singular that they should have so many years lived as colonies, and afterwards as a Confederation, without some legislation of this kind; but they might feel less surprise on reflecting that it was only some thirty years since the actual English law was first introduced into the Imperial Legislature. He believed it was the opinion of lawyers that, independent of this act, known as Lord Erskine's, a jury had a perfect right to consider the intentions of the party accused, to take into consideration the element of malice as well as the simple fact of the publication of what was technically called inuendoes. Therefore, he was a little surprised that his hon. friend thought proper to introduce that bill when its provisions had been accepted as a part of the unwritten law of this country. Some might say the bill did not go the whole length of declaring that the truth of the libel was a complete answer. The bill was very properly limited to allowing parties to prove the truth of the libel substantially in mitigation of damages. Under the old law the maxim was, the greater the truth the greater the libel. Till thirty years ago that was the accepted ruling in all the Colonial Courts. In 1792 the truth of a libel was considered an aggravation of the offence. He cordially approved of the changes made by this bill, though he would be sorry to make the allegation of truth an answer to criminal proceedings for libel. He would have great pleasure in assisting to amend the bill in committee.

Hon. Mr. MILLER had taken the trouble to look into this bill, and felt convinced it was such as should stand on their statute book. He thought it strange they should not have had before this some enactment with regard to libel, whether civil or criminal. He was not sorry the jurisdiction of this House did not allow them to deal with it as a civil offence, but only as a criminal. Till the reign of George the Third, libel was cause for action at common law. After that time, a statute, declaratory

to the common law, but more certain, was passed, which was applicable to this Province, which had not legislated on the subject. He believed the only one that had dealt with it was Upper Canada. He was of opinion that this bill, or something similar did become the law of the land. He thought the best argument in favour of this bill was that it merely established in this country the principle of the criminal law which prevailed in England—nothing more nor nothing less. He thought there was no country in the world where the liberty of the press was more jealously guarded than in England, and, at the same time, where offences against private reputation were more severely punished. Therefore, he thought that, in this instance, as in that of all their criminal laws, they could have no better example than the English law. It must appear to us an extraordinary thing that a party indicted for libel could not plead its truth, or the interest of the public in his defence, and show himself to have been devoid of malice. This was such an anomaly that there could be no mistake in remedying it. This bill contained the substance of the English law so far as relates to criminal matters. The great object, of course, of a law of this kind was to give proper protection to private reputation; in the second place, to give proper protection to the liberty of the press; and, in the third place, to restrict that liberty, or prevent its degenerating into licentiousness. A wise law on this subject would be a valuable acquisition to their statute book. He could not say to the honorable member for Lunenburg that he found much fault with any of the clauses of this measure. He thought that, in some cases the fine was too low, and the period of imprisonment rather aggravated, because, as a general rule, the character of the libels subject to prosecution under this Act would hardly warrant commitment for two years. Such punishment would be more applicable to libels against the country, of the seditious class. But this was a matter for the House to consider in committee.

Hon. Mr. PENNY remarked that, after the able manner in which the Bill had been moved, explained and discussed, there was little to be said on it. The honorable member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Howlan) had forgotten that the Bill related only to the criminal side of the offence of libel, and had nothing to do with the civil offence, and that the person wronged or robbed by a libel, could still recover any amount of damages that he had suffered; furthermore, with regard to the clause that honorable gentleman had alluded to, it but brought the law in this particular into accord with the ordinary criminal law upon this subject. Mr. Howlan was aware that if a carter or other cabman, in the ordinary course of his employment, had broken the leg of another person, the individual injured would have a civil remedy against the proprietor of the waggon or other machine by which the damage was inflicted, but that if the workman chose to use the machine for a criminal purpose, he and not the proprietor would be liable to punishment. He thought we might safely take the law that had been on the English statute book for forty years, and proved so satisfactory, an additional advantage being that it would give us forty years of jurisprudence in relation to this subject, including the decisions of Judges and findings of juries.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said the hon. gentleman's question or illustration had been put in a manner the opposite of the appropriate. If his carter broke a man's leg, he was not responsible. At a future stage he would try to show the error of that hon. gentleman's opinion.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT saw the force of the Hon. gentleman's (Mr. Penny's) illustration, which was quite clear, a principal being responsible for the acts of his agent. He believed the experience of Ontario, the last quarter of a century, was sufficient to justify the trial of this measure by the whole Dominion.

Some further remarks were made by Hon. Messrs. Dickey, Penny, Campbell, Letellier, Bureau, Howlan, Wilmot, and Reesor, generally in favor of the bill.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH replied briefly to the different speakers, meeting objections raised. He differed from the hon. member for Cumberland, regarding the law as now in force in each of the Provinces except in Ontario, and referred to the remarks of the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Penny) as a full answer to objections raised by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island —showing that it was contrary to the principles of criminal law and common sense that a person should be held criminally liable for the acts of another done without his consent or knowledge and that if the servant in the ordinary course of his service injured another, the principal or master was responsible in damages in a civil action.

The Bill having passed its second reading on motion of Hon. Mr. Kaulbach, seconded by Hon. Mr. Penny, it was referred to a

Select Committee composed of Hon. Messieurs Letellier de St. Just, Scott, Dickey, Campbell, Penny, Bureau, Odell, Trudel, and the mover, to meet and adjourn when they please.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN N. BRUNSWICK

On motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER. the House went into Committee of the Whole on the bill, from the Commons, to amend the law respecting criminal justice in New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT explained the object of the bill, which defined the term competent Magistrates, as regards New Brunswick, in the sense it bore in Ontario, where certain offences could be tried before those authorities, not triable before such officers in the Lower Province. An amendment designed the extension of this act to Nova Scotia also. In New Brunswick they could not apply to all Justices of the Peace the term competent Magistrate. The bill did not prejudicially interfere with the jurisdiction of the Magistrates.

The bill was reported from Committee with amendments, which were concurred in, and was read a third time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. FERRIER the House then adjourned.

THURSDAY, April 30, 1874.

The House met at three o'clock.

QUESTION OF ORDER.

Hon. Mr. BENSON said he rose to present a petition which he thought had been improperly objected to yesterday. He had since considered the matter, and came to the conclusion he was in order on his first action. The petition was from the inhabitants of the town of St. Catharines, for aid to enable them to build an addition to the General Marine Hospital. He then moved its reception, and observed the object in view was a very important one, which deserved the serious consideration of the Government. It would be remembered that yesterday an honorable member (Mr. Miller) raised the point of order, stating it could not be received, as it was a money petition, and, the Secretary of State concurring, he (Mr. Benson) had withdrawn it. On looking into the matter since, however, he found he was then perfectly in order, which had induced him to present the petition again to-day.

Hon. Mr. MILLER argued that petitions like this one, for a grant of public money, could not be presented to the Senate or received by it, according to the B. N. A. Act. The initiation of money votes rested solely with the Government, and must be made through the House of Commons on a message from the Crown. Therefore the Senate had no power to grant public money with such preliminaries, and it would be absurd to petition them to do that which they had not the power to do. He contended, in addition, that it was contrary to the rules of Parliament, and particularly under our system of Government, established by the Act of Confederation, to entertain such a petition. It could not properly be presented to the other House, and surely could not to this Upper House, which had no control whatever over subjects of this kind. They only rejected or received such votes as were sent them from the Commons. He considered the petition altogether out of order.

Hon. Mr. BENSON said he restricted the question to the reception of the petition, and contended there was no rule against the reception of a petition, even for money, citing the analagous or kindred power of the House of Lords, which was under no rule or usage forbidding the presentation and discussion of petitions for procurring redress or assistance; and although the Lords had no right to initiate taxation, or its increase, they were not constitutionally debarred from initiating enquiry by their own Committeess into financial matters. The consent of the Lords was indispensable to every measure, whether in supply or otherwise, and it was desirable they should be prepared by due investigation and enquiry, to give or withhold their assent. These were the views set forth in the authorities. He contended he was strictly in order, and that it was well the matter should be finally settled.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS thought his hon. friend (Mr. Miller) had allowed himself to be drawn into an error in this matter. The House of Commons made a rule for themselves, no doubt, and the motive, in regard to their convenience, could be easily understood. But the Senate had no rule on the subject, having to be guided by the views and action of the House of Lords. They received petitions of this kind. Mr. Todd believed the Senate had no right to receive such petitions. There was no rule forbidding it while their own rules prescribed that in all unprovided cases they were to be guided by the usage of the House of Lords. Now it was their usage to receive papers of this kind.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said the rule was perfectly clear in England as in this country. He had no doubt parties had the right to petition this House for general redress or compensation, or for a general grant. The hon. gentleman [Mr. Miller] said they had no power to grant money, but he was wrong, although the initiation of money grants belonged to another House, they had to come up to this House to be confirmed; therefore, the Senate had power to legislate upon them—although not separately, yet in the aggregate. That being the case, why could not a party petition this House for a grant of money? He believed this petition could be received by this House, and that it had the right of opposition on this petition if a grant in regard to it was proposed by the other House.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY thought they should not receive petitions if they had not the power to grant them. The Goverment had the initiation of all money votes, and all petitions for grants of money should be forwarded to the Government. What was the use of receiving petitions which they could not grant? They should be only deceiving the parties in interest.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT thought the better time to take the exception was on the putting of the question by the clerk—shall the petition be received? There was a wide difference of opinion on the subject. He did not know what the practice had been in this House.

Several members—To receive the petitions.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said the time to put the question as to the receiving of the petition was when it was presented if there was any objection to it. From his knowledge of the practice of this House, and of the Lords, he entirely agreed with Hon. Mr. Dickey on this subject. He contended that all money votes must originate with the Government, which was responsible therefor. The practice in this House and the Lords was to receive petitions of a general nature. Though the Senate could not initiate any money vote, still the sum petitioned or sought for must be included in the appropriation bill and be submitted for their consideration. Although they might not deal with one appropriation in the Supply Bill, in particular, at the same time, if they had good reason to object to any proposal, they might assume the responsibility of saying it was improper, and vote against the bill on its account. Under these circumstances he thought that any petition, couched in general terms, was presentable to this House, and that the custom, since Confederation, had been to receive such petitions. He had not the least doubt we could receive any of those general petitions, inasmuch as it related to a demand upon Parliament, which meant Commons, Senate and the Executive. [Hear, hear].

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said there was a wide distinction between receiving petitions and granting them here. There was nothing in the rules to prevent their receiving them. The mere receiving them did not imply the House had a right to grant their prayer, for it had not the right to grant money. After receiving the petition, the Senate had no further right to interfere with its course.

His Hon. the SPEAKER said: I find in "Mag," page 585, the principle laid down by the Hon. Senator to my left [Mr. Miller] who took exception to the presentation of the petition. The principle of awaiting the suggestion, on the exercise of the authority of the Crown, in relation to the voting of public money, is not confined to the annual grants, but applies to petitions asking grants of money. By a standing order of the House of Commons of the 20th March, 1866, it was provided "that this House shall receive no petition for any sum relating to the public service, or proceed upon a motion for a grant, if a charge upon the public revenue, in any case not recommended by the Crown, and this rule is extended by the uniform practice of the House to any motion which, though not directly proposing a grant, or change upon the public revenue, involves the expenditure of public money. When a petition praying for compensation or other pecuniary aid is fully recommended, it is then referred to a Committee of Enquiry or directly to a Committee of Supply." That is a standing rule of the House of Commons, but I have failed to find any rule of the Senate or House of Lords applying the same principle to the practice of the Senate or of the Lords. There is no rule or usage of the Senate to forbid the presentation, discussion, or reference to a Select Committee of a petition for pecuniary aid, redress, or compensation. Petitions may also be received, asking for the construction of public works and involving the expenditure of public money, or asking grants of money for particular institutions. This principle prevails in the usage of the House of Lords. I have looked at the index to the Lords, journals under the head-

ing "Petitions," running from 1837 to 1863, and find a number of petitions in that index, which have been received by the Lords—of a similar character to that now sought to be presented to the Senate. In looking into "Hansard," I find a number of those petitions were not only presented to the Lords, but acted on. In referring to "Todd," who was quoted by the Senator who presented this petition, we find this statement: "The practise of the House of Lords, in these particulars, is less stringent than that of the House of Commons. There is no rule or usage of the House of Lords to forbid the presentation and discussion of a petition for pecuniary redress or compensation, provided it be couched in general terms; and although the House of Lords have no right to initiate measures of taxation, or propositions for increasing the pecuniary burdens of the people, yet they are not constitutionally debarred from instituting inquiries by their own committees into financial matters, or into questions which involve the expenditure of public money. The consent of the Lords is indispensable to every legislative measure, whether of supply or otherwise, and it is desirable that they should be prepared, by full investigation and free inquiry, to give or withdraw their assent intelligently." I have noticed the terms of this petition and quite agree with the Senator to my left (*Mr. Botsford*) as to to the application of the principle named by "Todd," that it must be couched in general terms. It is true that the petition asks for an appropriation for a *particular object*, but it does not ask for a *specific sum of money*. I am therefore of opinion that, as we have no rule of our own which forbids the presentation of petitons of this character and, as we have a rule providing that on all unprovided cases, reference shall be had to the usage of the House of Lords, and since that usage permits, it is quite regular to present this petition. I therefore decide that the petition is in order, and may be received.

BRITISH AMERICAN ASSURANCE CO.

On motion of Hon. Mr. ALLAN, seconded by Hon. Mr. McMaster, the bill entituled an Act to amend the Act incorporating the British American Assurance Co., and other acts affecting the same, and to extend its powers, was read a third time.

RAILWAY TELEGRAPHS.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU introduced a bill to oblige Railway Companies to have telegraph lines along the routes. First reading.

ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER moved that when this House adjourns on Friday, it stand adjourned till half-past seven on Monday evening next—Carried.

CREDIT FONCIER.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved the second reading of the bill to incorporate Le Credit Foncier Royal Co. The hon. gentleman explained the measure in French. He said the the bill possessed both a public and private cearacter. The Credit Foncier bill he introduced last year met with a great success. The capital was promptly subscribed. He had introduced a new clause, rendering the machinery of the act and scheme a little safer, namely, putting the Company under Government inspection, and having the appointment of one of the auditors, charged with examining the accounts of the Company, to be appointed by the Government in certain cases. Now the three auditors were to be named by it. He intended making this Act similar to European Acts. We wanted, in these colonies, so full of natural resources, money to develop them, and the problem was the best way of attracting it hither. We needed banks of issue and discount, and loans on easy terms, to enable us to turn our advantages to profitable account. With the object of supplying this want, it was desired to establish a Credit Foncier institution on a solid foundation, the Goverament to have a voice in its management, in regard to its borrowing and lending. The Government would name auditors to deal with the loans to be raised in Europe and elsewhere. If irregularities were committed by the auditors or others, the Government could close the institution. If we could afford security for the repayment of moneys borrowed, or the payment of interest, by means of those institutions, we should succeed in establishing them, and imparting a great stimulus to the industries of the country. Many knew that a great number had taken stock in those companies, in Montreal, paid for by instalments, in some cases as low as four dollars a month. The prosperity of Montreal was due in no trifling measure to the operations of such corporations, which loaned money for building, received deposits at interest, and in other ways aided business. He said he desired to see the farmers assisted by the loans of such companies, as they would thus be enabled to extract

much larger returns from the soil, and give a broader basis and increased strength to the business of the whole country. The agricultural interest, which he did not desire unduly to protect or pamper, was the foundation of all the rest, and if it could be advanced by judicious encouragement in the shape of loans for improvements and better cultivation, the country, as a whole, would prove a very large gainer.

After some discussion, in which Hon. Messrs. Dickey and Allan criticised some of the provisions of the bill or scheme, as of an extraordinary and visionary character, likely to lead to losses and disappointments hereafter,

Hon. Mr. BUREAU admitted there was room for much improvement, which he was willing to assist in securing.

The bill was read a second time, and on the suggestion of Hon. Messrs. Ferrier and Dickey, referred to the Banking Committee.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU then moved the second reading of the bill to amend that respecting Le Credit Foncier du Bas Canada, seconded by Hon. Mr. Penny,—Carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SCOTT, the House adjourned at five o'clock.

FRIDAY, May 1, 1874.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

LIBEL BILL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH presented the report of the Select Committee, to whom was referred the bill respecting the crime of libel, setting forth that several amendments had been made. Before the chairman had completed the reading of the usual announcement in such cases,

Hon. Mr. MILLER rose to a point of order. He said he wanted the enforcement of the rule applicable under such circumstances. The 94th said: When the chairman of a Select Committee presents a report to the Senate, the other members of the Committee shall stand up. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH, apparently thinking the point was raised in jest, continued his reading of the notice, when

Hon. Mr. MILLER pressed his objection, amid laughter, when the other members of the committee rose and remained standing till the Clerk had read the formal report presented.

Hon. Mr. MILLER then said the bill was an important one, and as the amendments were numerous, and some of them very material, he suggested the consideration of the report be not taken up before Monday or Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS, concurring, said in the meantime the amendments could be printed.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD suggested that the report should be considered in Committee of the Whole when members had time to consider the amendments.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH would have preferred the immediate consideration of the report, but, in deference to the House, he would move that the Bill, as amended, be referred to Committee of the Whole on Monday next.—Carried.

LIGHT HOUSES.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said in placing this notice for to-day, he simply did so as the speediest mode of bringing the matter before the proper head of the Department as well as before the Government as a whole. His attention to the want of this light house was brought by parties well acquainted with the value of such a structure to a large class of fine men who are engaged in the daily, and he might say nightly, toil of earning their bread navigating the various crafts indicated in the notice, as well as by a large number of merchants, whose property is constantly being moved about by those men. He would further say he had no private ends to serve, and would ask that the Government may consult with other members and gentlemen from St. John to see that the work will be of great utility and value, and cost very little. With these remarks he would ask whether it is the intention of the present Administration to erect one of those efficient light houses [similar to those erected by the late Government of the Dominion at several points along the River St. John) on the Western point of Navy Island, in the harbor of St John, to assist parties engaged in the navigation of timber rafts, scows, wood boats, and other craft, through that dangerous passage known as Below the Falls, at St. John, New Brunswick?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he was not aware that the necessity of a lighthouse at that point had ever been brought under the attention of the Government. On enquiry he found it was not intended to erect a lighthouse at the place indicated.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said the cost of those structures was very small. A light house could be erected for $160 on the River St. John, while the cost of maintenance would be about $80 a year. A lighthouse at this point would be very useful,

there being a large number employed in running the rapids there, and it was only during a short time in every twelve hours when, owing to the state of the tide, the stream and the falls were very nearly level, that boats could pass the falls. While this improvement would not cost much it would be of great service to boatmen.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT promised to bring the matter under the notice of the Commissioner of Public Works.

SECTIONS FOUR AND SEVEN, INTERCOLONIAL.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN in moving for a return of the unpaid claims for labor on these sections, said: It is in the recollection of honorable gentlemen that there has already been some discussion on these claims here and in the other branch. From the report of that discussion it will be seen that the Premier in answer to Dr. Tupper's enquiry for the reasons why those claims were not paid, stated that he had been told that the claims were nearly all in the hands of third parties bought up at a large discount, and a number of them so held by one of the Commissioners. I knew such reports had been conveyed to the Government, and now that they have thus been made public I desire to say, publicly, that they are entirely incorrect and unfounded. But whilst I have never speculated in the paid or unpaid claims, I have had considerable to do with them. Early in 1869, seven sections of the Intercolonial were given to contractors before, as it has been on many occasion stated, the engineers had perfected a full survey. Work on sections four and seven in Nova Scotia—the Province I was more directly connected with on the Commission—commenced in June. Very little money was paid the laborers, except in July and August. Late in November, work on both sections stopped, throwing over a thousand workmen out of employment, from two to three months unpaid, and many of them without the means of procuring the necessaries of life. The condition of the men was such that great fears were entertained of serious disturbances. I was suddenly called to deal with these difficulties, and any gentleman who has had similar experience, will appreciate the trials and anxieties of the position. There was a sum in the hands of the Commissioners: per centage retained from contractors and the last estimate of work. Under the contract we reserved the power to apply this to the payment of labour. Unfortunately it fell very far short of meeting all the claims, and I could only attempt to divide it equitably among the men. This was done as far as possible, but with great difficulty, and not without personal danger to myself and those who assisted me. The hon. member from Cumberland may, perhaps, recollect one occasion when a partial payment of fifty cents on the dollar was being made, an exasperated navvy drew his knife with his bill and demanded to have payment in full, or a Commissioner. (Laughter) This partial payment I marked on the due bill or time ticket which the men held and returned it to them. Some time after this, the impression became pretty general in that section of country that the hardship to those laborers was so great that the Commissioners wanted to pay the balance. The consequence was, that I was continually beset by the claimants, and between '69 and '72 a great many of the claims were sent to me by the claimants scattered over Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, instructed, as many of them stated, to do so by their representative. The contractors on all those sections from one to seven, were also pressing for some consideration of their exceptional position. The Commissioners when the work on their sections was nearly completed under the second contracts, discussed the matter very fully, and seeing that the work on five of the sections had been re-let, after fuller engineering enquiry, and the lowest available tenders taken, concluded with the concurrence of the engineer-in-chief, that it would be no more than justice to allow these men a price for the work actually executed by them, approaching the prices paid under the re-let contract. This was recommended to Council, with a sum named for each; the recommendation was sanctioned, all arrears connected with labor on the section to be first paid. Competent persons were accordingly directed to ascertain what claims were outstanding. Mr. Schrieber being named for sections four and seven, and all the papers in my possession bearing on the claims, were handed over to him. He reported the claims presented to him, the amount, nature of it, and the person presenting claim—returning by mail to me most of the papers I had given him. In the session of '73 the House authorized the payment of the several sums to each contractor subject to claims connected with labor. Mr. Schrieber was again called upon to examine into those on four and seven, which he did with the aid of the contractors interested. Such of the papers as remained with me were again

given to Mr. Schrieber and adjudicated upon by him; the contractors furnishing all the information in their possession. Mr. Schrieber reported in September, classifying the claims under three heads. First—Direct claims, those in connection with work not sub-let. These claims all being assented to by the contractors were by Commissioners recommended to the Council for payment with the suggestion: that, inasmuch as the Commissioners had been told that many of the claims had changed hands at a large discount, only seventy-five per cent of the sums be paid, unless the holders showed that they had paid more. This report was adopted, and nearly all these claims have been settled by Mr. Schrieber or myself. It was certainly a great hardship to poor laborers to be kept out of their earnings four years, but the hardship was increased by the time and labor they spent in seeking payment from contractors, members of Parliament and Commissioners. I know many men who in visits to me at different times travelled in the aggregate hundreds of miles, and it was a great relief and pleasure to me when the matter was in a position to settle with them. Another class of claims were reported by Mr. Schrieber as indirect. Part of the work was by the original contractors sub-let, and the subs being unpaid their laborers also suffered. The claims for labor under these subs, in many cases largely exceeded the balances admitted by the contractors as due from to the subs under the prices of sub-letting. The liability of the sum set apart by the House to labor claims under sub-contractors, being very strongly objected to, the matter was referred to the Council. No decision was conveyed to Commissioners, and no action has been taken in respect to them, and they with the rejected list mainly make up the unpaid claims on section four and seven, not one of which do, or have ever owned, although when the list is brought down, many of them will as I before stated, appear in my name, but from the casues already given. The circumstances attending all these labor claims, certainly make very strongly against the idea of speculating in them apart from other considerations with me; and in looking over the list of rejected claims I found nearly two thousand dollars in my name, so that had I been the owner instead of the medium of presentation, the speculation would have been unprofitable. I am sorry to have troubled the House with this long explanation. I know that holding the position I have had on a work surrounded with so many difficulties, it is not well to appear thin skinned, as almost every week of the year some disappointed parties who may have suffered on the work, but from no fault of the Government or the Commissioners, will urge some complaint. But after what has appeared in the press I desired to make this explanation. I therefore make the motion on the paper.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY rose to a point of order. He did not interpose before, because he believed it had been the universal practice in Parliament, as well as a course in accordance with one's own feelings of what was right to every member who wished to make a statement affecting his own honor and character, to hear him out, and not raise any obstacle to his justification of his own conduct till the forms of the House obliged. This motion could not be entertained, for the reason that there was already a resolution on the journals to the very effect of the motion now proposed, but embracing more particulars; and as the lesser was included in the greater, the pending motion was unnecessary, the other covering the whole ground Therefore he hoped that his hon. friend, having attained the object of his motion, would see fit and be permitted to withdraw it, that the rules of the House might not be violated.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said he had no objection, with the permission of the House, to withdraw his motion.—Withdrawn.

MAIL SERVICE TO P. E ISLAND.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN was understood to enquire if any steps had been taken by the Government, with reference to his motion, of some days ago, touching the establishment of winter mail service between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island? He wanted information with regard to the advertisements for steamboat service, and any tenders for the work.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he had already explained that, in the interest of the public, it was not desirable to bring down the tenders; the Government had not yet decided as to which should be accepted. He had sent for the tenders, and had been answered that, by delaying a few days, it would be possible to bring down the accepted tender. The motion for tenders was granted on the understanding that, till the Government decided what should be accepted, they would not lay the tenders on the table. He had sent for the advertisement, however, which, he would see, was on the table on Monday next.

Hon. Mr. MILLER complained of delay in producing papers ordered.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied, the greatest possible despatch was used, and clerks kept busy in the work. Some papers caused much labor, including applications to every department of the Government.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL moved the second reading of the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Bill, whose main object he briefly explained. He thought the House would admit the desirability of encouraging such enterprises as this one, which not only contributed to the retention in the country of money that would otherwise leave it, but to the attraction of foreign money hither. The general provisions of this bill were of the ordinary character.

The bill was then read a second time and referred.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved the second reading of the Imperial Bank incorporation amendments bill. One object of the bill was to make a change in its name and the other to authorize the increase of its stock.

Second reading.

On motion of Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD, the House then adjourned till Monday at half-past seven p m.

MONDAY, May 4.

The House met at 8 o'clock.

RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT laid on the table returns to an address for the copy of an advertisement for a winter steamer to Prince Edward Island; also an address for copy of all appointments to, and dismissals from office in Prince Edward Island, as well as for petitions and other papers connected therewith since 1st July last; also for a statement of the distribution of the statutes of Canada of last session.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Hon. Mr. ODELL gave notice of motion with respect to the mail service between Halifax and St John, N. B. He said he desired to draw the serious attention of the Government to this motion. He would show bye and bye that the detentions at Halifax ran from 12 to 48 hours. The mails lay at Halifax, not owing to any fault of the Post Office Department, but in consequence of there being but one train a day for St. John. That train leaving in the morning, if the mail arrived at Halifax shortly afterwards, it remained there the whole of that day and night till the next morning. Thus, if a steamer arrived on Saturday afternoon, the mail remained at Halifax all that evening and night, all Sunday and that night, until Monday morning before it could be despatched westward. He hoped the Government would be able, on considering the matter to promise an improvement in this respect.

CRIME OF LIBEL BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. KAULBACH, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the above bill, as amended by the Select Committee, Hon. Mr. Montgomery in the chair.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that one of the chief recommendations of this bill was its intention to assimilate our law as closely as possible to that of England, but he regretted to see an alteration in clause 6, which would render it somewhat dissimilar in one important respect. He did not think it was wise to give further privileges and immunities to the Canadian press than were enjoyed by the English in the application of the criminal law. He thought it desirable also to have the benefit of the decisions of English Courts, of which we might be deprived by altering the original phraseology of this clause. At present the clause would give the accused a wonderful advantage in his defence. When he was allowed to go on and prove the truth of the libel, and its justification on public grounds, it was not right to take away what the English law required, namely, proof of the necessity of the statement of the particular facts which might be complained of as the libel. He, therefore, moved that the clause be amended by re-inserting the words struck out—"and the particular fact or facts by reason whereof it was for the public benefit that the said matters charged should be published."

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH spoke in general terms against the amendment, admitting, however, that he would not take very strong ground on the matter. He thought that every man accused of a criminal offence should have the benefit of every fact likely to turn to his advantage. In some instances the accused, on citing all the facts, might secure his acquittal. It would be hard to deprive him of any testimony or advantage allowed by the spirit of the British law.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that the reason why those words were left out was their omission from the revised

statutes of Upper Canada, which had a law on the subject already. It was thought it would be a pity to alter that law when in reality it was merely extending it by this Bill, over the rest of the country. It was thought, it was better to take it as it stood, than to change it as regards Upper Canada, while the main object was merely to give the other provinces the law of the west. He thought, as the clause now stood, it was more in accordance with criminal pleadings.

The amendment was then put and lost on a division.

The clauses subsequent to 6, as well as those before, having been carried down to the 9th inclusive, a discussion arose on the 10th, which reads as follows:—

"Whenever, upon the trial of any indictment or information for the publication of a defamatory libel, to which a plea of not guilty has been pleaded, evidence is given which establishes a presumptive case of publication against the defendant by the act of any other person, by his authority, the defendant may prove, and if proved it shall be a good defence, that such publication was made without his authority, consent or knowledge, and that such publication did not arise from want of due care or caution on his part."

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN disclaimed any intention of trespassing on the proper and legitimate sphere of the press, but he thought they should be very careful about that clause, and a great many others in the Bill. True, this Bill had been law in England and in Ontario for many years, but the press of England stood in a far higher position than the press of this whole Dominion. It might be quite right to have a law of this kind in that country, without our circumstances justifying it for Canada.

Hon Mr. MILLER here objected to a discussion of the principles of the bill in Committee—it was irregular.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said he was addressing himself to the 10th clause, which contained the gist of the bill. He argued that an editor might escape the consequences of the publication of a libel by attributing it to another person, or pleading his own absence, thus defeating the object of the assailed party in his efforts to obtain justice. Another objection was the absence of any provision declaring that the bill would not apply to any pending cases. Mr. Brook's bill on this subject, before the Lower House, was a better one than this. It, to a very large extent, comprehended this one, properly providing in addition, that no legislative enactment at present, should interfere with the rights or privileges of any person having an action pending for this offence,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the hon. gentleman was mistaken about that bill.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that was a mere matter of detail.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT, in reply to the repetition of Mr. Howlan's objection on this point, repeated that this Bill would not interfere with pending actions or with civil cases.

Hon. Mr. MILLER contended that the 10th clause did not contain the gist of the measure, which was to be found in the clauses defining the crime of libel and the punishment for that crime, and what constituted justification. The bill before the other House was not before them at all, and it was quite enough for them to deal with one at a time. The 10th clause was merely a matter of detail. This bill provided for criminal proceedings for the punishment of libel, leaving still a recourse at civil law. Supposing that the proprietor or editor of a paper happened to be absent, and that a libel found its way into the paper, despite their care, precautions, or instructions, could criminal intent be reasonably imputed? The very foundation of our criminal law was that there should be no criminal punishment where there was no criminal intent. It would be monstrous to punish a man without proof of that intent. The bill was strong enough for him. He was sorry Parliament had not the power to deal with this offence civilly as well as criminally.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN replied that the provision affecting the owner or editor was nothing more than a political scarecrow. After a wronged individual had undergone much trouble and expense in court, the owner or editor might coolly say—"I never wrote the article, but it was written by such a person," who might be a mere man of straw or a carpet-bagger, here to-day and away to-morrow. [Laughter.] This clause might be greatly abused.

Hon. Mr. PENNY was understood to say that, as a member of the press himself, as well as a member of this House, he felt it his duty to reply to some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman from P. E. Island. The hon. gentleman's speech, however, would not he thought convince the House that those who used types should be put out of the pale of the ordinary principle of law. He thought the hon. gentleman would not use the same kind of argument with regard to any important interest other than the press. In

that gentleman's own part of the country, ship-owning was a great industry, and he would like to know whether a shipowner was to be sent to prison as a criminal because his captain had maliciously run down a ship. Let the Canadian press be ever so bad—as bad as the hon. gentleman thought, it was questionable whether its abuses or mistakes could lead to such serious results or calamities as might flow from the improper employment of locomotives on railways or of steamships, and he asked whether the law applied to the owners or managers of such property should not be the same for the proprietors of those mischievous machines—the newspapers. (Hear, hear and laughter) The hon. gentleman said he might not know who the writer of a libel might be, but any one had the means of finding that out, as well in the case of a newspaper as in the case of a captain of a ship which was maliciously employed to do mischief. A short time ago an effort was made to lock up Mr. Brydges, in prison, for something one of his employees did near Quebec, but the thing was decided by the courts to be absurd, as Mr. Brydges was many miles away when the accident happened. His honorable friend, (Mr. Howlan) in a spirit of courtesy to the profession, to which he (Mr. Penny) still belonged, said that among other defects of this very bad Canadian press, the papers here had only one editor, while English newspapers had half a dozen editors. He (Mr. Penny) supposed the newspapers in this country were not as rich as in England; still, there were papers in Canada that had considerably more than one editor to conduct their literary business. If the press here was not as good as in England, it was because our public men were not up to the standard of England. But taking the press of Canada as it stood, he believed that of 100 libels published, not more than one could be traced to the regular editor—the majority came from outsiders. The hon. gentleman opposite, or any one might be slandered by an opponent's paper, and yet the circumstances be such that the editor knew nothing of it. But he would have recourse for all that, and the means of obtaining satisfaction. However, the press was adjudged to be so bad that, while formerly they cut off the ears and noses of literary men as a punishment for libel, it seemed they wished this spirit still continued. The hon. gentleman would confine him to his desk forever, since if he left for a moment, he would be subjected to punishment for the act of his agent. An editor upon this principle could neither come to Parliament, nor, indeed could he go anywhere else, because he did not know what might happen in his absence. The House certainly would not hold him liable for acts done in a place where he was not present, and certainly would not send him to prison for an offence which he had not committed. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN argued the ship case, adduced by the hon. gentleman, was not analagous, because it his captain, with a £12,000 ship ran down one worth £100,000, he, the owner, though thousands of miles off, would be held liable for the loss.

Hon. Mr. PENNY and others—That is in a civil action, not a criminal, when the act could not be traced to you.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said the illustration was without force. He did not desire to be represented as having stated the press of the country was so very bad. What he did say was, that a portion of it was not so good as the English. The fact of 99 in 100 libels being due to others than the editor, constituted a strong argument against the hon. gentleman, and proved that editors and owners of papers ought to be more careful. This House should see that the 99 should not have the unbridled license to libel, which they enjoyed, and would continue to enjoy by the bill. He contended there was no call for this bill, as the press was very leniently dealt with at present by courts and juries.

The discussion was continued by the Hon. Messrs. Miller, Penny, Howlan, Alexander, Kaulbach, Macfarlane, Reesor, Dever, Mr. Kaulbach replying, with the result of the defeat of Mr. Howlan's amendment to strike out the 10th clause—for 11, against 15.

The Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER moved the second reading of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's Mortgages Consolidation Bill. He said it was a permissive Bill, designed to enable the Company to arrange with the various individuals holding mortgages and other securities, and also to enable them to organize a superannuation and provident fund for the officers and servants of the Company. This measure had come from the Commons, where it was well considered by members generally and the law officers of the Crown. It exhibited certain amendments made in the

Commons Committee, and he now intended moving its reference to the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said—I presume there is nothing in this Bill that affects the priority of mortgages or preference investments in the road; nothing to disturb the rights of those mortgages.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—Nothing whatever.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The arrangements of this Bill would have to be approved by the usual number of shareholders, two-thirds. So far as he could see, they had given their acquiescence.

Hon. Mr. RYAN, in reply to the hon. Secretary of State, said that really the shareholders of the road had little or no interest in the present proceedings, their shares being worth very little. It was the bond holders and those who had a right to vote. There was one thing peculiar in this bill; it said two thirds of those entitled to vote, but he believed the bond holders had that right. But the interests of the different security holders might be very various, one class being interested in an opposite direction to another. The proper way to take the views of those interests would be to get the vote by sections, each being asked to declare its mind, the decision to depend upon the majority of each class of security holders. There were preferential claims to be considered. He did not object to the second reading of the bill, making those observations merely to show how necessary it would be in committee to make all proper investigation, and see that the rights of the different security holders were duly protected.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said that was the design of the promoters of the Bill. The very points just referred to were amply discussed by the Committee in the Commons, and would be discussed again by the Senate Committee. His hon. friend would then have an opportunity of dealing with the subject.

Hon. Mr. PENNY put a question as to the manner in which the rights of the holder of £5,000 of Champlain Railway bonds for instance, would be affected by the measure?

Hon. Mr. FERRIER thought that such a person would not be injuriously affected; a number of such parties were interested in this bill, which had been carefully looked into in reference to this point.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that other classes were in the same position. Suppose a man held a quantity of bonds of any class, and did not choose to accept this change, should he be overrun by the majority?

Hon. Mr. FERRIER replied that all those matters could be properly discussed in committee.

Second reading carried, and bill referred.

CAUGHNAWAGA SHIP CANAL.

Hon Mr. PENNY moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons to amend the Caughnawaga Ship Canal Act.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said he believed a bill on the subject of this Canal had been passed in the Legislature, so far back as 1846 or '47, since then repeated bills had been passed and the time for the completion of the work had been repeatedly extended, still no material progress had been made, and the project though much talked off from year to year remained in much the same position as when first spoken off some thirty years ago. He disapproved of these constant extensions of time which led to no result. He did not know how often they had been applied for, but on the last occasion about a year ago, the bill was in the hands of his hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Skead), who on that occasion promised that he would not again bring forward any other proposals for further extension of time. He was glad to see that gentleman had adhered to his resolution and did not bring up the present Bill. He (Mr. Ryan) did not object to a good bill getting a little additional time, when it was absolutely necessary; but he believed now, as always, that this was one of the projects which if undertaken at all, should be in the hands of the Government of the country, it being a link of the great canal system of Canada. If it should be found prudent to make this particular canal, it should be under the control of the Government exclusively. The responsibility should rest with the Government of recommending this work or not. [Hear, hear.] The Bill, besides extending the time of commencement for two years and the time of completion for five years, had a clause for increasing the directors from nine to thirteen, and allowing a large majority of the Board to be aliens, which was important with regard to an undertaking of this sort, which ran to the borders of the neighboring Republic. He really had not had time to enquire whether it was usual that Americans as well as British subjects might become directors under such circumstances.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that this was the usual provision of late years in regard to international works.

Hon. Mr. RYAN observed that the Bill did not say in its preamble anything about the admission of aliens as directors, and was thus, he thought, at variance with this clause. His first objection was that this project had been given time enough. If it was a serious enterprise, or likely to be carried out, it had ample time to recommend itself to those likely or able to carry it out. He was quite hopeless of its being more successful within the next two years or five, than it had been within the last 25 or 30 years. His second and principal ground of objection however, was that this canal belonged to our great system of public works, and if required should be constructed under the responsibility and control of the Government.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD said that after looking at the Bill he thought it was objectionable to give aliens such power in regard to Canadian enterprises. He had no objection to aliens coming into the country and identifying themselves with such enterprises, but in a work of this kind British subjects should be a majority on the Board. He saw by the last clause that it would be sufficient if but three of them were on the Board, which was bad in principle, as the majority of them should be British.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said there were gentlemen in the House, who knew more about this subject than he did, one of whom had had charge of the Bill before now. As this Bill, if nothing had been done, though it was so long before the public, must have been a very innocent bantling. (Laughter) If he was not mistaken, he thought there was a clause in it, enabling the Government to take charge of the canal scheme, whenever they pleased. He thought all parties concerned would be willing to have the Government take it up. [Hear, hear and laughter.]

Hon. Mr. RYAN—I dare say, as it would save a bill of expense.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that if Government would not undertake this work it would be well to allow private persons to do so. All parties agreed that it would be a very valuable improvement, and especially to all the interests of Ottawa. They appreciated the importance of the widest water communication in all directions. A city to be great required not only easy means of getting at it, but of going away from it, for purposes of trade and travel. This project was intended to connect the Ottawa and St. Lawrence with Lake Champlain and the towns and cities of the State of New York, by which the lumber trade of Ottawa would be greatly benefitted. This canal would give a straight cut to New York and other States, without a round about trip by Sorel and the Richelieu.

Hon. Mr RYAN was understood to say that he did not deny the value of such a canal, but that if it were at all to be undertaken, it should be by the Government on their own responsibility. Government should judge whether it was a work likely to be useful to the country, and if so they should take it under their control. He thought it ought to be part of their canal system.

Hon Mr. SKEAD admitted that there was some foundation for the remarks of the Senator for Montreal (Mr. Ryan) as to his promise under certain circumstances not to ask for this Bill again, consequently he had not solicited an extension of the time, but he did not say he would under no circumstances promote the demand, because no public improvement would be of so much benefit to the Ottawa section as the Caughnawaga Canal. It would greatly serve the prairie country and the western part of Ontario also, affording to their produce a short route to the Eastern States. They had no trouble in getting up a large subscription list, millions having been raised on the other side of the line, and U. S. municipalities had also been desirous of contributing to this work. As the chief promoter was a friend of the present Government, he thought it would be well that they should try and make the Government undertake this improvement. In order to attain such a result, he thought it best to leave the bill in the hands of the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Penny), who was also a friend of this Government. He thought that gentleman could urge the bill with more chance of success. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) The canal might be made for two and a half millions, and if the Government undertook the work, he would vote for it, should it be the only vote he would give the Ministry this session. (Laughter.)

The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. SCOTT, the House adjourned at 10 p m., until Tuesday at 3 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 5.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

MAIL SERVICE IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE moved "That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the Contract entered into with Benjamin Blair, for conveyance of Mails between Granville and Wallace, in the County of Cumberland, Nova Scotia, in September, 1873, and subsequently annulled by the Postmaster-General. Also, Copies of all letters, telegrams or other correspondence in reference to such contract and the carriage of the said Mails."

The hon. gentleman said, in explanation, that the mails from Truro to Wallace were carried by a contractor named Blair previous to the opening of the Intercolonial Railway, under a certain agreement. The uncertainty of the time of the opening of the Railway rendered it impossible to effect new contracts for the carriage of the mail, and Blair was requested by the Post Office Department to change his route to the Thompson Station on the Intercolonial. He did so, with the understanding that the mails should subsequently be transferred to the Granville Station, and that a contract would then be entered into at the same rate per mile as he was receiving on his original contract. Blair did carry the mails for two months, when the mails were transferred to Granville, and a formal contract entered into by the Department. This man continued to carry the mails with satisfaction to the public from September, 1873, for some two or three months, when, without any complaint, he was notified by the Department that his contract would be re-let. The fact is the elections were then approaching, when another person by pressing for the contract, induced the Postmaster-General to cancel it in the service or interest of the candidate running for the Government. Blair continued to carry the mails relying upon his contract. At length when he found that the service was re-let, and he was turned out, and dispossessed of his contract, feeling aggrieved, he applied to the Department for redress or recompense for the serious loss he had incurred during the time he had been carrying the mails. He received no redress or satisfaction, his application to the Department not having even elicited a reply.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he had no objection to the motion, but as far as he had been able to gather the facts from Mr. White of the Post Office Department, he found the contract was given out early in September, and not in the usual way of the Department, after advertisements for tenders, but rather in a manner that public opinion had not approved of, for a specific sum agreed upon between an officer in no way authorised to make the contract and Blair. When the subject was brought to the notice of the Post Office Department, Mr. White enquired whether the sum fixed was in excess of fair and reasonable compensation for the work, and he was informed that it was largely in excess of it. He was therefore induced, in the interests of the public, to call for tenders for the service. The result of the application was that one D. Purdy, who was also a carrier on the line with Blair, agreed to do the work for $298, Blair having obtained the large sum of $800. The distance was comparatively short—some 20 odd miles; Blair running a stage-line there, therefore he could not have been at a great outlay in carrying the mails and passengers. The Postmaster-General was not aware that he had gone to any extra expense in carrying the mails, and finding that he had, by an improper act on the part of some officers of the Department, secured rather a good thing, and not on a principle that ought to govern the Department, in the interest of the public it was thought justifiable to recall the contract. Nine tenders were put in for the work, ranging from $298 to $675, none approaching the $800. That of course was the best possible evidence that the amount originally granted to Blair was excessive. If, of course, it appeared that in consequence of this action of the Department Blair had suffered loss, after engaging teams or incurring other outlay, he thought it would constitute a fair claim for compensation, but this House would probably not be prepared to sanction a principle of underhand dealing by an officer of a Department, and particularly when productive of considerable loss to the public.

Hon. Mr. MILLER asked if the services in both cases were precisely the same.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied that they were, but in the first instance there was no public advertisement for tenders.

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE stated that he thought the hon. gentleman was not cognisant of the facts. A distinct contract was made with Blair. All the department did was to change the service from one point to another. Blair took it at the same rate per mile, travelling 40 miles a day for $2.50, which was surely not

extravagant payment. The Secretary of State must be mistaken as to the manner in which the contract was given to Blair, for he [Mr. Macfarlane] held in his hand a letter from Mr. White to him stating that as soon as arrangements could be made, by the direction of the Postmaster, the despatch of the mails would take place, and that the contract had been given him at his present rate of payment. He was told to fill up his papers and forward them as early as possible. He did so, and the contract was signed, not by an unauthorised officer, but at the pure suggestion of the Postmaster himself. His securities were approved of by the Inspector of Post Offices. On the faith of that he entered upon the contract, and continued carrying the mails, for two months before the bargain was broken. So far from being a heavy gainer by the contract, he had lost two horses, during those two months. He knew he was carrying the mails at a severe loss. He had to erect stabling for his horses, the station being in the centre of a wood, and not a building within five or six miles. He had just got equipped and his arrangments completed, relying on the faith of the Government, when he found himself struck down in the interest of Purdy, who had supported the Government.

Hon. Mr. MILLER considered the explanations of the Secretary of State cast a new light on this case. The contract was first given without a regular bargain, and judging from the circumstances of Cumberland, doubtless, without any public notice The whole matter appeared extraordinary in view of the smallness of the demand of the other bidders for the work, several of whom asked much less than $800. He thought the Government bound to deal with this matter, seeing the contract was given without a tender, and could withdraw it, at 3 months, notice. He believed the Government deserved the thanks of the country in the matter.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN suggested the consideration of whether there might not be circumstances warranting the remuneration of Mr. Blair for loss in the first year's performance of the work. The road was not in a finisned state, and the rate per mile might not have compensated him at that time. When the railroad had been opened a year, the route improved, and passengers become more numerous, tenders for the sum named by the Secretary of State might be expected. He believed Blair did lose largely the first year.

After some further remarks from different members the subject dropped, the motion having been agreed to.

LIGHTHOUSES—PRINCE EDWARD.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General for a copy of all papers and minutes of Council relating to the building of lighthouses in Prince Edward Island since the first July last. He said he was one of the delegates who arranged the terms on which Prince Edward Island entered the Union They had been assured it would receive the consideration it was entitled to from the Public Works Department. He complained of a disappointment in this respect, and pointed out the largeness of the ocean traffic which passed the Island, ascending and descending the Gulf, new lines of steamers using the channels of late which should be furnished with sufficient light houses for the protection of the whole trade. At the time of the Union, the Local Government contemplated the extension of the light-house system to the degree required, but they were assured the Dominion Government would see to this improvement. The bargain had not been carried out with the Island, while all that the needed lighthouses would cost would probably not exceed $35,000. He learned the other day from the Secretary of State that it was not contemplated to build more than one of the nine asked for. In all common honesty, they were fairly entitled to those lighthouses, which would be a benefit to the whole trade of the Gulf.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT had no objection to the address moved for, but he thought it could not be argued that it was the intention of the late Government to build all those light-houses immediately. The Island seemed to have got on for a good many years without them, and it was rather extraordinary they should all become necessary since Confederation. It was quite clear from Mr. Mitchell's statement in the other House that the late Government did not contemplate proceeding with them faster than the needs of the Island and the trade required. There would be spent this year on those Island light-houses in building and repairing, $16,000, or one-half the amount the last speaker claimed. There was, therefore, scarcely any ground for the complaint of neglect or breach of faith in the matter. Two new light-houses were to be built, including one at West Cape at a cost of $10,000 or $11,000.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN repeated his complaints as to the Government's short-comings in this matter, insisting upon the right of the Island to all that was promised it. He urged that the repairs of some of the light-houses would have had to be made by the Dominion Government in any case, so that the Island could not be properly credited with them, and advocated different coloured lights from white, employed at other points in the Gulf, with a view to the better protection of vessels.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said it was a most extraordinary position for the hon. gentleman to take—that the erection of those light-houses was a part of the specific terms of union, when there were no such terms in the Act itself. Possibly some private arrangements were made between the delegates and the late Government on this subject, but if so there might be half a dozen other arrangements on as many others, of which Parliament has been kept equally ignorant. True, under the Act admitting the Island, we assumed the duty of erecting light-houses and keeping them in repair, but this was a general and not a specific arrangement, not binding the Government to any particular time.

After a reply from Hon. Mr. Howlan, re-asserting his views and some remarks from Hon. Mr. Montgomery in favour of the new light-houses on the ground of their utility to the whole Gulf trade, as also for a proper system of coloured lights, the motion passed.

PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON presented the third report of the Joint Committee on Printing, and moved that it be considered on Thursday next.—Carried.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved the second reading of the bill respecting the Anglo-Canadian Mortgage and Investment Company, whose provisions he briefly explained.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said he had been struck with several of its provisions which were most extraordinary. As just stated, it authorised companies to commence business upon the payment of ten per cent on the stock; upon that they were authorized to invest their whole capital. The stockholders would be under but a limited liability to the amount of that ten per cent. But some better protection ought to be secured for the public. Another provision—clause 8—enabled the company to charge such commission to the lender or borrower, upon monies invested, as might be agreed upon. So far as that went, it was a complete repeal of the usury laws, or any enactment preventing undue interest. There were limits in the various provinces to the rate of interest imposed, either directly or indirectly; but his hon. friend, while restricting them to the legal interest, had inserted a clause enabling them to take interest indirectly to any amount.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS said he was quite aware of the clauses objected to by his hon. friend but that respecting interest was nothing new, being found in a dozen bills on the statute book. In the first place the arrangement must be made between the parties, but at the same time it would not be contrary to the law as it stood. The Canadian Loan and Agencies Company's Bill was almost word for word with this on the present subject. That association was in successful operation.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY contended that because there had been an irregularity in one or more cases they should not be asked to sanction it in others.

The second reading was carried, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS then moved the second reading of the bill respecting foreign corporations investments in Canada. He said the object of the bill was to get over the difficulties experienced by foreign companies doing business in this country. They wished to enable certain companies incorporated in the States to do business under certain circumstances, such as obtaining a license from the Secretary of State, satisfying him as to their *bona fides*, &c. He read the various clauses, upon which he gave brief explanations; and said that it was desirable to exempt certain companies from the trouble of obtaining special acts of incorporation here. He thought it would not conflict with any act on our statute book.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT asked would it not be best to give Government some discretionary power in the event of companies insolvent or in exceptional circumstances. Surely it would not be right to oblige Government to sanction companies by the issue of a license, unless fully satisfied of their competency to do business. He thought they should have some discretionary power with the view to enquiring as to the solvency of companies.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS replied that it might be desirable for these companies to make a return to the Finance Department,

(Hear, hear, from Mr. Scott) at the same time, although this bill was general in character, he would like it sent to a select committee or one of the standing committees; he was inclined to that on Banking and Commerce. If they thought it desirable that such a provision should be introduced, he had no objection whatever.

The bill was read a second time and referred to Banking and Commerce Committee.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD moved the second reading of the Bill from the Commons respecting the Canadian and Great Northern Telegraph Company. He explained that this was intended to amend the Act of incorporation to which it referred. Its design was to extend the time for the commencement of the works of the Company to three years from the passing of this Bill, and the time for completion to five years therefrom. He thought that as the original Act was granted, and as this amendment did not affect the principle of the Bill, there could be no objection to this measure.—Carried.

THE CRIME OF LIBEL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH moved the House again into Committee on the Bill respecting libel as amended by the Select Committee.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY took the chair.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT, in order to enjoy an opportunity of speaking on the 10th clause of the bill, moved its reconsideration. He said that while strongly in favor of the liberty of the press, he thought this 10th clause took away that security which the public should enjoy in regard to libel, because it did not hold the proprietor or editor responsible, throwing the onus on some party employed by him instead. He deprecated the encouraging of a licentious press. The hon. gentleman related an instance of the difficulty he had experienced in obtaining the correction by a Liverpool paper of an untrue statement to the effect that he had sent a ship to sea in an unseaworthy condition and leaky. The underwriters said they would not hold themselves responsible under the policy, because of the statement made in the *Mail*. The ship sailed in December, and had she been lost, which she was not, it was doubtful if he could have recovered the insurance. It was with the greatest difficulty he could get the proprietor or editor to insert a statement acknowledging that they had made a mistake; and it was only done at length unsatisfactorily. He thought that clause 10 would really relieve a proprietor and editor of responsibility for anything published affecting individual interests.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that in the case put by his honorable friend, a complainant would have his recourse in a civil action against the proprietor. This Bill in no way would affect a civil right while relieving a newspaper proprietor of the consequences of a criminal act under certain circumstances.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said it had been urged as if the argument was unanswerable that it was inconsistent to seek to make a person criminally liable for the act of his employee, in this instance, when in no other instance was he so liable. But it must be recollected that the circumstances of a newspaper publisher put him in a very different position from any other employer. From the very necessity of the thing it was always the will to hold a publisher criminally responsible; there were good reasons for it, while in other matters the employer was criminally liable for the criminal action of his servant. That was one side of the case. It was said a person might have a civil remedy in cases contemplated by this Bill; but if he had failed in a criminal prosecution against a publisher upon the ground that the Act was done without his knowledge, he (Mr. Dickey) would not give much for his civil remedy after that; so it amounted to very little. Yet on the other hand it would not seem exactly fair that a person who was honestly carrying on business of publishing or reporting proceedings, should be made criminally liable for an act unauthorised by him—in his absence perhaps, and without his consent or knowledge—possibly against his orders. It would be a hardship to imprison a man under such circumstances, particularly when he was civilly liable; and a newspaper proprietor was supposed to be a person competent to respond to a civil action. Upon the whole, after discussing the matter over, he had made up his mind to this result. There was a grave difficulty in the question, and a great deal in the views put forth by his hon. friend, with whom to a large extent he sympathised; but at the same time he thought upon a fair consideration of the question, and considering that this law had been in operation for several years, without being objected to, and considering also that the balance of advantage was with the clause he felt disposed to sustain it as reported by the Committee. His views had been

modified so he would not favor the striking out of the clause.

Hon. Mr. REESOR said that in reference to the strong objection made to the clause by the hon. member from P. E. Island (Mr. Howlan), at the last meeting of the Committee, he found that in its law on this subject, a precisely similar provision existed. He was sorry that hon. gentleman was not in his place to hear that the clause of the Island statute was substantially the same as the present; and so far from that law pressing hardly upon the proprietor or publisher of a paper in which a libel appeared, without his knowledge or consent, and when he had used due care and caution to prevent such an injury, the Island Legislature had abolished the feature of criminality altogether. By the last clause of its Act, it was provided that "Proceedings by criminal information for libel are hereby abolished." So there the practice and the law were even more liberal than what was proposed by this bill. He contended the publisher was entitled to, at least, this amount of protection, and that there was no wrong in not holding the publisher criminally liable for libels which others might have slipped into his paper. The 99 in the 100, this majority being outsiders and not publishers, could be proceeded against criminally as well as other perpetrators of criminal acts. Under all other circumstances men were exempt from responsibility for criminal acts done without their privity or consent. The actual offenders, however, were held responsible. Any other principle would be contrary to that of our modern law.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said that the hon. member for P. E. Island (Mr. Howlan) was a member of its Legislature when its little Act was passed. Its last clause even prevented the taking of an action against a private individual.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY objected to these references to the hon. gentleman, who was absent.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said the present Bill should be more agreeable to him than the Island's statutes, as it would restrict the power of the press, and give a man redress against an offending editor, who could now be criminally prosecuted.

The Committee then rose and reported the Bill.

MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER announced that a message had been received from the other House, to inform the Senate of the appointment of a Committee, with the view of facilitating the despatch of business, particularly with reference to Bills which both Houses had to deal with.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT suggested that the subject might be considered to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said that evidently the object was to give the Senate a better opportunity to legislate upon important business, and not to throw all leading measures to the end of the session, and then call on the Senate to deal with them in a manner avoiding the delay of the closing of Parliament. This matter had been discussed in both branches without any satisfactory results. He presumed this was another attempt to secure this House an earlier opportunity of considering those important matters that come before Parliament every session.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SCOTT, the consideration of the message was fixed for to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. FERGUSON, that the Hon. Mr. Wark be placed on the Printing Committee, instead of Hon. Mr. Muirhead.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. SCOTT, the House then adjourned until Wednesday at 3 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 6.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER moved the third reading of the Bill to consolidate the Mortgage and Preference shares of the Grand Trunk Railway Co., and for other purposes. Carried.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, of Kingston, moved the third reading of the bill to amend the Act of the Caughnawaga Canal Company.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER explained some of the amendments made to the bill in Committee. The majority of the directors would have to be British subjects, and residents of this country, and the time for the commencement of the work would be extended three years.—Motion carried.

EXCISE DUTY.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said he rose to this notice to say that he hoped this hon. House would conceive that he wished no remarks of his might be taken as the slightest reflection on any head of Departments, or on the gentleman who so ably fills the important office of Commissioner

of Inland Revenue. His only object was to obtain an intelligent expression of this House in favor of what he conceived to be an improvement in the mode of rendering to this House, and to all who take an interest in the examination of our sources of Excise, an account book of similar easy reference to that of the "Trade and Navigation" of this Dominion, that is to say, under the head of Separate Provinces, detailing the several items, with their quality, &c., &c. He felt this improvement now was wanted, that branch of the Revenue of this country being so important that this coming year he thought it would amount to the astonishing sum of almost six millions of dollars. And this tax or excise being new to the Lower Provinces, they not having even had it before entering into the Confederation, he held it should be made quite plain to them, and all others interested in their examination. And whilst on this subject too, he would ask the permission of this Hon. House to state that a strong feeling of dissatisfaction exists at present in the minds of all parties engaged in trade relations with the excise authorities, and this is to be regretted by thinking, and true friends of this Dominion, since it should be the aim of all parties employed by the country, and paid by the people, to soften and make as acceptable as possible a tax of this growing magnitude, instead of meeting just complaints and grievances by special pleading, if not by boldness, coldness, and obstinate tyrannical views. Again, while on this subject, he might be permitted to point out the unfairness which merchants in the Lower Provinces have to submit to in being compelled to pay excise on quantities of goods they never receive, owing to leakages or other causes, and during a time they had no access to them, the goods all the while having been in Government possession. For instance merchants in the Lower Provinces having to obtain liquors or oil, in bond, from Toronto, and they are constrained to purchase there, owing to the protection form of the present and past tariff and excise—two or five hundred barrels of liquor, or oil, or whisky, in bond, as the case may be, find on their arrival, they are not permitted to have them guaged that they may pay only the duty on the exact quantity received by them. And this seems the more unfair and unreasonable from the fact that the Government had full control of it up to then, and thence they must well know no fault lies with the merchant, Besides it is wrong for the Excise Department and the Government of a country to act more unjustly than any merchant can do, that is to take full pay for that which is short in measure or weight, and that too whilst under their charge and control. Secondly, take duty again on the quantity required in consumption to make up this deficiency, or in other words taking duty again on the same article. He would further remark that the prnciple is unjust, and will yet have to be corrected or amended to satisfy the reasonable and wide-spread hatred to the whole system of the excise as at present collected. In reply again to the hon. member of the Government, he would say that no matter what leakage might occur whilst in bond, the Government could not obtain the duty on leakage if the owner of the goods took the advantage of exporting the goods to any other country, and then bring them back again and enter them at the exact guage. Looking then at all the surroundings he would appeal to the Government, which the people of this country so lately have placed in power, to see that justice shall be done in all cases, and that instead of resisting obstinately, reasonable complaints of business men who have many vexations to contend with, they will try to harmonize matters in such a manner as that contentment may reign through the length and breadth of this Dominion instead of bitterness and hatred, which he knew prevailed to a very large extent against some of the institutions of this country. He would therefore again appeal to the Government and say that it is most desirable that some improvement be made in the mode of levying the excise on liquors moved in bond from one Province to another, and that it is unfair that the merchant of one Province should be compelled to accept the excise established in another Province, unless the quantity on which that excise was established is found to be correct by gauging or otherwise, on arrival at its destination. And further, that gauging should take place in the several Provinces on arrival of the goods at the nearest Port of entry, and duty only levied on net quantity, so as to put merchants purchasing in bond Dominion manufactured articles on equality with those importing from other countries.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he had submitted the motion to Mr. Brunel, Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, and his explanations were entirely satisfactory. He said that so far as it was possible, they complied with the form observed in the making of the trade and navigation returns. The Inland

Revenue returns could not be similar in every respect. There was classification as to Provinces, and the duties received on the various articles were as well defined as possible. In proof of this fact, he referred his hon. friend to the returns for the present year, pages 4 and 5, where he would find a synopsis of the amounts collected on the various articles of which the Inland Revenue Department had charge. The several towns of the different Provinces were specified, with the various and total amounts received, and so forth. At pages 6, 35 and 36, there was detailed information on these subjects, including returns of the amounts of commodities consumed in the manufacture of malt, distillation of spirits. and so on. He thought the hon. gentleman would find the returns as clear and distinct as it was possible to make them. As to the loss on liquors sent from one province to another, spoken of, it must be remembered the bonded system was introduced for the benefit of trade and the entire country, and that the only fair rule was for the Government to fix their charge upon the quantity put into the bounded warehouse. Surely the revenue on the few gallons of liquids lost in their transportation from one place to another, should not be denied the Government. It would be prosperous to expect the Government to follow the article from place to place, ti l it reached its utmost destination or the consumer, before fixing the charge on it. It could not be maintained that the Government should bear the loss from exporation or leakage. This was a matt r solely b. tween the buyer and seller.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT had heard complaints as to the loss from leakage and other causes, on imported liquors. The question was, whether it was desirable to place the importer from a foreign country in a better position than he who, in the Lower Provinces, for example, obtained his liquors from Ontario, from which the greater portion came. The importer from France or Britain paid duty only on the quantity that reached him. But the importer from Ontario had to pay duty on the quantity lost by leakage and otherwise, as well as on that actually received. He argued that there should be no distinction between the treatment of those different importers.

After some remarks from Hon. Messrs. SCOTT and FERRIER, in elucidation of the subject.

Hon. Mr. DEVER, while acknowledging the courtesy and kind feeling with which he had been treated by the Ministers present, objected to the special pleading, so characteristic of Government officers, high and low, on this subject. He expected such an answer as had come from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue—that the Government were accommodating merchants, in placing their goods in the bonding warehouses. He granted it was an accommodation all round. The privilege of putting large quantities of goods in such warehouses was, perhaps, an encouragement to manufacturers to do business in Canada. But while the Government had full control over them, the merchants had none, after they were stored in those establishments at the different ports of entry. Liquor in bond was, of course, not being consumed in the country, while its place was being supplied by other liquors, on which another excise had been collected, which amounted to the Government reveiving the duty twice. If a merchant sold goods and demanded a certain price, he was compelled to give weight and measure, and the Government had no less right to act justly. It was more important that this matter should be considered, that some of the Provinces were separated by a great distance. Home-made commodities should be placed on the same footing, with regard to Government charges, as those imported from abroad. It was only on the quantity actually received by a merchant the duty should be levied. He had no personal interest in this matter, merely speaking in the interest of the community. The losses sustained in this way by some merchants, had driven them from business.

Hon. F. SMITH agreed to some extent with the hon. gentleman but found it very hard to expect all that he required. They had to take either one way or the other of levying the duty. Commodities must be measured in bond or on coming out, the Government could not be expected to follow commodities from place to place to see that nothing was lost—from a distillery in the far West, for example, to New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, for instance. Supposing a barrel lost half its contents on the trip, who was to suffer? Suppose it was stolen by some of the employees on the road, the hon. gentleman would expect the Government to bear the loss. Brandy from France was measured, and if there appeared any more than what the invoice called for, merchants were charged with it. They did not complain, however. One course had to be laid down for a guide, but he feared that advised by the hon. gentleman would be found very troublesome. One thing might be complained of, how-

ever, that all spirits imported from a foreign count y in warm weather would guage much more than were they in a cold cellar for a month or six weeks, but notwithstanding, merchants at Toronto, for instance, had to pay more duty on the spirits received in this hot weather than was justified by the quantity actually received. Warm weather expanded liquor, so that a puncheon of rum would gain four gallons in the heat of summer. Four months afterwards in cool weather, the puncheon, without a drop having been drawn from it by hand would contain four gallons less than when it came to this country. But yet there must be some rule for levying this duty, and he feared, such as favored by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dever) would be more troublesome and annoying than the present.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN thought that this was an excise matter which there was no way of remedying but by the Custom House. He spoke of the loss sustained by the coal oil trade in the matter of leakage, evaporation and excise duty, which had brought ruin upon a good many merchants. The difficulty was not with regard to what came into the country, but with liquid articles produced and consumed in it. There was not so much loss by wines or brandies as by articles like kerosene and petroleum. When the temperature was high, the more spirit there was in liquor, the greater would be the loss. If a thousand barrels of coal oil had to remain 20 days in the year in bond, there would be a loss of 5,000 gallons, or something like 10 per cent. He knew, however, how difficult it was for Government to remedy the consequent grievance. An arrangement might be made between the manufacturer and Government, with regard to allowing a certain per centage for over a hundred gallons or barrels of such liquid shipped.

Hon. Mr. DEVER complained of the manner in which goods were entered in the printed return.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the quantities were to be found on pages 33 and others.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER asked the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, of which he did not see the utility. The annual reports furnished the information he asked for. True, he might desire more details; but, while it might not be convenient to furnish them in print, they might easily be got at the office of the Department concerned, and he had no doubt, this discussion would have a good effect in inducing the Government to look more closely into the system of keeping the accounts and making the returns. It was not always very easy to submit complete returns since many of the branch offices were remote from this centre. Government, however, would try to have them made up in the way best calculated to show the amount and character of the trade in the different Province. The bonding system was designed and calculated to benefit the trade of the country by giving merchants the use of money for the time their commodities were left in bond. The loss of spirits or other liquids in the transit from one Province to another was a question for the seller and buyer. He did not see why the buyer could not deduct money for any loss of quantity. They could not much improve the existing system, or follow liquors all the way from Ontario to the Lower Provinces.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—You have revenue officers below for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER observed that any loss from their neglect would fall on the Dominion revenue. Difficulties would occur in connection with the difference between the return of a quantity entered at one place and that taken out at another.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said the first part of the hon. gentleman's answer was very reasonable, nor did he expect an immediate change of system, but he did hope for a change in the compilation of a new report, and with this expectation he was willing to withdraw the motion. Government had a right to place liquors in bonded warehouses, but the merchants receiving them should not be held liable for any loss. How was it to be made up when these liquors were exported to a foreign country? Why should not the same rule govern liquors brought from the West to the Lower Provinces which governed as to liquors imported from abroad? Government need not follow liquors in transit, but merely place them in bonded cars and leave their officers to look after the rest. They need not charge duty on liquor that had been lost. However, after this discussion, he would withdraw his motion.

CANADIAN MAIL SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Inkerman) in the absence of Hon. Mr. Campbell moved for an address to His Excellency for a copy of the Postmaster General's agreement with Dominion line of steamships, by which they are to carry mails to and from Liverpool to Canadian ports or Portland.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER consenting, the motion was carried.

INTERCOLONIAL.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT laid on the table a statement of the unpaid claims on sections 4 and 7 of the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon Mr. AIKINS moved that the 60th rule of this House which requires that private bills should be affixed in the lobby for one week and one day respectively, be dispensed with during the remainder of the session.—Carried.

LIBEL BILL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH moved the third reading of this Bill as amended in Committee.

Hon. Mr. MILLER wished to present an amendment which would leave the Bill in its original condition, as a faithful copy of the English Act 6th and 7th Victoria. He thought it was not desirable to adhere to the alteration made in the 6th clause. The words he desired to re-insert were: "The particular fact or facts by reason whereof it was for the public benefit that the said matters charged should be published." He approved of this Bill, objecting only to this clause which had been altered by the expunging of the above words. The English Act rendered it necessary not only to show that it was for the public benefit the offensive matter had been published, but to state the particular fact or facts whereby it was for the public benefit the libel should have been published. He thought his amendment to restore the Bill to the condition of the English statue should not be objected to, because they were throwing over the press of a great portion of this country a protection that it had never before enjoyed. He only asked that in extending this protection they should not go further than the English law. Nobody would say our press had a higher claim to consideration than the British. Were our law the same we could have the benefit of all the English decisions and precedents. He concluded by moving the re-insertion of the above words at the 9th line of clause six.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND argued that it would be of great advantage to have our laws on all fours with that of England. He thought no member of the press could find fault with an amount of freedom and privilege equal to that enjoyed in the old country. A publisher should be obliged to show that the libel was designed for the public good and not to gratify private malice. He was strongly of opinion that the Bill should be recommitted for the re-introduction of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that as a representative of the press, in this House, he thought proper to say that as far as the press was concerned there was no very great desire on its part to have the original words struck out. The promoter (Mr. Kaulbach) had shown him the Bill before its introduction and he was perfectly satisfied with its provisions as they stood. He did not think the matter of the amendment of very much consequence. If there was any importance attached to those words, as a newspaper man, he had not the slightest objection to their restoration; but it would be well to remember that in doing so they would be dealing with a law of the largest Province of this country on the subject of libel, which, though not entitled to any further privileges than were enjoyed by the others, contained nearly half the population of the Dominion, and had been living under its Act, passed under the direction of its Attorney General, a good many years. It had been of those codified subsequently, and seemed to have given satisfaction. These were the only grounds on which anybody thought it desirable in committee to alter the clause.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY explained why he had yielded to the desire to expunge in Committee those words from the Bill. It was thought undesirable to have any provision at variance with the Ontario statute, and with the usual form of pleading, which did not require a statement of the facts, but merely the general allegation. He agreed with the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Penny) that the amendment in itself was of little consequence, any further than it affected the Bill's passage.

After some further discussion in which Hon. Messrs. Kaulbach, Dickey, Miller, Scott, Trudel and Reesor, took part, the amendment was put to the vote resulting in a tie, there being 25 for and 25 against. His Honor the Speaker gave his casting vote against the amendment which was consequently lost, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

BRIDGE AT NIAGARA.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company. He explained that the object was to bridge the Niagara between Clifton and Chippewa, at a place called Grand Island. With the completion of this project and another in contemplation by the Great Western Railway Company, there would be six bridges within a distance of thirty miles, over the Niagara, connecting

Canada and the United States—seconded by Hon. Mr. Miller and carried.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Kingston), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY, May 7.

The House met at three o'clock.
After routine.

THIRD READINGS.

The bill to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Bank was reported from Committee, without amendment, and

On motion of Hon. Mr. AIKINS, read a third time.

Hon. M. TRUDEL moved the third reading of the Act to incorporate the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD moved the third reading of the bill to amend the Act respecting the Great Northern Telegraph Company.—Carried.

FIRST READING.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER introduced a bill entitled an Act to amend the charter of the Montreal Credit Company, which was read a first time.

SIX NATION INDIANS.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD, in introducing the motion on the paper, in his name, said he would explain why the New England Company was connected with the address he was about to propose. The Company was founded by an Act of the Tory Parliament, in 1649, and incorporated by Royal Charter in 1661. It was endowed by the Hon. Robert Boyle and several other charitable persons, and also had charter funds. He thought the income was somewhere about £6,000 sterling. The object of the Company originally was to civilize and convert to Christianity the Aboriginal inhabitants of North America, and it was then called the New England Company, because it was supposed that New England comprehended a large portion of the West and Canada. The Company had expended half nearly its income on the reserve of the Six Nations, on the Grand River, and were deeply interested in the good work there undertaken and in progress. The Indians were composed of the six tribes who originally inhabited the Valley of the Mohawk River, State of New York. They adhered to the British cause, and under their celebrated Chief and warrior, Brant, fought for Britain to the end of the war, when the Government of this country gave them a reserve on the Grand River, consisting at the time, of some one hundred thousand acres. Subsequently about half was sold by the Government, the proceeds being funded for the benefit of the Indians. Since that period they had been located on this reserve, under the authority of the Government. In many cases they had cultivated the land tolerably well. They were being educated, and converted to Christianity, principally through the influence of this Company, which had established and had in full operation nine schools, where some 400 children were being educated. They also supported the Mohawk Institution in the vicinity of the town of Brantford, where some 100 Indian children, of both sexes were being educated and taught in manual labour, the males agriculture and the females house-keeping. This company had also with its own funds supported and was now supporting four missions in the locality, and had taken a great deal of interest in the important problem of endeavoring to cilvilize and convert to Christianity the aborigines of the country, and had been to a certain extent very successful. There, for the first time, had he seen the Indian race settled in frame houses of their own construction, cultivating the soil and living in a civilized state, and sending their children to school. It was an experiment being made under the most favorable auspices. The climate was good, the soil unquestionably good; they had also the protection of a kind and liberal Government, and the aid of stringent laws in the protection of their rights, They enjoyed the benefits of the exertions of this benevolent society, which was spending annually £3,000 sterling in the effort to convert and Christianize this race. There were six tribes in the neighborhood including Mohawks, Cayugas, the Onondagas, the Delewares, the Tuskeroras and the Oneidas. He believed there was another tribe on a portion of the reserve, but it did not come within the Six Nations—the Ojjibewas he thought. The object of the motion was to ascertain what was being done with regard to a portion of a lot which was purchased by this company as a labour farm, for the purpose of teaching the Indian children the arts of industry and agriculture. It was obtained from a man named Bakcock who had been in possession of it 15 years. The Company

purchased it 10 years ago and with Babcock's possession had been in peaceable possession for 25 years. It seemed on further enquiry that a portion of the six acres in question had not been granted by the Crown, consequently the title was still in the Crown. The Grand River Navigation Company may have made some claim to this part of the lot, but it did not compose a part of the towing path or canal. The object of the enquiry was to ascertain what the claim of the Town of Brantford was—six acres, which had been so long in the possession of this Company. It formed a part of the reserve, being in the immediate neighbourhood of the Mohawk institution and church which had been built by the Indians when driven from the Valley of the Mohawk, aided by persons who felt an interest in the welfare of those six nations. The church adjacent had been repaired by the friends of the Indians and the Company and in which Divine Service is now held for the benefit of the Indians. If the town took those six acres from the Company, it would have a very injurious effect upon the Indians, inasmuch as the land was in the immediate vicinity of the Institution and Church; and it was supposed that a class would settle on it whose influence would prove prejudicial to the young Indians in the near neighbourhood. He desired to ascertain what the nature of the claim of Brantford was, and to obtain a copy of any Report or information relating thereto from the Local Superintendent Mr. Gilkison, whose exertions on behalf of the Six Nation Indians is entitled to all praise, as also the Government decision on the question. The institution was a most praiseworthy one, and the company was entirely disinterested in its action. They had no personal motive in seeking to hold this land, for which, if necessary, they were willing to pay; but, they felt their work would be injured, their benevolent objects frustrated if Brantford succeeded in obtaining this land. It was a singular circumstance and one which excited his surprise, that notwithstanding all the exertions of this company, the surrounding white element, and the influence of some two-thirds of the now christianized Indians, there were five hundred Pagans still in the heart of that reserve. A mitigation of the fact was that they were not idolators—and he believed the great Iroquois nation were never idolators — they worshipped the Great Spirit. It was most interesting to see those people following the ceremonies and observing the rites of their forefathers in worshipping the Great Spirit. Of course the company were taking every step, by the introduction of schools into every district, with the view and in the hope of converting to Christianity, this singular race of people. He had no doubt, when the attention of the Government was directed to the subject, they would practice the same kind treatment to the Indians which the Governments of Britain and Canada had ever been distinguished for, and which formed such a striking contrast to the policy of the Government of our neighbours towards the Indian races. A good and considerate policy on the part of our own Government would have a most important influence and bearing upon the settlement of the Great North West. No doubt British and Canadian policy in this respect had made a deep impression on the Indians, rendering it much easier to deal with them than could otherwise have been possible. The kind feeling and generous spirit displayed in our treatment of those people would no doubt have a good effect in facilitating treaty and other arrangements between our Government and the Indian tribes of the West. (Hear, hear.) The hon. geutleman concluded by moving the following resolution:—

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a Return showing any claims that may have been made by the authorities of the town of Brantford to a portion of the lot of land near the Mohawk Institution, now in possession of the England Company, in trust for the Six Nations Indians, at the Grand River, Ontario; also a copy of any instructions, if any, from the Indian Branch of the Department of the local Superintendent, Mr. Gilkison, relative to the said lot, with a copy of the report from the said Superintendent, respecting the same, and what decision the Government has arrived at as to the disposal of the said piece of land.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that while cases in dispute were before the Government, he believed it was not usual to bring down papers, but as in this case the dispute had been standing since 1842, this could scarcely be cited as a good reason for refusing them. As he understood it, the lands around were sold for the benefit of the Indians in 1840, subject to certain terms and conditions which had

been referred to arbitration, but the arbitrators' report had never been produced. Since, however, the town of Brantford claimed the land as public property—alongside part of the pier or dock, for the purpose of wharves. The property had stood in that position in the Indian Department from that day till this. Of course it was important that the claim should be decided, and if the case the honorable gentleman brought forward was true in all its details—and he had no doubt it was—it would appear the company has a strong interest in this property. There was no objection to the production of these papers, though he could not say what settlement could be made.

APPOINTMENTS AND DISMISSALS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN rose to submit the motion on the paper in his name which read as follows:—"That he would ask the House to take into consideration a return to an address to His Excellency the Governor General, to cause to be laid before this House a copy of all appointments to and dismissals from office in P. E. Island, as well as a copy of all petitions and other papers connected therewith since 1st July last, and would then move the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this honorable House, it is not in the interest of the good government of this Dominion that any officer of the Civil Service should be dismissed from office unless for either misconduct or incapacity." The hon. gentleman proceeded to say that the papers brought down had not been printed, but that was not his fault. P. E. Island had come into Confederation on 1st July, 1873, when it was necessary in the interests of the public service of the Dominion that several of the Departments should be re-organised, and new appointments made under the new arrangements. These appointments were not made until the following November when we, its representatives, were up here. What we complained of was that without any complaints against the new appointees they were removed from office—not that at that particular time the Government which made those appointments had not a majority in the country at their back, and that therefore the said appointments were not entitled to the credit allowable under other circumstances. It would be remembered the Island was then a portion of the Dominion, and it was necessary the appointments should be made. After July the Custom House officer at Charlottetown had to do all the work, so that in the interest of the public service the appointment had to be made. The appointment had been made by his (Mr. Howlan's) successor and he filled the office with due satisfaction to the department; but without any notice of any incapacity on the part of the official, or of any misconduct in any way, he was removed summarily in January. The particular appointments made in the Island were in the Custom House, Inland Revenue and Post Office Departments. The first difficulty arose when the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue occupied the office. The different appointments were sent direct from the Departments in Ottawa to the offices below. The new officials complied with all the conditions of the acceptance of office. He spoke at present particularly of Messrs. Ferguson and MacNeil both of whom were in the Inland Revenue Office. An officer from Ottawa went down to swear those gentlemen in, but strangely enough on reaching Charlottetown discovered he had not the power. He said in the correspondence that he then applied to the Minister there—Hon. Mr. Laird he supposed—who also probably discovered he had not the power. The matter was then referred to the Department. At this time the gentlemen were in possession of their offices, and the gentleman from Ottawa was to examine them and report. They had handed in their bonds, but he notified them next day that they must not take charge of their offices, though 20 days had elapsed since their appointment. The gentleman who occupied the office for the time then wrote the letter of the 24th November to Mr. Brunell, the assistant head of the Department.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS here suggested that the papers should be printed, to enable members to understand this question in all its branches.

After a brief conversation by several members on the subject,

Hon. Mr. Scott said it was unnecessary as the facts were admitted, and upon them the hon. gentleman proposed to lay down a principle as to such dismissals.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN promised to give the information contained in the papers in the course of his remarks. He continued to say that this was a most important question, involving all the provinces as well as Prince Edward Island. He desired to show there was a necessity, a basis in fact, and justice for a resolution of this kind. After Mr. MacNeil had received office, with all his instructions and preparations, he wrote an answer acknowledging the re-

ceipt of the letter, informing him that the Governor General had been pleased to appoint him Collector of Inland Revenue, &c., and on the 20th of the month he had received a note as follows: "Please do not enter on the duties of District Inspector until further advised." This was certainly strange conduct when viewed in the light of other circumstances detailed in the correspondence. The hon. gentleman continued commenting upon the danger of such conduct. The official from Ottawa travelled all the way to Pictou, stopped two days there and then crossed to Charlottetown before discovering he had not power to administer the oath to a gentleman sometime appointed and ready with all his securities to fulfil the conditions required by his appointment. The strange feature of the case was, however, that the Hon. Mr. Laird was there at the time, doubtless ready to give his advice and to interfere, though not the minister of that particular department. It was a singular coincidence that he was there, and he left the House to draw their own conclusions from it. He next read the narrative of the Ottawa official, including his mention of his consulting Mr. Laird on the occasion. He (Mr. Howlan) could understand his consulting the head of the department in question. A Mr. Nash, connected with the service here at Ottawa, was sent down and remained until the 9th January, when the Government appointed John A. McDonald. The matter had been left in abeyance from November until January, one party thinking that he had the office, and another telling him that he could not get it. This was an extraordinary position to be placed in. Mr. MacNeil assumed office, but the correspondence did not give the letters which passed between him and Mr. Patterson at Ottawa. Mr. Ferguson was an assistant at the same office, and was put through about the same operation as the other. Next we come to the Marine and Fisheries Department. To that office were appointed Mr. John Corbett and Dr. J. T. Jenkins, and it might be surprising that at this moment Mr. Corbett supposed he had got the office. He was appointed on the 13th of October, and dismissed on the 6th of December, but at present he had no knowledge whether he was really dismissed or not. He wrote a letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, having no direct communication with the office. He was one of the best Architects in the Dominion, was every way fit for the position, and could procure security for $40,000 or $50,000 as appears by his letter to the Department. In answer to his note he was informed from the Department—"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, addressed to the Minister of Marine, requesting to be retained as the Inspector of light-houses, and in reply I have to inform you that the matter will be considered." He (Mr. Howlan), presumed the matter was under consideration yet, for to this day he did not know whether he was dismissed or not. He contended that gentleman ought to have been notified of his dismissal, so as to have been able to act in the matter in the way most conducive to his interests. Dr. Jenkins, the medical officer, was appointed on the 18th November, and dismissed the 6th December. Up to the time he left the Island that gentleman was discharging the duties of his office, and supposed he was to be continued therein. His was also probably a case of hardship. The next case was in the Militia Department, which had dismissed Colonel Gray, Adjutant-General, Mr. Freeland, the Paymaster. They were dismissed, but some bright star influenced the fate of those gentlemen, for they were re-instated. This act was done in the dark. but those gentlemen appeared to have some good friends in the Council, for, dismissed one week, they were re-appointed the next. They were a sort of double-barrelled gentlemen, for they were appointed by both Governments, and therefore, must be good officials. In the Custom House, there were only one or two dismissed. Mr. Collector Currie, perhaps owed his luck to his connection with the paper of Mr. Laird, the *Patriot*, of which he was Editor. Mr. McLennan, who was removed, had no charge of misconduct or incapacity brought against him, since he accepted the office on the 4th November; yet he was discharged on the 9th of January. He would necessarily, in the meantime, have given up his private business. He was sober and industrious, and every way qualified for the post, still he had been kept in suspense up till the 9th January. A paper with respect to the dismissal of a man named Costain, being dismissed at Summerside, had not been produced. He was a man 50 years of age, but was suddenly deprived of his little salary. His petition for re-instatement was signed by nearly all the clergymen, bankers and merchants of the place. His successor had been as suddenly and mysteriously appointed as in the other cases. The Auditor-General's department was one of the most important, as they all

knew. The Treasurer of the Island was appointed to that particular office, with an assistant—a young man who had held office under all Governments, useful and very difficult to be done without. He was advised to take the office, and there was no complaint made against him. He was well qualified and experienced, yet he too was removed from office on the 12th January—a particularly unfortunate day for all officials in Prince Edward Island. He (Mr. Howlan) contended that this policy was injudicious and hurtful to the public interest. Those gentlemen dismissed had not received that courtesy and fair play which they were entitled to. It might be answered as a strong argument that Government made those appointments when they were going out of power, but several officers were also appointed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at that particular time, yet he was not aware of their having been treated as the Island officials. It was rumoured in the Island that a clean sweep was going to be made of the offices in the Custom House, Inland Revenue, and Post Office Departments. That would be most unfortunate for the interests of the Dominion, because the system pursued in the Island might be carried out in the other Provinces. The Islanders were a contented people, and small as they were as a community they were not calling for better terms. Their present officials had given entire satisfaction. The Government, if they disturbed the trade of the country by deranging the post office and other public departments would not be acting for the advantage of the country. Before Confederation the Islanders had the unfortunate habit of turning out the officials with the change of Government. [Hear, hear, from Hon. Mr. Scott]. For this and other reasons we advocated Confederation, after which we hoped the practice would cease. He knew it would relieve the leader of the Government to be freed from the necessity of making those changes. In conclusion he said he was strongly opposed to any dismissals from the civil service except for misconduct or incapacity. He thanked hon. gentlemen for the patience and courtesy with which they had heard him, and concluded by proposing the foregoing resolution.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that all would agree that the necessity for placing motions of this kind on the paper had not hitherto existed in Canada. It had been the proud boast of this country that the acts of their predecessors had been recognised by the different Ministries so far as it was possible with any regard to the interest of the public; and he thought that, in this case, when hon. gentlemen heard the facts, they would not imagine this Government had acted in any way unfriendly or improper in regard to P. E. Island, and that it would be seen that the hon. gentleman had scarcely put his enquiries as he should have, in bringing this matter before the House Last year when the question of Confederation was being brought to a focus, Hon. Mr. Laird, then a colleague of one of the leaders of the Local Government, and Mr. Haythorne, visited Ottawa, and came to an agreement with the late Canadian Government, as to the basis upon which the Island should enter the Confederation. We all knew that in carrying out great measures of this kind, in small countries, men were influenced by lofty motives or by small local jealousies. An Anti-Party arose there and a Separate School Party. His own colleague (Mr. Laird) and an hon. gentlemen now a member of this Senate had, however, decided to promote Confederation and, with the hon. Mr. Pope, who was in the Local Government, carried it They appealed to the people, and by cries of one kind or other, persuaded them to agree to union But what did the local minister then do? He was surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Howlan) should not have been frank, ingenuous and straightforward in his statement, and told the circumstances that led to the removals so lately. What did that hon. gentleman and his colleagues do, after the elections? They swept away every civil servant in the Island, who had been a friend of the late or preceding Administration. He (Mr. Scott) believed there had not been three exceptions, and this was the gentleman, forsooth, who came forward in an indignant speech, and recommended a course consistent with that action as the only one that could secure peace and prosperity to the Island? Not only did that hon. gentleman sweep away all the old civil servants, but he, a Minister, himself and colleague, had seized upon two of the best offices in the Local Government. A gentleman who had been Postmaster-General for many years, a man respected by everybody, was dismissed three days before Confederation, the Hon. Mr. Macdonnell, himself taken possession of that office, while the hon. gentleman, here, (Mr. Howlan) despoiled a Mr. Currie of his office, as head of the Customs, three days before Confederation. The indignation of the Island

was raised by this atrocious Act. A leading paper of the Island, spoke the general sentiment, in the occasion. The leading men of the Island presented an address to Mr. Donald Currie, which appeared in the Prince Edward Island *Patriot*.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN.—Written by himself.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT, having read an article strongly condemnatory of Mr Currie's dismissal, in the *Patriot*, continued · The wicked Act of the Federal Government was the replacing of Mr. Currie in his position, sensible of the worth of such an old faithful officer. That a three days' Government could sweep him and many others out of official existence was surprising to us, but those Ministers themselves were borne out of sight by the next tumultuous wave of politics that rolled over the island shortly after. The hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Howlan) lost both his seat and his office. He and his colleague Mr. Macdonnell, knowing their rule would be short, dismissed all the officials, and seized upon the two best offices themselves. He left it to hon. gentlemen to say whether it was in good taste for that hon. gentlemen under such circumstances—whether it was a dignified course to render necessary the recital of the facts he had just made public. That hon. gentleman had been one of the Anti-Confederation men returned, but having attained power, and perceiving it would be beneficial to come into the Union, they turned round and agreed to join the Dominion. He (Mr. Scott) was much gratified that a better light had shone in on them, being averse from attributing to their course in this respect, any but the most honorable motives. He merely alluded to the circumstance to show how it was that the Laird government was so suddenly defeated. Those who brought it into existence afterwards refused to stand by it. When the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Howlan's) administration came into office for the moment, Mr. Laird did not oppose it. He and colleagues said—we have honestly gone into Confederation, and will help you to carry it out, so as to be unanimous—we will not seek to tear down your Cabinet. So they did, and when they were thus acting they appealed to those gentlemen saying, "We are all entering Confederation, and let it be on some broad basis we all can approve of ; let it be carried, and the offices to be given shall be divided fairly between the two parties that each section may be fairly represented." Was not that a just and fair principle proposed by the Laird party? Events so ran that the short-lived Government, that his hon. friend [Mr. Howlan] was connected with, went under. Mr. Laird came here, and in November took part against the Administration of that day, as did also the majority of the members of the House of Commons. A motion of want of confidence was put on the paper on the 26th October, and on the 4th of November following all the appointments were made from one particular party, and on the recommendation of a party in the minority in the Island. After the new Government came into power here, it was represented to them that public opinion would never be satisfied with that condition of things, that it looked upon it as a fraud—the whole transaction as dishonest. We said then that the fair and honest thing was to divide the 28 or 30 offices between the parties equally ; replace as far as possible the gentlemen who had been in office before, and give the new set some of the other offices, leaving them a fair half. That policy he was happy to say had brought peace and contentment to the Island, having met the approbation of the large majority of its people. The hon. gentleman here read an article from one of the Island journals severely censuring the dismissals of the Howlan Government on the ground of cruelty, selfishness, and injustice. After cries of "dispense," he resumed his remarks. He said he would not now discuss whether it was in good taste or proper for a Ministry attacked in the Commons on a vote of want of confidence, and which had to resign on the 5th November should have on the 4th gone into a system of wholesale appointments to gratify a small clique on the Island. So far as the abstract principle went he supposed they had a naked right, but it was one that Governments in this country had not exercised to such a wholesale extent. He was not basing his argument on the prerogative of the Crown or on the right of the Government to advise those appointments, but was taking the broad, fair, manly ground that when a portion of this country was coming into Confederation it was wise and proper—it was the duty of the Administration here to consult the feelings of all parties and make Confederation agreeable to all. It was right that all political bodies, sections and interests should have fair representation. It was on that principle the present Chamber was constituted in 1867, and that the late Ministry proceeded in the treatment of the different parties in the Provinces which had since entered the

Union, so that no party, majority or minority should enjoy a monopoly of the advantages accruing. If we had dimissed all the officers who had been appointed and named others there might have been some cause of complaint. It would have been following the example set by the preceding Local Government itself; but when they simply took back so far as they could, the old officers despoiled improperly a few months before, and supplemented the number by one half from the minority party, they took the course best adopted to soften any hostile feeling in the island, and to make its people appreciate their motives, which were good, and their action, which was intended to promote that harmony and good feeling which should prevail in the Island. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Dr. CARRALL could not agree with the honorable gentleman who had just sat down with regard to these dismissals. In his very able treatment of the subject he had not touched the point at issue. They were asked to vote for a resolution the necessity for which he regretted. It proposed that they should not adopt in future the American principle which had been pursued by the present administration, of dismissing the officials. Whilst he did not stand up to-day as the apologist of the late Government, he desired to severely condemn the action of their successors in the dismissal of those officials. The hon. gentleman here related an instance of the confirmation of the appointment of a gentleman who held office under the Imperial Government. The Duke of Buckingham intended to make out his commission, but before it could be done, the Ministry of which he was a member was succeeded by the Gladstone administration; yet, Earl Granville respected his predecessor's purpose and made out the commission, the person being well qualified. That was the principle acted upon by British Governments with respect to patronage. This spirit should govern out going and in coming administrations in this country. Without defending the conduct of the late Government with respect to appointments, he condemned the present for violation of British practice and precedents. The Secretary of State had said inferentially, that we had nothing to do with the Local differences and prejudices of Colonies coming into the Union. He said "Let us go out of such petty grooves," yet that hon. gentleman, among the first acts of his ministerial life was *particeps criminus* with a colleague in delving into all the vile linen and into all the picayune politics of the little Island before Confederation. He contended that his policy with regard to conciliation, and the wiping out of all the pre-existing littlenesses and pettinesses of the insular politics was more calculated to stir up and perpetuate them. That the hon. gentleman should have allied himself with an Island party and gone into all the old quarrels and difficulties was an additional reason for the censure of this Government. (An ironical cheer from the Hon. Mr. Letellier). He was glad to hear that somebody cheered him. (Laughter). He contended that the Government had been guilty of most unpatriotic action in this matter, and he was told that they were going to perpetrate similar acts. It was his duty to oppose conduct that he believed was not conducive to the interests of the Dominion and which was calculated to disturb the interests and good feeling of the Island, existing in ante-Confederation days.

Hon. Mr MILLER said that the discussion had taken a course he had not quite anticipated. The resolution of the honorable member from Prince Edward Island was of so general a character, that it did not at first appear to him as intended to censure the Government for acts committed since their assumption of office. He had imagined from the course of his honorable friend in not offering a motion of disapproval in regard to any specific case, that the honorable gentleman considered he had no case to justify such a step. But the speech of the honorable mover was very specific in the other direction, and had been altogether confined to certain dismissals in Prince Edward Island; he had hardly said a word in support of his resolution except in relation to those dismissals. In that connection, the motion while on the face of it containing a proposition that by itself he would readily assent to, was clearly intended as a vote of censure. As such, he (Mr. Miller) was not disposed to support it, as he did not believe that the honorable gentleman had made out a case to call for any censure on the administration. When he (Mr. Howlan) had moved for the papers in connection with the recent dismissals of public employees in the colony to which he belonged, he (Mr. Miller) inferred from his remarks that good grounds existed for censuring the acts of which he had complained. From the remarks of the honorable member on that occasion, he had been led to believe that several old and competent public servants had been dismissed without notice or cause of

dismissal assigned; that those men had been sacrificed on purely party grounds, and at the instance, and for the benefit of political partizans. Had such been the case—had it been shown to him that the Government had ruthlessly struck down trustworthy public servants in order to replace them with their own followers or tools, he (Mr. Miller) as an independent member of that House would only be content with a direct vote of censure on such an offence, instead of the general proposition before the Senate. But from the information given by the papers laid on the table, and in the speech of the honorable Secretary of State, as well as from the information otherwise obtained, he could not help coming to the conclusion that the charges the honorable member had made had not been sustained. He had supposed that the honorable gentleman himself had come to the same conclusion, as otherwise he would have proposed a specific censure of the Government. That would have been a more fair and candid course, than the one he had adopted, by which the honorable gentleman endeavored indirectly and by implication to secure a hostile vote against the administration. He (Mr. Miller) was disposed to give the Government fair play, but he did not think that was fair play, therefore he could not go with his honorable friend in support of a motion that under other circumstances, and in the abstract, he would approve of. The appointments of the gentlemen removed had all been made at a time when it was well known that the Government of the day did not possess the confidence of Parliament or the country, and when the Civil Service of Prince Edward Island, as a result of confederation with Canada, as well as all its public affairs, was in a state of transition from the old to the new order of things, and when appointments, as in a period of political revolution, could not properly be either accepted or conferred under the ordinary conditions of tenure. These appointments were made by men who possessed a momentary command of the situation—who improperly used their advantage, and appear to have involved a breach of faith and fair dealing in the peculiar circumstances of the colony at the time. He regretted that the dismissals had been considered necessary even in this view of the case, but he could not consider them unjustifiable, especially after the facts stated by the Secretary of State, that they were absolutely demanded in some instances, to remedy the injustice done to previous incumbents, for which the hon. mover himself was responsible. Had the resolution come before the Senate under different circumstances, he would support it, for he was strongly convinced of its wisdom and justice of the principle it enunciated in relation to the true interests of the state. He trusted the English rule in regard to office-holders, as far as circumstances permitted, would be followed in this country, and thought that it was highly advisable that the members of this House should give expression to their views on the subject, if for no other reason, to strengthen the hands of the Government against undue pressure. Perhaps there never had been a time in Canada within the past quarter of a century when any Administration was more liable to pressure from its supporters for the dismissal of their opponents from office than the present. The party now controlling the affairs of this country had been for a long term of years in the cold shades of opposition, and their opponents had certainly during that period monopolized the public patronage. It might be safely said that three-fourths of that patronage were in the hands of the minority of to-day, while nearly three-fourths of the representation of the country in the popular branch of the Legislature were in the hands of the dominant party. It was for this and other reasons, that he must condemn in the strongest terms the wholesale appointments of the late Government on the eve of their resignation, and when they knew they had lost the confidence of Parliament, as unconstitutional and unjustifiable in the extreme, and not binding on their successors. So, also, was their action in regard to the increase of the salaries of important branches of the Civil Service. He did not mean to say that some appointments could not have been properly made at that time, but they should have been limited by British precedents. His hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Carrall) had said that he only wanted British practice in this country, and asked for an English precedent to justify the late dismissals. In reply, he (Mr. Miller) challenged the hon. gentleman to produce an English precedent to justify the wholesale appointments of the late Government, when they knew they had lost the confidence of Parliament. (Hear.) The appointments of scores of officials in almost every branch of the Public Service that were then made, he believed to be both unprecedented and unconstitutional. It would not be surprising, there-

fore, in view of the position of the whole question, if the party now in power should clamour wildly for the dismissal of their opponents in order to make room for their own friends. As things stood at present, it must be admitted that power and patronage in this Dominion, held relations to each other very unusual and anomalous. Such a state of affairs might never again occur in this country, because, if the present Government held office for a few years, which was not impossible, they would have ample opportunities of doing justice to their friends without inaugurating a vicious system. It depended upon the firmness and justice of the present Government, in the trying position in which they were placed, whether the English rule in regard to non-political office-holders, was to prevail in Canada, or the American system of dismissals on every change of Government, was to take its place. They all knew the position was a very difficult one—more difficult, and peculiar from the facts he had alluded to than any Government of this Dominion may ever again be called upon to face; but the vital interests at stake should nerve the administration to meet it with determination and wisdom. There could be no argument as to the comparative benefits of both systems. The efficiency of the public service should be the first consideration of every Government, although this was not always the case. The Government that make qualifications the test of appointments to office, and good conduct and efficiency the conditions of its tenure, will always secure the best talent for the service of the state. Then there was the inhumanity of dismissing deserving public servants who generally became unfit for other employments, often to make room for favorites or party-hacks with claims of a very questionable description. They wanted no better examples in this matter than England and the United States. In the former, honesty and efficiency was the result of the system there pursued—in the latter, dishonesty and inefficiency were more notorious among their public employees of the class of which he was speaking, than in any other country whose constitutional system he was acquainted with. There the policy of removals from office on every change of rulers had carried competition and incompetency into every department of the public service. An office holder, liable to dismissal in the accession of his political opponents to power, had no incentive to integrity and fidelity in the discharge of his duties, but thought only of making the most of his place while he held it. The system had been condemned by the best of American Statesmen, and had received the strongest condemnation in recent Presidential Messages. But it had obtained such a hold that it was now almost impossible to apply a remedy. President Grant had attempted reform, but it was well known with what result. He trusted this country would profit from that experience, and check the evil in the bud. The executive authority in the United States had been weakened by the encroachments of the legislature on its proper domain, and the latter would not readily give up its advantage The example should warn our executive not to fall into the same mistake, and not submit to undue pressure from its Parliamentary supporters in the distribution of patronage on mere party grounds. While he [Mr. Miller,] admitted that a Government should reward its supporters, and listen to some extent to their advice in appointments to office, he contended that even in such cases qualification and merit, should be indispensable to promotion in the public service. An able American writer on this subject had justly said that "the man who buys outright with his own money his seat in the National Legislature is guilty of an act not more dishonorable to himself, and far less hurtful to the public interests than that which he commits in paying for the same dignity out of the nation's means, at the expense of the nation's future good, by an appointment to office." What should form a sufficient cause for the removal of officials was not a question on which there ought to be much difference of opinion. The resolution of the hon. member mentioned incapacity and misconduct in office, but they might not all agree on what should constitute misconduct. He held that a non-political office-holder should abstain from active interference in political contests—at least, should never make himself a violent partizan. Above all, he should never by such misconduct make himself obnoxious to the Government whose servant he was. Any Government, in his opinion, would be fully justified in dismissing an official who had been guilty of such impropriety. No administration could be expected to retain in its service its open and offensive enemies, but he would not support any administration in compelling a public servant to vote contrary to his convictions on pain of dismissal. That would be a tyranny that all should denounce, for perfect neutrality should be

the right of every official who desired it. (Hear, hear.) He did not, however, consider that the rule should extend to the lowest grades of the public service, such as way post office keepers, &c, whose duties were trifling and salaries insignificant; he did not believe it should be applied to the hosts of petty officials of that description scattered over the country. He thought that those who should be considered within the rule should be disqualified by statute to vote or interfere in elections. This would remove all doubt on the subject, and would, he contended, be a real kindness to the officials themselves. Then no man should complain, if he wished to become a political partizan, and assume an attitude of hostility to the Government, whose subordinate he was, that he could not at the same time be protected as a non-political office holder. Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said that it would be most unfortunate to adopt the policy that to the victors belong the spoils. This, the American system, was in every sense bad. The true system was the British, under which a certain number of officials were, by Act of Parliament, prevented from interfering with politics, or voting, or, if allowed to vote, forbidden to use any political influence for any party. It would be as dangerous, in his judgment, to allow Government officers to go out and canvass for a candidate, as it would be to allow them to canvass against the Government of the day. While he concurred in the abstract proposition brought forward by the hon. gentleman from P. E. Island (Mr. Howlan) he agreed also with a great deal that fell from his honorable friend opposite, (Mr. Miller) including the opinion that the passing of this motion, relative to the dismissals in the Island, would amount to a censure to the Government. He thought, moreover, that a more unconstitutional course could not have been pursued by any Government, than appointing 150 to 200 officials, from the highest to the lowest grade, while a vote of want of confidence was pending over them, and a majority of the people's representatives were opposed to them. He thought this conduct could not meet with the approval of this Chamber. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. AIKINS regretted very much that the papers brought down to the House were not printed. In regard to their contents, he knew nothing. It would have been very much better had the House been put in possession of their contents. He had learned for the first time of some political difficulties with regard to the Island and the Civil Service. He was not before aware that within a few days of Confederation, a number of officials had been swept out of official existence The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Miller). had made use of language on this subject, with reference to the late Federal Government, of the strength of which he hardly seemed to be fully aware. Some of his expressions were unnecessarily strong on this occasion. He took unjustifiable ground in his criticism upon the appointments of that Government, which he (Mr. Aikins) was prepared to defend. [Hear, hear.] He admitted however, that the Government had power to make these appointments. Not a doubt of it.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD—How many did you make?

Hon. Mr. AIKINS said he did not know. If the ground taken by some hon. gentlemen was correct, that the Government had no power to make them. then it was the duty of the present Government to annul them. He would ask his hon. friend opposite if that was the course pursued?

Hon Mr. MILLER replied that he did not say the late Government had not the power to make the appointments, but that the appointment of so many persons under such circumstances, was unconstitutional and unprecedented; but that he did not deny that, within the limits of British precedent. certain appointments might be made by an outgoing Ministry.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Well, if it was unconstitutional, the late Government had no right to make them.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—That did not follow.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—If it was unconstitutional, he hoped the wrong would be remedied. He felt quite satisfied, from the remarks of the Secretary of State, that such was not the intention of the Government. He did not know how many appointments had been decided upon by the late Government, but he stated unhesitatingly that they had a right to make them, and, as made in good faith, it was obligatory to carry them out. Some were of an important character, but if unconstitutional, he did not think that a statesman such as we had at the head of the Government would have sanctioned what was unconstitutional.

Hon. Mr. MILLER objected to the bringing in of the name of his Excellency in a discussion of this kind.

Hon. Mr AIKINS said he did not mention the name of His Excellency.

Hon. Mr. MILLER rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman said the Governor had approved of the appointments, and would not have lent himself to anything of the kind, had they been objectionable. That was an unparliamentary remark.

His Hon. the SPEAKER, having been appealed to, decided it was not in order to use the name of the head of the Government, with regard to the action of the Government.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS replied he would withdraw his remark; but one statement of the hon. gentleman opposite he would deny *in toto*—namely, that the late Government made those appointments after they knew they were in a minority in the other House. To that he would give a distinct denial. As soon as the late Government became aware they had not a majority, they placed their resignation in the hands of His Excellency. With regard to the general question of the objectionableness of introducing the American system, he believed there could be no two opinions. He regretted that this general abstract principle should be brought up in connection with what might be considered a petty political squabble in the Island.

An Hon. MEMBER—Parish politics.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Yes; if there were less of parish politics introduced here, the interests of the Dominion would not be the sufferer. He believed everyone would regret the adoption of the American principle in Canada. At the same time, were it adopted in one case, it would have to be applied in all. It was quite objectionable, under our present system particularly, that an incoming administration should dispense with the services of officials unless for misconduct or incapacity. It was most unfortunate the general question should have come up in this way, mixed up with the local circumstances of the Island. He was not aware, moreover, that the question was to be brought up to-day. If he had been, he would have looked into some of the facts of the case, and, whatever views he might have had, would have, probably, presented them with much more clearness and force than he had exhibited on this occasion. He would vote for the hon. gentleman's motion if he decided to persist in it.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU expressed the surprise he felt at first seeing the notice of a motion of want of confidence in the Government, for it would amount to that, on the paper of the Senate. He had no doubt his hon. friend (Mr. Howlan) merely wanted to evoke a discussion, not intending to press the motion further. Considering the composition and antecedents of the Senate, it would be a most unfortunate thing to place it in a position of expressing want of confidence in a Government possessing an overwhelming majority in the Lower House and country. It had been said that the late Government, of late, appointed their friends, mainly, to the Senate, and that it would not give the existing Government a fair trial. He believed in no such intention, feeling confident that this House would judge of all matters before it in a spirit of independence and justice. He deprecated this motion or such a contingency as a vote of non-confidence in the Government, which would produce a dead-lock of the Houses of Parliament. He understood, moreover, that the hon. mover was not desirous of embarrassing the Government, were such a thing possible, but that he intended giving them a fair trial. His object was probably attained by this discussion, and he would therefore advise him to withdraw his motion.

Hon. Mr KAULBACH was understood to express the opinion that it might be better should the motion not be pushed to a vote, though, on the abstract principle, he would vote for it. He believed the late Island Government made the dismissals complained of under peculiar circumstances, and that the late Federal Government found it necessary to fill the vacancies referred to, and could not be censured therefor. He thought the remark of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Miller) that those appointments were not decent or constitutional, was quite unjustifiable. Precedents might be found for them. He would be sorry they should be made the subject of a party vote.

Hon. Mr DICKEY moved the adjournment of the debate. There was a good deal of business on the paper, which would not otherwise be disposed of.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said he had no objection, but with the consent of the House, he would reply to the Secretary of State, on a future occasion, and show the impropriety of introducing into this discussion the politics of the Island.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—After the hon. gentleman gives his answer, does he intend to withdraw his motion?

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—I will consider the matter after my reply. I should like to know, is it the intention of the Government to remove any more of the officials of the Island?

Hon Mr. LETELLIER—Whenever there shall be a just cause. [Laughter.]

The motion to adjourn the debate was carried.

PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved the adoption of the third report of the Joint Committee on Printing.—Carried.

CAUGHNAWAGA SHIP CANAL.

The House went into Committee for the consideration of the amendments to this bill, reported by the Select Committee.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved that the amendments be now adopted. He explained that it was only in the last clause an amendment had been made, the object of which was to prevent aliens becoming a majority of the directors. He believed that in every other respect the Committee were agreed as to the propriety of the bill, and the proprietors were satisfied with this alteration.—Motion Carried.

The bill was then read a third time on the motion of Hon. Mr. PENNY, seconded by Hon. Mr. BUREAU.

DESPATCH OF BUSINESS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the consideration of the message of the House of Commons, requesting the appointment of a Committee to join the Committee of the Commons, to consider in what way the despatch of business in Parliament may be facilitated. He explained that he allowed the matter to come up in his name rather with the view of eliciting the opinion of the House than of proposing any particular course himself.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said that if the Commons had adopted the same standing order adopted by the Commons in England it would have facilitated the business of Parliament. He said that body had relaxed in several very important particulars the rules with regard to bills, which might not only be imitated in this House but also dispensing with penalties as tolls or fines to a certain extent, which carried out any particular machinery which did not impose a burden upon the people. It struck him that if that principle were adopted by the Commons here, and if they passed the standing orders adopted in England, and relaxed the strict rules which had governed them with regard to bills issuing from the Senate as respects toll, fines, and penalties, many bills might be introduced here not now presentable. He took for granted that the reason for the Commons appointment of a Committee on this subject was to give the Senate a better opportunity of considering the important measures passed during the session. Many coming up at an advanced period could not receive the deliberate consideration they were entitled to. He would approve of the appointment of a committee to meet that of the Commons and ascertain their object. If they could thus accomplish the object of the motion they would expedite the business of Parliament and not defer the discussion of vital measures in the Senate until the last hour of the session.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said he had arrived at pretty much the same conclusion as his hon. friend who had last spoken. To some hon. gentlemen it might appear a sacrifice of dignity on the part of this House to confer with a Committee of the Commons on this subject, but he could not share in that feeling. He could not see any objection to meeting the House of Commons in the approach they had made to a good understanding of the better despatch of the public business. On the contrary he could see some advantages. A leading idea of the Commons was to more evenly distribute the business between the two Houses, which would be a great practical good if it could be effected. There might be another aim, namely, to lessen the amount of business. It was not unlikely that members on both sides of the House might come to approve of narrowing the area of legislation in regard to the matter of private bills. The only way of practically dealing with this subject was by studying the convenience of members by mutual consultation. The difficulty of rejecting a private bill was much increased when it came from the other House. He thought this was a movement they should meet half way.

After some further consideration,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bureau, that the following hon. gentlemen be a Committee:—The Hon. Messrs. Aikins, Botsford, Bureau, Dickey, Dickson, Miller and the mover, to consider whether any facilities can be given for the despatch of business in Parliament, especially in regard to the relations of the two Houses who are to confer with an equal number of members of the House of Commons for the purpose aforesaid, as desired by that House in their message received on Tuesday last.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT doubted the propriety of appointing a Committee. The Senate's rights and privileges were very well defined already. He was ready to surrender any rights or powers for the

privilege of amending measures with regard to imposing penalties or fines.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER thought they could not do otherwise than meet the advance of the Commons courteously. He did not commit himself, however, to the principle enunciated in the motion. The committee could consider the matter more carefully than the House, whose sanction would no doubt be given to its report. He doubted the correctness of the opinion that the changes contemplated would not affect the position of the House. He pointed out the difficulty of the Senate following the precedent of the English House of Lords in the assumption of a portion of the duties of the Lower House, from the different constitution of the Canadian Upper House. He held that the Senate could perform all the work submitted to it without delaying in any way the business of the Commons.

After some remarks from the Hon. Messrs. Ferrier and Aikins, the motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE then moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons to amend the Act incorporating La Banque d'Hochelaga.—Carried.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock until 3 o'clock on Friday.

FRIDAY, May 8.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

The bill entitled an Act to incorporate the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company was reported from the Banking Commerce and Railway Committee, without amendment, and on motion of

Hon. Mr. DICKSON, seconded by Hon. Mr. Seymour, was read a third time and passed.

From the same Committee, Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Kingston) reported the bill to authorize corporations and institutions incorporated without the limits of Canada to lend and invest money therein, with amendments.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS said the amendments were not very important, but they met the views of the Secretary of State. He moved they be adoped.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that this was a bill of an important character. Certain provisions of it were not affected by these amendments. He suggested that the bill with the amendments be left on the table till a future day for further consideration.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER supported this suggestion.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS, consenting, moved that the amendments be considered on Monday next.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Kingston) reported from the Banking Committee the bill to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Mortgage and Investment Company with amendments.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS explained that one of the amendments was to make the qualification for directors the same as for banks. The other was to limit this Act to a period of seven years, and to secure a notice in the Canada and Imperial *Gazettes*, when the organization was effected. He had no objection to letting this bill and its amendments stand over too, if hon. gentlemen desired it.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY thought this a proper course when

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved the consideration of the amendments on Monday next. Carried.

THE BONDING SYSTEM.

The Order of the Day being called for the consideration of Hon Mr. Dever's resolutions on the subject of the desirability of an improved mode of levying excise on liquors moved in bond from one Province to another: He said that inasmuch as the subject of these resolutions was rather in a lengthy manner debated a few days ago under the head of another resolution involving somewhat the same considerations and also being aware that no motion affecting the tariff can pass this honorable House, he now would ask permission to withdraw the same.

There being no objection, the resolutions were withdrawn.

MAIL SERVICE IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH enquired whether the Government intended making any change in the present system and arrangement for the conveyance of passengers and mails on the shore route from Halifax to Yarmouth in furtherance of the prayer of the petitioners from the County of Lunenburg. He described the defects and inconveniences of this mail route and the disappointment the people had felt in the neglect that had taken place for making the necessary improvements. It was hardly safe to travel by the mail. The contractors said they were not obliged to make adequate accommodation for passengers. He wanted to know if any arrangements would be made for the better accommodation of the people.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said Government did not intend to make any change at present, but if anything came to the knowledge of the Postmaster General with regard to serious irregularities in the service, he would endeavour to remedy them. There was no intention to make any material change however.

DETENTION OF NEW BRUNSWICK AND WESTERN MAIS.

Hon. Mr. ODELL on rising to submit his motion on this subject, said he would give some explanations in regard to it Halifax had been the port at which all the mails for British North America originally arrived. Formerly the mails were carried in sailing ships at the expense of the British Government, subsequetly, when ocean steamers were established, a contract for this service was made with the Cunard Company, and he thought that at that time the British Government still paid the whole subsidy. Subsequently the service fell to the Inman Company and afterwards to the Allan Line, which was still running under a contract which he thought was terminable next July. For this contract with the Allan Line, Canada pays a subsidy of $79 083 28, half, or $39,541.64 was contributed by the British Government. Now, Quebec and Ontario were interested in those mails as well as the Maritime Provinces. P. E. Island and the far Western Provinces were also interested in the service. Of course New Brunswick paid her share of the subsidy. Then again Ontario and Quebec were in some degree independent of this service, because another contract had been entered into with the Allans, for running a weekly steamer to Quebec and Montreal in summer, and to Portland in winter. For this service there was an additional subsidy of $126,533.33, a portion of which New Brunswick paid also. But that was not all; the Grand Trunk Railway received a subsidy of $166,000 for carrying the mails. Other railroads, steamboats, stages, &c., were paid the amount of $495 000, making a total for the conveyance of the mails for Ontario and Quebec alone of $662,000, of which New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island were all paying their share. Thus the Lower Provinces bore a portion of the expense of their own mail service, and that of all the other Provinces of the Dominion. Under these circumstances, with those separate mails for Ontario and Quebec, arriving weekly, he might fairly ask whether those Provinces would submit to a delay varying from twelve to forty-eight hours, and averaging on the year a detention of 25 hours each mail. He felt their answer would be a unanimous "no." How was it then that the people of New Brunswick had to submit to this delay in the forwarding of their mails from Halifax? The responsibility fell in no way on the Postmaster at Halifax, who had made strenuous exertions to get the mails off if possible by the first train. If the British Government were keeping troops in New Brunswick as they used to do, would they, paying half the subsidy, submit to a delay of that sort, involving sometimes the arrest of important despatches for 48 hours at Halifax? But that Government was not now affected, as the troops were at Halifax. The hon. gentleman now read a memorandum, showing the delays for the different weeks for the half years, ending June 30th, and December 31st, 1873. This statement showed that mails remained at Halifax from five hours forty minutes to forty-seven hours fifteen minutes. On one single occasion in the year, on the 5th of April, were the mails forwarded without delay, having been detained only 45 min., but the average detention taking the whole year, was 25 hours 14 minutes. Now, they had a continuous railway from Halifax to St. John, N. B., and connection thence by the European and North American, with the United States. This railroad was in fact a Grand Trunk, connecting the Maritime Provinces with the Republic: but it differed from the Grand Trunk of Canada in this respect, that the portion in New Brunswick was paying its working expenses. The other portion had not done so yet but he had no doubt that it would in a short time, with proper management. In building this railway, it was intended to provide for the mail service, and the benefit of the country at large. We desired to facilitate the carriage of passengers and mails over the road. Previous to its construction, we could get a mail from Halifax to St. John, by stage, in about 36 hours. Now, if you take the average detention for the year at Halifax, 25 hours, the train afterwards taking 14 hours for the trip, we could only expect the mails from Halifax at St. John in 39 hours, or three hours more than the old stage system required. When the detention was, as often happened, 48 hours, and you added 14 hours running time, there would be a total of 62 hours, or nearly twice the time formerly occupied by the stage from Halifax to St. John. Now he asked, if he had not made out a clear case of grievance that required redress. What did he ask?

Merely that a remedy should be applied. True, he had suggested the running of a special train on the arrival of the mails, but that was a mere suggestion. The Government could take such other steps as might be necessary to enable the postmaster at Halifax to remedy the present inconvenience. This was purely a departmental affair, requiring no vote or appropriation whatever. All that was necessary was that the Postmaster-General should order an extension of this mail route, which the Post Office Act authorized him to do, and he had a right to ask, and the matter only required to be brought under the notice of the Board of Works under whose management the railway was placed, and the road being government property, required no subsidy. When we handed over this railway to the Dominion of Canada, it had from the time of its completion been paying from twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars a year over and above the working expenses, and now under the present management the portion within New Brunswick was paying $10,000 over and above the expenditure. That was a strong argument for the relief asked. He doubted not, that the portion of the road in Nova Scotia, with better management would pay too. He found in a return to a motion from the member for Westmoreland in reference to special terms and free passes over this road some time ago, that during that year five special trains were run for volunteers and back, making ten, and for the Intercolonial Railway Commissioners eight special trains, and a great number of other special trains for pic nics and pleasure parties, and things of that sort. But the latter he took for granted paid their expenses, those for the volunteers and the Commissioners were of course a charge upon the running expenses of the road. At that time also free passes were given to members of the Provincial Government, the Speaker of the Assembly, the editors of papers, their agents and reporters, officers of and agents of steam lines, railways and telegraph lines, proprietors of stages, railway contractors and engineers, officers and servants of the post office, railway employees and families, superintendents of schools, principals and professors of colleges, &c. (Laughter.) Subsequently the Minister of Public Works requested that passes might be given to members of Parliament, but this had not been done since 1870, according to the report; but he knew instances to the contrary, though the practice had not been general. He understood, however, that a great deal of this free pass indulgence had been put a stop to, but he did not think there had yet been a clean sweep made of the whole system; that was done, until he doubted whether the road would pay. He fully expected that since this matter had been brought before their honors, care would be taken that every possible means was employed to make this road remunerative, which in that case, he was sure it would be very soon. He trusted he need scarcely appeal to the members of Ontario and Quebec to support him in this matter. All he asked was what was just and equitable, and he could not but look forward to receiving from the Government a very satisfactory reply to his motion. He expected they would fully consider the matter with a view to redressing what was clearly a serious grievance, and an absolute inconvenience to the people of New Brunswick. The following was the motion of which he had given notice:

"That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General praying that His Excellency will cause instructions to be given for forwarding by special train, over the Government railway between Halifax and St. John, that portion of the English mail destined for New Brunswick, arriving at Halifax by Allan steamer, or to take such steps as may be necessary to enable the Postmaster at Halifax to remedy the serious inconvenience at present felt by the detention of that mail at Halifax for a period varying from 12 to 58hours, as appears by the returns laid on the table of the House."

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said that the statements made by the honorable gentleman were of a character to call for the immediate attention of the Government. If the facts were as represented, and no doubt that hon. gentleman believed them to be so, the people who suffered these delays had certainly reason to feel annoyed. It was the duty of the Government, moreover, to extend the same advantages to every section of the country. He did not see how the Government could refuse justice in this case any more than in any other. (Hear, hear.) In some of the cases mentioned the delays might have been occasioned by circumstances over which those concerned had no control. For instance, on Sunday the employees in the mail service on the railroad would have left or not be working, no trains running on that day, so that twenty-four hours would elapse before work would be resumed; but it was hard that on days when trains were run-

ning and railway people were on hand, such long delays should take place. This was a question for all the Ministers as well as the Postmaster General, but in one sense it was satisfactory to know that the facts just mentioned concerned events that took place under another *regime* that of the late Government. However, it was possible that a bad example might be followed, and it was well to take precautions against such a contingency. The hon. gentleman might be sure that the present Government would endeavour to avoid the responsibility of such a course, in the interests of the country. No doubt, the free pass system on those Lower Province railways was a very great abuse. Up to this time this Government had given strict orders to terminate it, free passes being prohibited on all the railways. He could not blame the late Government for giving free passes to volunteers who were entitled to them when on duty for the country. In any other case, free passes would be an abuse. The present motion would involve public expense, a matter which he did not care to discuss in this connection, and in regard to which he did not wish to make opposition; it was better to deal with it on its merits. But after consulting with his hon. friend the mover, they had agreed that he should not press his motion, he knowing the willingness of the Government to consider as to a remedy for the grievance in question. He must acknowledge the hon. gentleman's courtesy in the matter.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY confessed that his hon. friend who had proposed the motion had not in any way overstated the facts; but he must acknowledge a little surprise that he had confined his observations entirely to New Brunswick, because his objections to the detention of the mails intended for New Brunswick, at Halifax, applied with equal force to the parts of Nova Scotia outside of Halifax. They all went over the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax, and could go no other way. There was but one mail and passenger train a day from Halifax to St. John. If there was a night as well as a day train, it would meet the difficulty, except when the mail arrived on Sunday morning, when there would necessarily be a detention, which would explain occasional delays on the Intercolonial of 47 hours at present. If the steamer arrived five minutes too late for the train on Saturday, the mails must remain to the Monday following; but if there was a night train on Saturday, only twelve hours need be lost. Besides all these detentions in Halifax, there was a loss of 10 to 12 hours by the detour made by the steamer in calling at St. Johns, Newfoundland. With all those delays, they thought themselves very fortunate in getting their letters from England from 13 to 15 days old. In view of the future importance of Halifax as a starting and receiving point for the European and American trade, it was most desirable to endeavor to avoid all loss of time in the forwarding of mails or passengers. Under present circumstances it was not surprising that the passenger traffic remained almost stationary. The transportation of the mails was not a question of pounds, shillings and pence, but one of public convenience. Why, if it was desirable that the mails should be transported immediately, and if one of the trains did not fit in with the arrival of the steamer, was not a special sent off from Halifax, instead of detaining mails and passengers an average of 25 hours? He hoped the Government would take immediate steps to remedy this inconvenience.

Hon. Mr. WARK thought the mover in this matter [Mr. O'Dell] had laid the people of New Brunswick under an obligation, and the last speaker, equally, the people of Nova Scotia. He urged upon the Government the flattering prospect of a liberal return from the railways connecting New Brunswick with the United States and the West, so soon as a bridge over the River St. John was completed. Both passengers and a subsidy from the States might be expected. The number of through passengers from the United States to get the advantage of the short ocean voyage would be very large. If the Government constructed that bridge, in a few years the return from additional traffic on their own roads would compensate them. He understood some of the companies in the States would be willing to bear a portion of the expense. The present was a favorable time to call the attention of the Government to the subject, because, he believed that the road would not be remunerative, nor perform the service it ought to, till the connection with other roads by that bridge was created. He believed there might then be two steamers a week to Halifax, with plenty for them to do.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said he supposed the postal arrangements were for the convenience of the public mainly. The postal service of the United States occasioned a deficit, and this service was a question for the public and commercial convenience. Otherwise mails would only be carried through the populous districts where

the service would pay. The despatch of a train on the arrival of the ocean mail would cost little more than the fuel as the road, rolling stock and all were owned and the employees paid by the Government.

After some remarks by the Hon. Mr. DICKEY.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said that inasmuch as the leader of the Government expressed doubts as to the regularity of this resolution, he would like to know if it were withdrawn, whether it would be on that ground or on account of the Government's having undertaken to remedy the grievance pointed out?

Hon. Mr ODELL replied that he did not consent to withdraw on the ground that his motion was out of order, but in consequence of a conversation with members of the Government, who met him very cordially, and on the understanding that there should be a conference with the Postmaster-General on the subject, with the view of the discussion of a remedy. (Hear, hear.) He had no intention to reflect in any of his explanations on this Government. After the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, he felt bound to say besides, that he was prepared last session to bring this matter up before the then Government. He had half of the present report, as to the detentions before him, but in consequence of the sudden dissolution he was prevented. He had no doubt, had he done so, the late government would have favorably considered the matter by a remedy. He thanked the present government for the manner in which they had received his motion.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER understood perfectly well what the hon. gentleman stated. The facts the hon. gentleman had adduced related to the responsibility of another *regime*. His remarks in this connection were the inferences of his own judgment, which he had not attributed to the hon. gentleman, and the conclusions were drawn by himself [Mr. Letellier] simply. He did not imagine or pretend that the hon. gentleman's remarks were intended as reflections upon him or the Government to which he belonged.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN [Hopewell] agreed with the gentleman who had spoken before him, as to the serious nature of the present grievance, which he argued the Government would be able to remedy. He was very glad to see that ministers had given an assurance that they would look into the matter. He gave his views on the state of some of the Government railroads in the Lower Provinces, saying the Intercolonial between Halifax and St. John was a fine road, but when placed in better working order, some of the present difficulties in connection with it would promptly disappear. Business would be fostered and developed, which would render two trains a day necessary. He concurred in the opinion as to the great increase of the business of this and other lines, which would follow from their connection with the roads in the United States, by a bridge over the river St John. He believed the Intercolonial R. R. would ultimately be found not unprofiable The pernicious system of passing a multitude over these roads free for some years occasioned a very large item of loss, and if the present Administration made the abolition of the free pass system an absolute rule, they would gain enough to put on an extra train. He had no objection to free passes to volunteers when on public duty, but they should be charged, not against the railway account, but against the Militia Department. The railways should be left to stand on their own foundation, with the receipts set down against the expenditure. The railway from Halifax to St. John was not an incumbus on the Dominion, but one of the most valuable assets brought into the Union.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS thought that the hon. mover of the motion had made out a very strong case which, it was surprising, he had not brought up sooner. He was glad to see that the Government looked on the motion favourably. He would abolish free passes, and believed the order was given with that object by the late Government before its dissolution. The system was inherited by the late government, it being a feature of the old state of things before Confederation.

After some further conversation in which Hon. Messrs. Wark, Aikins, Odell, and Dr. Carrall, participated, without any difference of opinion as to the propriety of remedying the inconvenience which was the subject of the motion,

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD stated, as a matter of fact that when the returns as to Lower Province Railroads were brought down last session, he put a motion on the paper with respect to those free passes, which the leader of the Government here requested him to withdraw because of their having determined to put a stop to that abuse. The hon. gentleman opposite who stated that the free pass system was based on regulations made by the Local Government was entirely correct. If some local Ministers did not ride free, under it, others certainly did.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said the free pass system was inherited in the very initiation of our railroads. The hon gentleman created some merriment by the list of professions and callings which were allowed free passes when he became connected with the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. The system had been abolished lately, only the managers of the different roads passing free over those of each other as a matter of courtesy and on account of the necessity of frequent intercommunication with reference to running and other arrangements.

Hon. Mr MACFARLANE was inclined to think that the free pass system with the Lower Province roads was confined to the narrowest possible limits. He believed that even employees of the road were not able to pass free, unless provided with a certificate from the department that they were such officers enga ed on the roads. Formerly passes were granted to Local Legislators and Ministers. He had always understood that for the last few years local ministers had paid their own fares like members coming here, as they ought to do. He believed these roads were managed at present as economically as possible. The hon. mover had taken a most important step in this matter. The mails should be despatched from Halifax at the earliest possible moment after the steamer arrived. The carrying out of the object of his hon. friend's resolution would confer a great boon, not only on the people of New Brunswick, but on the people of the whole Dominion.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said he felt an interest in this matter in reference to free passes. He was not aware of any free passes having been given for the last three or four years, he had received a free pass for the term of one year, but upon that pass he never travelled. Since that period he was not aware that any free passes had been issued. He, therefore, felt that it was quite unfair to both the present and the past governments to hold them responsible for results, that he was not aware they were guilty of. There was also another point on which he wished to say a word or two with reference to that part of the European and North American Railway between St. John and Shediac, which belonged to N. B. It was well known that with the exception of a break upon a portion of the road, or an incomplete connection between the present depot at St. John and the terminus of the Western Extension at the falls of St. John—there a break or deficiency of connection of about half a mile exists—he held that when that portion of the road was constructed, and the connection made by a bridge across the Falls of St. John, that instead of complaint being continually made, it would be found that that portion of the road would be the best paying work in the country. His conviction was that if that short connection were completed, it would be the finest paying property in the Dominion. So much was he convinced of this, that he had no hesitation in saying if the present Government of the Dominion felt anxious to dispose of it to a company, he would have no hesitation to invest the last dollar he had as a shareholder in such a company, and for the reason that, with the completion to which he referred, it would form a portion of the great highway between New York and Halifax, so that it would not only be the best paying property in the Dominion of Canada, but on this continent. These were his views upon the matter.

The motion was withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD [Toronto], introduced a bill to incorporate the Great North West Railway Company, which was read a first time, and the second reading fixed for Monday.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. ODELL that the Hon. Mr. Aikins be added to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Several members of Committees of which Mr. Aikins was already a member objected to the motion, on the ground that he could not be spared from their Committees, and it was impossible for him to sit on two Committees at one time. As it was very difficult to get a quorum.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS was not aware that his friend was going to make such a motion, and he hoped it would be withdrawn as he was on three Committees already, and it would be impossible for him to attend more.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON was anxious to have Mr. Aikins' services as they would be most valuable on that Committee.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER explained that this was a question which deserved some consideration. He had tried as much as possible in forming Committees to follow the rule that had been followed for years; but a good deal of difficulty was felt in the matter. What he considered the readiest way to get over that difficulty would be for the future to appoint no members on more than two committees, instead of three as at present, and as had been the rule. He thought if that rule were

adopted, there would be a better attendance.

The discussion was proceeding, when

Hon. Mr, BOURINOT said he had just ascertained that a member of the Chamber died about an hour ago. He referred to the Hon. Mr. Churchill whom he had been to see yesterday, and at that time he appeared quite composed and conversed as usual. He thought it his duty to mention the much to be lamented fact now, as no doubt the House would adjourn through respect to his memory, and he would move the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY seconded the motion, and he had no doubt it would meet with a ready response from both sides of the House under the circumstance. The lamentable intelligence took him very much by surprise. He did not now intend to say one word on the subject further than to express his deep regret at the occurrence, and he had no doubt that as a slight mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House would at once adjourn.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON'S motion was then allowed to stand, and the House adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock.

MONDAY, May 11.

The House met at three o'clock.

THE INSOLVENCY LAW.

Hon. Mr. MILLER introduced a bill to continue the Insolvency Act of 1869 and acts amending the same. He said that his object in introducing this bill now, was to test the sense of the House with regard to the intention of dealing with a new bill this session. If the House desired that a new bill should be introduced on the subject this session, and thought they would have time for its discussion before the prorogation, they could say so on the motion for the 3rd reading of his bill. But his opinion was that it was likely they would have more business from the Commons than they could attend to during the time the House would sit. This bill would become law if they could not effect the passage of a new bill until next session.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said that the bill to be introduced by the Government was nearly ready.

Hon. Mr. MILLS said his object in introducing this bill was because he thought the time that would be at the disposal of the House between now and prorogation would not be sufficient to consider the measures to be sent down from the other House, and therefore he thought it important to introduce this bill for the continuance of the Insolvency Act.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER did not see any objection to the introduction of the bill, but he might mention that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a measure on this subject.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL said with respect to this matter, he wished to mention that there was a petition from the Board of Trade of British Columbia, praying for the continuance of the existing local Insolvency Act for that Province. He wished to bring that matter before the attention of the House.

Hon Mr. SCOTT repeated that it was the intention of the Government to submit a bill on the subject.

The bill was then read a first time, and the Hon. Mr. MILLER moved its second reading for Wednesday next, which was carried.

THIRD READINGS.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU reported a bill from the Committee on Banking and Commerce, entitled a bill to amend the Act of the Credit Foncier du Bas Canada, the third reading of which he moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. PENNY.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. PENNY, that the select Committee on Banking and Commerce be discharged from the consideration of Credit Foncier Royal Bill, which will be withdrew.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE reported from the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways, a bill to amend the Act of the Bank de Hochelaga, and moved the third reading of the same.—Carried.

BILLS.

Hon. Mr BUREAU moved for permission to withdraw the bill respecting Credit Foncier Royale.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU next moved the third reading of the Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Banque d'Hochelaga.—Carried.

FIRST READINGS.

Hon. Mr. REESOR introduced an Act to amend the Act 36 Vict., Cap. 40, with reference to the inspection of certain staple articles of Canadian produce.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL introduced an Act to give certain additional powers to the Port Whitby Harbour Company.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL introduced an Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Lower Canadian Investment Association [limited].

WITHDRAWN.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved for leave to withdraw the Railway Companies Telegraph Lines Bill.—Carried.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the Canada and New York Bridge and Tunnel Company, which, he explained, was intended to make only one change—to extend the time for the paying in of subscriptions of stock, one year.

In reply to Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL'S call for further explanation,

Hon. Mr. McMASTER said the original bill was passed two years ago. It provided that a bridge should be constructed over the Niagara, in case such should become necessary. The Company did not now think it was necessary, as they had the use of a bridge at present; but in consequence of a decision of the Court of Chancery, lately, the lease of the Great Western Railway, of this bridge had terminated, the lease being pronounced *ultra vires*. Consequently the Company laboured under the necessity of constructing a new bridge.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The application is therefore that of the Great Western Company, although the bill is called by another name.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER—Yes; that was the name given the bridge; but at the same time the bill was passed in the interest of the Great Western.

Bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved the second reading of the Western Canada Permanent Building Society's change of name bill. Carried.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Charter of the Montreal Credit Company—Carried.

DISMISSALS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY resumed the debate on Hon Mr. Howlan's motion to resolve that, in the opinion of this House it is not in the interest of the good Government of this Dominion, that any officer of the Civil Service should be dismissed from office unless for either misconduct or incapacity. He said the resolution propounded an important principle connected with the administration of affairs in this country, and demanded the serious consideration of the Senate. He abhorred the American system of rotation of office on the change of every Administration, and should deprecate its introduction into this country, a system lamented by some of the wisest and most patriotic American statesmen, and whose results were seen in the corrupt state of a great many official circles in the Republic. Its disadvantages were obvious. Officials holding their situations by so uncertain a tenure, would have a very strong temptation to make the best use of their time and, in every way possible, help themselves at the expense of the country, while their opportunity lasted. Contrast this American tenure of office with that prevailing in England, the country to which Canadians looked for their example in everything great and good. So long as a man conducted himself well and showed efficiency in the mother country, he was quite safe and could keep his office without fear or danger. In England there were three causes of removal, one was called abuser, or abusing one's office by acts of malfeasance; another was non-user, not doing his duty, and which came within the category of incapacity; the third was outright refusal to do his duty. Those, independent of charges of crime, were the main reasons upon which the tenure of office depended in England. Officials there had a right in their employment, and a remedy in the courts to protect them in regard to their tenure of office. His hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Miller) surprised him by stating that custom house officers, and persons connected with the collection and management of customs duties, were prevented from voting in England. He was quite aware that a good many years ago there was an act in force to that effect, the first put on the statute book, being 22nd, Geo. III, about the year 1782; but the very fact of the enactment of such a law proved the existence of the rule that every official had the right to vote. Parliament, in its wisdom, thought proper to restrict the rule in the case of custom house officials, but even that had been swept away for a period of almost six years, the Bill to remove the disabilities of persons connected with the collection and management of the custom house revenues, having been passed in 1868. His hon. friend made another statement, which surprised him, but which was uttered in the heat of debate, and might not have been his deliberate opinion—namely, that office holders, whom he was pleased to call servants of the Government, should not be allowed to vote

against the Government. (Hear, hear, from Hon. Mr. Miller.) The hon. gentleman cheered that sentiment and, it must be taken for granted, still adhered to it. Now it was due to the Ministers who had spoken, to say they had not propounded any such principle, and he confessed that the principle itself was to his mind quite as Un-British as anything that had been advanced by the advocates of the doctrine that to the victors, belong the spoils. Servants of the Government! Why, the Government, themselves, were but public servants; the servants of the country, and every official under them was equally a public servant, and while he did his duty was entitled to the same protection. If an official was merely a Government servant—carry the idea to its logical conclusion—the necessary corollary was, he would be obliged to vote as they wished him. He (Mr. Dickey) failed to recognise any such principle in the British constitution, or system in operation at present. Were they to be told that a man accepting an office, became emasculated and unfit to discharge the duties of a citizen in the country; (Hear, hear.) that he had no free will of his own, and must do just what his masters, the Government of the country for the time being, asked him? (Hear, hear.) He was glad his honorable friends on the Treasury Benches had enunciated no such doctrine which would have partaken of the essence of official tyranny. The difficulty he found with regard to this resolution was that it was an abstract one, against which he certainly could not vote. The honorable mover had not thought proper to carry it to a legitimate conclusion. If he had proposed a resolution to this effect,—Resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government in making these changes or appointments in the Island have contravened this principle, he (Mr. Dickey) could understand the motion. The House should have had something to pass upon. Or, if he had moved a direct vote of censure, in view of the facts of the case, they would have had something tangible. But the resolution before the House was a mere truism as to which there was no controversy. had the members of the Government come down and said—we accept this issue—we challenge the opinion of the House on the doctrine that it is wrong to dismiss except for cause. [Hon. Mr. Letellier: hear, hear]. He should have been prepared to follow his hon. friend, the mover, and in some way to have brought the Government to a trial before this House, and discussed their conduct in regard to these dismissals. But he had not understood the Secretary of State or Minister of Agriculture to endorse that principle. Therefore, he [Mr. Dickey] thought the hon. mover was not in a position to challenge the opinion of the House upon it, and that, on reflection, he would perceive he had attained the object of his motion in the discussion of this question and the production of his statements. Therefore, he put it to that hon. gentleman whether, having gained his object, and placed his facts and views before the country, he should not be satisfied with leaving the matter where it was? He hoped he would, with the leave of the House, withdraw his resolution. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. READ deprecated, strongly, any thought of introducing the American principle of rotation in office. The advent of P. E. Island should not be allowed to create any movement or tendency in this direction. He had thought that one of her great objects in entering the union was to get rid of this practice, which had been found so mischievous during the last twenty years. [Hear, hear.] But we found that this Island having joined us, it was not long before the American principle they had been trying to escape, had been imposed upon them by the present Government. Immediately after the late change of Federal Government, a great many officials of the Island had been dismissed, not for incompetency or misconduct, but for some reason not explained to them but believed by many to be mainly political in character. If such was the case, it was not action in keeping with the views of the people of this country. This principle sanctioned in this instance might be the thin end of the wedge whose action might hereafter lead to the dismissal of our judges. The people of Canada were not prepared for this system. If there was anything they prided themselves upon, it was respect for British principles, precedents, and usuage. Government should make appointments only as vacancies occurred. The hon. gentleman now quoted Todd, and cited a number of the appointments made by the out-going Gladstone Administration, at the time of their resignation, to show the regularity of the course of the late Canadian Government in making the appointments complained of. The Gladstone Ministry had ennobled several members of their Government and promoted others, including the Irish Attorney General, to a lucrative office which they had declared they would dispense

with, and otherwise dispense patronage property. He contended that, till a very late hour, there was nothing to show the Macdonald Government did not possess the confidence of the House and country that they had a right to fill vacant offices, and that their acts were as binding upon their successors as ministerial acts could be. The appointment by Mr. Gladstone, of the Irish Attorney General, to the office of Chief Baron of the Exchequer, at a salary equal to that of the Finance Minister, was a sufficient precedent for any act such as the late Canadian Premier had performed on his retirement (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he would like very much to know the object of this resolution which, as it stood, presented a certain ambiguity. If they looked at it without its preamble or introduction, it seemed like a mere abstract proposition. They might as well vote that the earth was round, or went round the sun as a mere abstract principle with which everybody agreed. If they coupled it with the preamble, they found it amounted to a vote of censure on the Ministry.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—It would be out of order thus, for they could not move a resolution without a preamble.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL said the motion could be amended so as to be made all right.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said there was no condition or preamble in the words of the motion.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said whether there was a preamble or not, at all events, unless there was some cause for it, it was a mere abstract proposition with which all agreed in theory, and which it was quite unnecessary to affirm. If there was an occasion at all for it, it must be the one the hon. gentleman mentioned in his speech, which was the act of the Government upon which this motion would amount to a vote of censure. If they did what was charged, it might be proper to apply that vote, but would it be wise in this House to do so? In what position should they place themselves if they censured a Government sustained by a majority of about 110 in the other House? It seemed to him they would be putting themselves in a very false and ridiculous position, and nobody would care much for their vote of censure, nor would anybody thank them for their pains. He agreed entirely with the opponents of the American system, but it was necessary that those who objected to it in this discussion should be reasonable in this matter. If a Government desired its successors and should adhere to British practice, it was necessary that they should observe the same courtesy and exhibit the same respect for the opinions of others as they demanded from those who were to succeed them. That was not the case, however, in the conduct of the Government that had just gone out of office. It was said the offices were filled up by that Ministry because it was necessary in the public interest, but they had been vacant many months. They were filled up because the Government found it would answer a partizan purpose to make about 150 appointments. He never heard of any English Ministry who, in proportion to the number of offices, made appointments in this wholesale way. They all knew what was the custom in England, namely to make a certain number of peers and provide for a certain number of other adherents as secretaries; but as to making Custom House officers, and postmasters from one end of the country to the other, there was nothing like it in British practice. His hon. friend [Mr. Howlan] had said the present Ministry had seized upon all the offices, while the Secretary of State had shown they had only taken one-half, in accordance with an arrangement made, equally by the party in the Island who had broken it with regard to those appointments. That seemed to meet the objections of the hostile critics of the Federal Government. With regard to the propriety of officers of the Government voting at elections, he should be very sorry to see them limited as to this right as by law; but on the other hand it was perfectly certain that officers would vote, if at all, for the Government of the day; if they did not they could not expect to be continued in office, or if continued, would be under a cloud. He did not think any Ministry in the world would tolerate, or, if they tolerated, would look with an agreeable eye upon a number of officers voting against them. Either these gentlemen were allowed to vote, or they were not; if they were let, they would go for the Ministry of the day. He should very much prefer to make it impossible for them to vote; when they could not vote honestly or impartially, let them stay at home. He agreed entirely with the sentiment of the motion, but as he saw no use for it he would certainly vote against it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he could not but think that the line of argument adopted by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down was, coming from him, a professed Liberal, somewhat unfortunate.

(Hear, hear.) He did not think that this House would be influenced in arriving at a decision upon this or any other motion on such a subject, by considerations of the kind he had just set forth. He had told the House that because the Government had, as he thought, a majority of 110 in another place, therefore this House should not arrive at a certain conclusion on this question. (Hear, hear.) That, he (Mr. Campbell) must confess was to him an inconsequential and anomalous reason, and one somewhat in the nature of an indignity to offer to this House. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that whatever might be the decision of the House, its resolution would be arrived at only from considerations affecting the merits of the question, and not from considerations derived from reasons such as those to which he had alluded. He had not the happiness of hearing the remarks made by his hon. friend, who had charge of the resolution introduced on the previous occasion. He was aware of some of the facts which resulted in the appointments to which attention had been drawn. It might be, as the hon. gentleman had said, that when the late Government were about to leave office, the number of appointments made was large; but with regard to the Island, he did not think that any similar observation could be made. The appointments filled up on the Island grew out of its accession to Confederation; they became necessary on account of the Union. In accordance with the system of responsible Government, the late Government were anxious to take advice from the members of Parliament elected by the Island to the other branch of the Legislature, and to this, upon the subject of those appointments. That was the proper and the usual course for Government to take, and no person, still less no gentleman claiming to be a Liberal could find fault with the Government for taking advice of members elected from the new Province, as to making appointments. In that way delays arose, in consequence of which there was some dissatisfaction; but the appointments were made in accordance with British precedent. It was impossible to argue there was anything unusual in these acts. These offices were filled in a way which reflected no discredit upon the Government in consequence of the incapacity, improper character, or antecedents of the favoured parties. Under these circumstances one would suppose that the appointment would not have been disturbed. They were made strictly in accordance with British precedent and the practice of this country; they were rendered necessary by Confederation, and were made in the ordinary course, having been delayed to almost the last moment for reasons which he trusted every hon. gentleman will accept as sufficient. The moment the new Government attained power, all these appointments but 4 or 5 were disturbed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—About 30 were made and only half were disturbed.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—No, 21 were made and only 4 or 5 were of importance, the others being appointments of officials of inferior rank, appointments which one would have supposed would not have engaged the attention of this or any other Government. They were reversed, not because the late Government was not in a position to make them, according to British usage and precedent, in the regular, ample and complete discharge of all its duties, but because they were not filled by persons friendly to the gentlemen who represent the Island in the Government at the present moment The men appointed had been sacrificed on the principle that "to the victors belong the spoils." He understood that the Secretary of State on a previous occasion disclaimed the principle of turning out officials on account of political bias or antecedents. He would like to draw his attention to a case in Kingston, where a gentleman, holding a commission in the militia, a surgeon of Battery A. at Kingston, was concerned.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Not a commission.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Yes, a surgeon holds a commission; this gentleman held a commission as surgeon unattached, and was appointed to be assistant surgeon to Battery A. He was also, it is true, a physician in private practice. He had been doing duty for something like a year and a half. He choose, in the exercise of his undoubted rights as a subject of Her Majesty, to give his strong support to Sir John A. Macdonald at the recent elections. He voted and canvassed for him, and did all he could for him.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—And perfectly right too.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Yes, and perfectly right. (Hear, hear). What was the result? A few days afterwards he was dismissed. It was hard to say whether he was dismissed from the service at large or from Battery A, because it appeared by the *Gazette* that the services of Assistant-Surgeon Strange were announced as dispensed with, the notice being signed by the Deputy Adjutant-General himself. We had in this instance a gentleman of

merit and high standing, who had discharged his duties in a manner which gave satisfaction to those in command over him, and who held testimonials from the officers commanding the Battery, Colonel French and Major Irwin, with certificates attesting the satisfactory way in which he had discharged his duty to the Battery—and because he voted for Sir John A. Macdonald, his services were dispensed with, although the Secretary of State said he did not believe that officers under the Government should be obliged to vote for them. Yet this gentleman who did not hold an office under the Government in the strict sense of the term, had had the ill-will and vindictiveness of Ministers vented upon him for supporting a candidate opposed to them. He gave that as an instance of the conduct of these gentlemen who talk fair with their lips, but act in a most tyrannical manner against any in their power who chose to oppose them. He differed from the hon. gentleman who had spoken before him, saying that officers of the Government of necessity should vote with the Government. This principle of preventing members of the Civil Service from voting at elections had been departed from in England for the last 20 years, the tendency there having been of late to allow everybody to vote; and when in the spirit of that principle the change was made, enabling Custom House Officers to vote, it was desired to follow up this law to the extent of allowing every one to vote as he pleased.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Did this officer leave his office to canvass?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he had not an office which occupied all his time. He had the most satisfactory certificates as to the ample discharge of all the duties connected with the Battery. He had a right to leave when his duties were discharged; but in spite of his services because he chose to support Sir John A. Macdonald, he was dismissed from his office most cavalierly, not having been able since to obtain, to letter after letter to the Department, more than the mere acknowledgment of their receipt, and the intimation from the Adjutant-General that they would be laid before the Minister of Militia. Without a word of explanation, without an iota of reason, and when in the full exercise of his duty he had been harshly and unjustly dealt with, his dismissal being a most arbitrary and objectionable act. Though he (Mr. Campbell) was a Conservative and a Tory, (hear, hear), he believed he was more liberal than the hon. gentlemen opposite, as he would rather see all the public officers vote, no matter what side they took, than be deprived of the franchise. (Hear, hear). If the hon. mover (Mr. Howlan) saw fit to press the motion to a division, most certainly he should have his vote. He thought that the resolution did not exactly point to the real pith of his hon. friends charge. It said that men were not to be dismissed except for misconduct or incapacity. He supposed that that was such a general proposition that they could all adopt it; the hon. gentleman's real contention was, he thought, that officials should not be dismissed on account of the political course pursued, or in reference to the elections. Whether he pressed his motion or not, he had done good in bringing this matter before the House, and in exposing the course pursued by the Government on the Island—a course arbitrary in the extreme, and which reflected no credit on the Federal Government. Their conduct was tyrannical, and not in consonance with British usage or precedent, but a departure from it for the purpose of giving vent to the ill-will and partizan prejudice of their colleagues in the Island itself. (Hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said that when the Secretary of State spoke the other day of the change of Government in the Island, of the dismissal of the Collector of Customs from office, the hon. gentleman himself having taken the vacancy, he (Mr. Haviland) told him with all courtesy that he was mistaken in the information upon which the speech to this House was founded. (Hear, hear.) It so happened that the Government now in existence in the Island ran a general election in March, 1873, and was sworn into office at the end of April, and that the Collector of Customs was so violent a partizan that he sent in a written resignation of his office to the Clerk of the Executive Government. After that resignation was sent in, he was a mere *locum tenens* till the Hon. Senator was appointed. He remained in that office until the elections took place in the Island to the Federal Parliament, until the remaining vacancies were filled up by the late Government—that of Sir John A. Macdonald—for the Dominion, when they filled this office with a gentleman every way capable by experience, talents and character, and after he had received his commission, and held office four or five weeks, he was dismissed without rhyme or reason, the gentleman who resigned the office in April being put in his place. [Hear, hear]. If there was one thing more than another that made him a

Confederate, it was his desire to get rid of the villanous American system of rotation in office which the Island had been afflicted with from 1851 till it became part of the Dominion. The motto of the successful politicians was *a vae victis*—woe to the vanquished. Every man was turned out with the change of Government, from the Provincial Secretary to the tide-waiter, and as a consequence, on the eve of a general election, the excitement in such a small colony was something tremendous. They had heard the saying—the smaller the pit the more fiercely the rats fight. (Laughter.) On such occasions, that little colony was a hot bed of political excitement, from one end to the other. Every man not in office joined with the opposition, to get the Government out. It was the ins against the outs, without any great political principle at stake. The system worked great evil, and corrupted the political morality of the colony. He did hope when they became part and parcel of the Dominion that, whatever the rule upon which the local offices would be filled up, Dominion offices would be filled on the same principle as in Great Britain. He had cherished this hope till he had learned from bitter experience within the last few months, that the contrary would be the result. He had heard a great deal the other day from the hon. member for Richmond, as to the numerous offices filled by Sir John Macdonald's Government, on the eve of their vacating their seats. As to the Island, however, the vacancies were occasioned by its entering the Union. The whole of the Customs Department passed over to the Dominion, and they had no Inland Revenue Department themselves. The supply of the offices of these departments fell of course to the Dominion. It was the same with the Post Office and other branches. It was a natural consequence of a Cabinet retirement, and a principle enunciated by all constitutional writers, as well as the late Sir Robert Peel, that a Government though resigning might fill up existing vacancies. Suppose the present Federal Government happened to be in a minority on any great question hereafter—(A Member: Which is very unlikely)—he presumed they would take care to fill all the vacancies before handing over their portfolios to their successors. (Hear, hear and a laugh.) He did not think any honorable gentleman could find fault with such conduct. Whether it was desirable that his honorable friend (Mr. Howlan) should press this motion or not, he was unable to say. He had had a declaration from both sides of the House that they all approved of the British principle, that was all he cared for; he would be content to leave things as they were in the Island, provided that the Government for the future would carry out the principle and follow the practice which had grown up in England, and received the tribute of admiration of all lovers of constitutional Government. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN replied at great length to the remarks made in opposition to his motion on Thursday last, particularly those of the Hon. Secretary of State. He commenced by stating that he had always been guided by a strict regard for the truth in any explanations or allegations made before this or any other public body. He repudiated the imputation that he had brought up this motion from factious motives. He said, to the Senate of this Dominion the smaller provinces must look for protection. When the great wave of political passion or change swept over the Dominion, leaving material effects elsewhere, it did not influence the Senate, which was the existing place between the Crown and the people, where right was might, while, in another place, might was right. Taking that view of the matter he thought his duty to obtain for this question of dismissals from office a thorough handling and discussion. He had no desire to embarrass the Government, having resolved to give it a fair trial and assistance reserving to himself the right of ultimate action in accordance with the dictates of duty, and under these circumstances he felt he would have been remiss had he not exposed to the House the reprehensible misuse of patronage and the gross piece of tyranny exhibited by this Government in the treatment of a number of the Prince Edward Island officials. In reply to the Hon. Mr Bureau, he utterly disclaimed any intention of moving a vote of want of confidence in the Government. He would never so far forget his duty as to wish to shake a Government possessing so large a majority in the other House. (Hear hear). He was not dissatisfied with them in all respects; they were doing what he wished from his standpoint. (Hear, hear and a laugh.) And he had no wish to see them going out of office. He protested against that hon. gentleman attributing improper motives to him. He knew the Government were urged by certain representatives from the Island to make other changes, and this discussion would do more to strengthen the hands of the Government, if they chose to resist improper pressue than it could possibly do

to weaken them. He repudiated the idea of desiring anything to weaken them When he brought this matter up, the Secretary of State accused him of misusing his position in this House, but that hon. gentleman, like every lawyer with a bad case, could only abuse the plaintiff's attorney. He had broken the rules of Parliament to read a newspaper article, written by the very person whose own action had placed him outside the P. E. Island Custom House. He [Mr. Howlan] was not going to trouble the Senate with abusive newspaper articles; but if he wanted to do so he might find within the columns of some newspaper not very far from Ottawa some cogent and telling exposures and denunciations of the Hon. Secretary of State himself. He was not going to search the purlieus of political apostacy—(Laughter)—for arguments or accusations against that hon. gentleman, he himself never having played the part of a political apostate. (Renewed laughter.) He had spent 14 years of political life without holding any office, and no friend of his directly or indirectly received any appointment He was not afraid to let his public character stand side by side with that of the hon. gentleman for examination by the light of open day. The hon gentleman went on to denounce the P. E. Island *Patriot* as the worst paper known to the island's history, as devoid of common honesty, and the receptacle of all the filth and slander of the colony. Its proprietor and editor was Mr. David Laird, and it had been condemned by a resolution of the Local Legislature, moved by Hon. Mr. Haviland on 30th May, 1872, for falsehood, by a vote of 14 to 6, in a House containing a majority of the editor's political friends. The hon. gentleman went on to state the circumstances connected with the last local elections and the results by the change of Ministry, and the various dismissals from office, stating emphatically that Mr. Currie upon the success of the party opposed to his own had given up the seals of his office the day after the new Government was sworn in, in accordance with the system of the Island. How that could be called a dismissal no honest man could conceive. He retorted the charge of audacity upon the Hon. Secretary of State. If ever an audacious statement was made by a Cabinet Minister it was the other day, when he had said that one half the officials only were turned out, to make room for an equal number of the opposite party. Had that been so, he (Mr. H.) would never have raised his voice in the matter. Only the rank and file of such offices as in the Custom House, were allowed to remain, so the hon. gentleman's statement was most fallacious.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT objected to the language as too strong. He made the statement on what he believed was proper authority. He was under the impression then, and still, that the Government's action intended the offices should be fairly divided between the two parties. He did not make the statement on his own authority.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said the hon. gentleman erred through ignorance or willfulness, and he could take which horn of the dilemma he chose. This was the true statement. There were twenty-one appointments made, fifteen were dismissed, five retained, and one resigned. The hon. gentleman went on to analyse the list of dismissals, the motives of which he denounced as political hatred and malignancy. He began with the father of the hon. Mr. Pope, and went on to speak of Colonel Gray, who had been without warning or cause, suddenly dispensed with, only two of the Dominion appointments being respected, and concluded by saying he was glad of the apparent disapprobation the exposure of such improper executive conduct had elicited in this House, and much good would be done should it be emphatically rebuked as regards the time to come. He had not acted from fault finding or factious motives in this matter. He knew that every officer throughout the Dominion was looking to this debate to see what the sentiment and action of the Senate would be. Let ministers get up and state that for the future no dismissals would take place except for misconduct or incapacity and he was ready to withdraw the resolution, otherwise he would press it to a division.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the hon. gentleman had thought proper to put a question at the end of his speech to which, before going further, he would reply that it was the opinion of the Ministry that, in the interest of the good Government of the Dominion, no officer of the Civil Service should be dismissed except for misconduct, incapacity or just cause. This he was ready to declare. [Hear, hear, from both sides] And when they saw the debate take the course it had, and his hon friend, a member of the late Ministry (Mr. Campbell), assail the present Government in the most violent way, he felt convinced that hon gentlemen did not remember the manner in which he

and colleagues were treated by the Opposition of a former day. He (Mr. Letellier) could not pay him the compliment of saying that his conduct on this occasion at all resembled that of the late Opposition under similar circumstances. What was the Government accused of? Dismissing persons appointed to office by their predecessors. By whom appointed? By men against whom the great charges were made, and over whom a vote of censure hung for the most serious political offences ever formulated against a Cabinet. They were charged with selling the charter of the great Pacific Railroad of the country, and the evidence was so strong against them that they could not do otherwise than resign; and when the House of Commons and the country had sustained the men who brought those charges, when the accused had lost the confidence and respect of both, they took upon them to dispense the public patronage as if they stood with pure reputations, every way entitled to exercise ministerial power and rights in the matter. No man could have gone to the country and been applauded in saying that a Government under these charges had any reason to dispose of half a million of money by promotions and appointment of persons they would immediately leave behind them, thus exercising an undue patronage. When the new Ministers came into power, the ink was not dry on the commissions of those appointed and promoted, such acts having been performed the very day of the change of Government. He did not comment upon this matter on account of any injury to the new Ministry, but to the interests and morals of the country. It ill became the late Ministers and their friends to come here, after all this, and cast reproaches upon their successors in the manner witnessed. He referred to the sale of the charter for money to corrupt the elections in 1872, and Sir John's telegram—"send me another ten thousand." He defended the action of the present Government, as regards the Island dismissals, stating that the late Government made appointments on the 4th and 5th of November last, though quitting office, themselves, on the 6th. They were kept in them by the Macdonald Government, their situations being the bait for their votes and influence. It was said the Local Government of the Island acted upon the views of the majority, but that majority had sent here a majority of supporters of the Dominion Government. Its action in this matter was not intended to injure any hon. member, but to rebuke and make amends for the improper conduct of the late Government, in taking upon them, while such grave charges hung over them, and a vote of censure by the majority of the Commons was threatened, to make these and other appointments.

A MEMBER—How do you know there was a hostile majority?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied, by the fact of their resignation, and by the great verdict of the electors subsequently. [Hear, hear.] What were the new Government to do? They decided, after consideration, to cancel appointments made after the date of the charges, those whom they thought fit to be re-appointed. They knew it was boasted, at the Opposition caucus on the 7th of November, that patronage was taken out of the hands of the new men in power for ten years. Was it likely or reasonable they should not consider the position, moral and political, of the men who had made those appointments? Were the resigned Ministers in a position to declare that 150 persons should have been named by them to offices, at an expense of a million, when they dared not have asked the House for an appropriation to that amount for the purpose? He contended the Government had just cause for what they had done. As to the complaint of the hon. member for Kingston [Mr. Campbell] about a dismissal, he had not told them that all the officials of the Penitentiary had voted against the candidates supporting the present Government, and actually used the horses of the institution in working for Sir John Macdonald. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he would explain that shortly

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the motion proposed to assert an abstract principle, in no need whatever of affirmation, and therefore, he was the more surprised to see the hon. gentleman from Kingston ready to pronounce in its favour. It would only go on the minutes of the House, and would be like affirming that right was right, or snow was white. The Government, as before said, was quite in favour of the principle of dismissing nobody except for incapacity, misconduct, or just cause. Mr. Gladstone never abused his position, or prostituted the public patronage in the way witnessed on the retirement of the late Canadian Government. A parallel for its conduct would have been the making of 1,500 appointments, and such a scandal would have roused a storm of indignation throughout England. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said, as to the employment of Penitentiary sleighs to convey voters to the polls, he desired to remove a reflection on the very deserving Warden of that institution. He was, on the day of the elections, very much pressed for men, there being not more within the buildings than he had occasion for. On the morning in question, he met all the men in the ante-room and said the elections were going on and they knew he was short-handed, and that those who desired to vote should get the sleighs, in the name of the Deputy Warden and go in them to the polls; the sleighs to take back the men who had voted, in half dozens or so, in order to avoid delay, and enable the officials to return promptly to their places. The sleighs thus went backwards and forwards, carrying the voters of the Penitentiary only, to and fro. They were not employed with any other electors.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—For whom did they vote?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—For Sir John A. Macdonald.

An Hon. MEMBER—And voted right too.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—And voted right. In the Post Office Department, with which he was familiar, there were eleven officials who would all have been delighted to vote for Sir John, but were terrified and frightened out of their desire by reason of intimidation. One voted against the late Premier and the rest absented altogether.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—I do not vouch for the last statement.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I vouch for it.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said that when these appointments were made he was a supporter of the Goverement, but, he did not approve of the policy of the late Government when they made them. He was not consulted on those appointments, and he did not think that a minority of the people's representatives had a right to make them. He thought the hon. gentleman who had moved the resolution had accomplished all that was necessary by the discusion that had taken place, and it would be better for him to withdraw it, but, if he did not, he (Mr. Montgomery) would make a motion himself.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE said that although a number of appointments made in Prince Edward Island had been disturbed, there never was any intention on the part of the Government to adopt any other than the old constitutional English practice. Now he thought the case before the House was neither American nor English. Neither practice had been closely followed out in this instance. With regard to the English practice, it is based on the principle that the Government of the day will look to those officials who are in office for complete information in their several departments; but, he would ask how could Mr. Mackenzie look to those men who were appointed in Prince Edward Island for such information, and who were known to be decided partizans. The case had no parallel with the English system. By all means he was willing to grant that the outgoing Government should take those appointments, which truly belong to them, but here was a case that might never occur again, except Newfoundland came into confederation. He hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his motion, but at any rate, he (Mr. Haythorne) was quite prepared to defend the position which the Government of the day had taken on the question. With regard to what had been said about a statement made by the editor of a newspaper, he might remark that it was quite possible for any man to make a mistake. The vice of making a false statement was the making of it knowing it to be false. When that statement was made in the paper the editor stated what in his opinion was true, but when he found that he was mistaken he made the only reparation in his power by a thorough recantation of the whole matter.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL, who spoke in French, said that after a declaration so satisfactory as that which the Government had made through one of its members, and after the statement of the honorable author of the motion he could conceive no further room for argument, and no reason to continue the debate, nor was it to pursue the discussion he now rose. But he felt it his duty to protest against the proposition announced by the honorable member for Alma—a proposition which would have the effect of lowering the character of this honorable House if admitted by its members. The honorable member had put the question: In case of a vote on the present motion hostile to the Adminisrration, what would be the result of it? and he answered by affirming that such a vote, amounting to a vote of want of confidence would be ridiculous when the Government had a majority of not less than 110 in the Commons. Now, he considered it his duty, as it was the duty of the whole House to protest against such a position, and to repulse it. [Hear, hear.] They must not lose sight of the

fact that they were called by the country to judge of the acts of the Administration, and that they ought to do irrespective of its strength or weakness. When all the details of the Administration were duly submitted to their judgment, when they asked for returns from any branch of the Administration, having reference to any possible fact relating to the public service, when they expressed an opinion on the merits of administrative acts, would there be a single member on the floor of the House who would pretend that they were encroaching upon the privileges of the other House? If, then, they were, in the exercise of their privileges, fulfilling a duty by thus acting, they ought not to pretend that their judgement was of no consequence, even supposing it had no immediate result for or against the Government—that is, though it did not affect its existence. The hon. member for Alma asked what would be the judgment of the House. He answered that it would be the judgment of the highest tribunal in the country—the decision of the highest House in the Dominion. And he held that such a judgment would be of great importance, having the effect of showing to the country the degree of confidence which ought to be imposed in the Administration. If the action of the House had not this importance it was of no utility at all, and the Senate should no longer be part of our political institutions. They should either recognize and appreciate the importance of the Senate or ask for its abolition if they judged it of such minor importance. He might have misunderstood the bearing of the remarks of his hon. friend from Alma, and if so he would be very glad to offer that hon. gentleman, by his present remarks, an opportunity of explaining the whole of his opinion if it had been misrepresented. Now as to those who sat on the Opposition side of the House with himself, when they gave the administration a fair support and when they took care to avoid all action that might have a color of systematic opposition; when they gave the fullest fair play, they did not act so from feebleness, but because they understood they did not allow the slightest tinge of party spirit to enter the Senate. For that moderation and spirit of fairness they wanted to have credit from the Government, and he was sure it would not be withheld.

After a few words of explanation from the Hon. Mr. LETELLIER, the motion was withdrawn, and it being six o'clock the House adjourned until half-past seven o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

BILLS.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons, entitled the Confederation Life Association Amendment Bill. He explained that the financial year of the association closes on the 31st of October, and the annual meeting is held in December; but there was a vast amount of labour to be gone through, and a great deal of time was occupied in making out the financial statement. What was now wanted was power authorising the passing of a by-law to enable the extension of the time for holding the annual meeting in May.

The bill was read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on private bills.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved the consideration of the amendments of the Select Committee on Banking to [Bill I] foreign corporations investment in Canada bills. He said that it was unnecessary for him to explain the amendments, and all he had to do was to move that they be confirmed.

The bill was re-committed on the motion of the Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the amendments of the Committee on Banking on the Anglo-Canadian Mortgage and Investment Bill, Hon. Mr. Botsford in the Chair; but after a long discussion the Committee rose and reported no new amendments, and the bill was recommitted.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Toronto), moved that the order for the second reading of the Great Northwest Railway Company Bill be discharged to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved that the time limited for receiving private bills be extended to Wednesday, the 20th instant.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Hon. Mr. RYAN gave notice of his intention to ask on Wednesday next, whether it is the intention of the Government during the present session of Parliament, to introduce a measure, having for its object the repeal of the 78th subsection of the 29th section of Act 29 Vic. cap. 57 of the Statutes of the late Province of Canada, or by other means to prevent as far as practicable, the recurrence of the

serious losses, injury and inconvenience to the trade and commerce of the St. Lawrence, in consequence of the stoppage of ice and the formation of an ice bridge within the harbour of Quebec.

PETITION.

A petition was received from Sir Hugh Allan, and others, praying for the construction of a railway bridge across the river Ottawa, so as to form a communication between the city of Ottawa and Hull.

A great number of bills from the Commons were read a first time, and

The House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

TUESDAY, May 12, 1874.

The House met to-day at three o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

After routine,

Hon. Mr. McMASTER moved the third reading of a Bill to extend the time allowed for the paying of subscriptions of stock in the Canada and New York Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. FRÉRIER moved the third reading of a Bill entitled an Act to amend the charter of the Montreal Credit Company.—Carried.

P. E. ISLAND DISMISSALS.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND gave notice that he would move on Thursday, for copies of despatches from the Administrator of the Government of P. E. Island to His Excellency, and other papers on the subject of the resignation of Stanislaus F. Perry, Speaker and member of the Legislative Assembly.

CONSTITUTION OF THE SENATE.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he gave notice of a motion on this subject some time ago, under the impression that certain proceedings would have been taken in another branch of the Legislature. He now knew they had not occurred, nor were they likely, this session. He would therefore drop his motion.

MESSAGE.

A message was received from the Commons, asking that the Senate allow the Hon. Mr. Letellier to be called to attend and give evidence before the Select Standing Committee on Public Works.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bureau, that a message be sent to the Commons to acquaint that House that the Senate did give leave to the Hon Mr. Letellier, to attend and give evidence before the Committee on Public Works, if he sees fit.—Carried.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER moved the second reading of the bill, from the Commons, entitled the Collin's Bay Rafting and Forwarding Bill. He explained the objects of the Company interested, which included the forwarding of rafts from Collin's Bay, in Ontario, to Quebec and other places, and the construction and chartering of tug boats and foreign vessels, and the doing of such other things as might be necessary in the forwarding business. The capital was $100,000, power being asked to increase it to one million, if required. The bill contained all the usual provisions, and might be amended in the proper committee, if necessary.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL asked if this bill should not properly originate in the Legislature of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL asked what clause of the Bill necessitated its coming here. The bill appeared, on a hasty examination, to be one that should be dealt with by Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER explained it was of the character of Bills often passed at Ottawa, and one reason for its being brought here was that the operations of the Company would extend over two Provinces, Ontario and Quebec, and foreign countries beside.

A long conversational discussion ensued on the inexpediency of touching private Bills or measures that fairly belonged to the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. Several members urged great care and strict regularity in the matter, in which the smaller and weaker Provinces had a particular interest.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER replied that the Bill came to him from the Commons, and might be amended in Committee. In certain cases a Company incorporated simply by the Legislature of its own Province might not be able to get its rights in another.—Motion agreed to, and Bill referred.

Hon. Mr. PERRY moved the second reading of the Bill from the Commons, to incorporate the London and Canada Bank. He was understood to say the Bank would have an office in Toronto also; that its capital would be five millions of dollars, the amount to be paid up before commencing operations being $500,000.—Seconded by Hon. Mr. Reesor, and carried.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons to incorporate the Lochiel, Hawkesbury and L'Original Junction Railway Company.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons, to incorporate the Marine Insurance Co.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons, respecting the International Transportation Association—Carried.

The House then adjourned during pleasure, pending the arrival of bills from the Lower House and, afterwards at six o'clock adjurned till to-morrow at three.

WEDNESDAY, May 13th, 1874.

THIRD READINGS.

The House met to-day at three o'clock.

After routine,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved concurrence in the amendments made in Committee to the bill entitled An Act to authorise Corporations and Institutions incorporated within the limits of Canada, to lend and invest money therein.—Carried.

On motion of the hon. gentleman, the bill was then read a third time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. PENNY the bill to incorporate the Maritime Insurance Co., reported from the Committee on Banking and Commerce with amendments, was referred back to it for reconsideration.

The bill to incorporate the Lochiel, Hawkesbury and L'Orignal Junction Railway Co., reported with amendments, was, on motion of Hon. Mr. BUREAU, read a third time.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved the adoption of the amendments to the Anglo Canadian Mortgage and Investment Co, reported by the Committee.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY pointed out objectionable provisions as regards the matter of the jurisdiction of the House and other subjects. The bill asked for unlimited borrowing powers, while affording the public but little security in the shape of only ten per cent of a paid-up capital.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS said the hon. gentleman entirely misunderstood the bill, which asked only power for the Company to act as an agent for others in the business of borrowing and lending money. Bills of a similar character had been passed in this House.

After some discussion, Hon. Mr. AIKINS yielding to a suggestion of Hon. Mr. Campbell, consented to changes in the bill, for which purpose he moved its immediate reference to Committee of the Whole. Carried.

The bill, as amended, was then read a third time.

On motion of Hon Mr. PERRY, the bill to incorporate the London and Canada Bank, amended in Committee, was read a third time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. McMASTER the bill to amend the Act incorporating the Confederation Life Association, with amendments, was read a third time.

FREE POSTAL DELIVERY.

Hon. Mr. READ moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a return of the places where letters and other mail matter are delivered free, the number of letters and other mail matter so delivered in each place, the number of persons employed in delivery in each place, and the cost of such delivery respectively, from the 30th June, 1872, to the 1st July, 1873.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the Government had no objection to the return asked, but it would involve a large amount of work, which could hardly result in producing the report by the end of the session. He suggested whether the hon. gentleman should not be satisfied if he could, by enquiry at the Postmaster General's Department, gain all the information he wanted, without requiring a written return. If verbal replies were insufficient, the return might afterwards be brought down.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL suggested the alteration of the motion, so as to make it ask for a list of the places where letters were delivered free, without adding the numbers of letters and the persons employed. The list of places and cost of delivery could be ascertained from papers at the Post Office Department without much trouble. The places of free delivery were Halifax and St. John. Some time ago it was in contemplation to establish free delivery in other cities, but the late Government found that for Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton and the other cities it would have cost $30,000 to $50,000, therefore it was deemed best to postpone it. Nevertheless, if the expense could be borne, he thought free delivery would be an improvement.

Hon. Mr. READ adopted the suggestion to strike out of his motion the words "the number of letters and other mail matter

so delivered in each place, the number of persons employed in delivery in each place."—Motion agreed to,

STEAM SERVICE BETWEEN QUEENSTOWN AND HALIFAX.

Hon. Mr. ODELL said he did not desire to move for the address of which he had given notice on this subject, but merely to call the attention of the Government, and, through them, that of the Postmaster to the existing contract for carrying the mails from Queenstown to Halifax. He thought it was terminable on the 1st July, and he hoped and desired that no new contract should be so loosely drawn as the existing one, but that such conditions should be inserted in the new one as stood in the contract for the line between Liverpool, Quebec and Portland. It was extraordinary that there was no limit whatever in the existing contract, to the length of the voyage, and it was under these circumstances, he thought, that some of the difficulties alluded to on a former occasion, with regard to the delays of the mail service, had arisen. He had another object—to endeavour to accelerate the voyages, and get rid of the delays complained of. In the contract with the Liverpool and Quebec steamers there was a limit laid down, or a fixed time for the voyage, though he considered it was too long. But as to the other line of steamers, as already remarked, there was none whatever. The following was the motion, which he read only for the purpose of attracting the attention of the Government to this important matter:—

That in connection with the return of the voyages of the Ocean Steamers conveying mails from Queenstown to Halifax laid before the House on the 22nd April, and the resolution for an address in referrence to the forwarding of the English Mails from Halifax to St. John, New Brunswick, under consideration on the 8th instant, the attention of the Postmaster General be requested to the existing Ocean Mail contract for the service between Queenstown and Halifax, terminable on the 1st July next, with a view to accelerate the delivery of mails at Halifax, and thus avoid in a great measure the delay in forwarding mails thence, there being no condition whatever in the present contract requiring the voyage to be performed within any given period, nor any penalty for non-performance of contract—and that his attention be also called to the necessity of having provisions inserted in any new contract similar in effect to Nos. 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 26, contained in that for the like service between Liverpool, Quebec and Portland.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the attention of the Postmaster had been given to the matter. He was not in a position to state the reason of the difference between the contracts with the respectivellines. He was not aware of any necessity for the discrepancy, moreover; but he did know the Postmaster General was willing to consider and deal with this matter in the way thought most advantageous to the public.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that so far as he remembered, the contract for the mail service from Halifax to Liverpool was taken up after it had been abandoned by the Imperial Post Office Department or Government. The old papers were followed, the contract language original y used being again employed in the contract between the steamship company and the Postmaster of the Dominion. Whether it was necessary to insert any of those clauses referred to as existing in the contract with the Allan's, he did not know. He [Mr. Campbell] did not concur with his hon. friend that it was desirable either in the interest of the Post Office Department or of the public, to press the mail service, in order to gain a little time. He thought experience had shown it was better and safer not to press it. Though the contract with the owners of the Quebec and Liverpool steamers required a shorter time than some other lines were granted, yet they were excused for delays and trifling failures, and during all the time he was in the Post Office Department, there never was a single instance of any important neglect. The service had been performed by the Allan's in a manner which, he thought, everybody would say he was satisfactory, and by ships that reflected credit on the Dominion, and compared favorably with those of any other line. He thought there could have been no better service nor ships. Nor had he heard of any delays of a nature to occasion complaint. With the exception of a charge as to the 'Prussian's' having a short supply of coal, or coal of an inferior quality, on a voyage last season, and which was not sustained, he had never heard any complaint made of the Allan line, and he had heard none as to the passages between Halifax and Liverpool. He thought his hon. friend should seriously consider whether it was advisable to press these ships. He believed they might rely on the interest their owners had in making good passages for safe and speedy travel. He thought

the trips were made as quickly as the country required. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. ODELL replied, saying he had not the slightest desire to press these ships. There was a provision guarding the public in times of risk, making an allowance for loss of time on occasions of fog, ice and so forth, so far as the Quebec and Liverpool line was concerned. He did not find fault with caution and delay under such circumstances. The hon. gentleman was mistaken in supposing there had been the same class of ships plying between Liverpool and Halifax, as between Liverpool and Quebec. There had been now and then an interchange, but only when the ships from Queenstown to Halifax had made such long passages as to be unable to take the mails off in time. As a rule they were not the same kind of ships as those of the Quebec and Liverpool line. Had the steamers of the slower line been faster, or run without unusual pressing, the mails might often have been landed at Halifax in time for the western train on Saturdays, thus avoiding 48 hours delay. It often happened the steamers did not arrive at Halifax by the Tuesday, so that people were unable to answer their letters by the next mail. He hoped that, whatever contract Government made, would be fair to the public as well as the authorities.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said the limit to time was not for the purpose of forcing ships to wear themselves out or endanger the lives of passengers, but to prevent their being loaded down with freight. That was the trouble with regard to steamers running to Halifax. As the great difficulty with steamers, when not restricted to limited time for their voyages, was the temptation to take freight as long as they could put it on, at the same time he admitted the Allan Line had performed the voyages to Halifax reasonably well, there having been the utmost care exhibited. He thought, however, that was a reason for inserting provisions in the contract of the other line to Halifax, similar to that of the Allan contract.

SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS AND DISEASE IN OTTAWA.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said he thought it would be admitted that the subjects to which he asked to call the attention of the Senate by the notices that he had put on the paper was one of considerable importance to Parliament. It would be recollected that since Parliament met in Ottawa they had had a good many cases of sickness and death prevailing among members of Parliament, and some of these deaths arose from diseases which, if proper precaution had been taken would not have taken place. Within four years three members of the Dominion Parliament had been seized with that loathsome disease—small-pox; and he thought if reasonable precaution had been taken for the prevention of that loathsome disease this would not have taken place. There were other diseases prevailing which might be attended to. There was a want of proper sanitary regulations, in the city of Ottawa as well as the imperfect ventilation of the Parliament Buildings. Now, under the circumstances he thought this a subject which deserved the consideration of the Government of the country. The sanitary condition of Ottawa, it must be obvious to every member who was brought here to discharge a public duty was very unsatisfactory. The state of the streets and of the drains in the town was such that the atmosphere must be unhealthy. The streets were allowed to remain uncleaned until they dried, and then the dust that filled the atmosphere, with no efficient system of watering the streets, made the place very unhealthy. The condition of the city of Ottawa was such as it should not be from the large expenditure of the public money in the various departments of the Government and from many other advantages. He thought himself that in justice to Parliament the sanitary regulations in the city of Ottawa ought to be more perfect than they were; he was told that small pox exists in various parts of the town, and that certain portions of the city were never free from it. Now it did seem to him that if proper sanitary arrangements were made that state of things might be rectified. If they took the cases of disease that had occurred among the members of Parliament, no one ever knew how it was contracted, except in one case, and that was accounted for by riding in one of the public coaches of the town. From this he argued that there should be a proper regulation with respect to the use of coaches which would prevent such occurrences taking place. He called the attention of the Government to this, because it seemed to him that the Government possessed a lever, and that they could exercise an influence with respect to this state of things that must insure a reform. It was a matter of serious importance to the people of the Dominion that the members who come here to do the public business were obliged to sit in buildings where

their health was endangered, and it would be for the Government to say if no improvement was made whether they would not remove to a more healthy locality where proper arrangements were made for the health of individuals who were called upon to go into that locality. That they had the power to do. He had therefore put this notice on the paper in order that the Government might bring to bear the power which they possess to effect a thorough mode of drainage, and to prevent the existing state of things. He thought the honorable members would admit the necessity for these improvements; and make proper sanitary arrangements, a good result would be accomplished, if they gave attention to the matter. The next question had reference to the ventilation of the Parliament Buildings. He understood a large sum had been already expended for that purpose, but he must confess from his own experience, since he had been here he could see no improvement. The reading room had been most offensive; and if any one went into the gallery of the House of Commons, to listen to the debates, he did so at the risk of his health. He did not intend to go into the minutiæ or details as to what should be done with the Parliament buildings, but he said that if it required more money to be expended for their proper ventilation than had been expended, it should be done. The third matter of which he had given notice, he looked upon as a very serious question. No proper regulations had been made for the vaccination of all persons, and the prevention of that loath some disease small-pox. Now, when they came to look at what had been done for the prevention of the spread of contageous disease among horses and cattle, and when the power was taken to destroy cattle and horses in order to prevent the spread of those diseases, he thought it would be admitted that there was nothing arbitrary in enforcing an order for all persons to be vaccinated in order that small-pox should be stamped out. Local authorities were at great expense to provide for the accommodation of patients suffering from the disease, and the expense of its prevention would not be greater than a compulsory system of vaccination. Under these circumstances, he thought the Government should provide for an universal system of vaccination; he thought the subject of such importance that Government attention should be drawn to it, and he trusted such steps would be taken as will prevent and remedy the evils of which he complained, he therefore asked.

1st. Whether the Government propose to take any measures to influence the authorities of the City of Ottawa to improve the sanitary condition of the city? 2nd. If it is the intention of the Government to provide for a better system of ventilation for Parliament Buildings? 3rd. Whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt any measures to insure a more general and effective system of vaccination throughout the Dominion of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MILLER asked the hon. gentleman if this House had any power in the matter.

Hon. Mr. BAILLARGEON said, as a physician he learned with a great deal of pleasure that Mr Botsford had taken such a step, and that he took such a deep interest in the subject of vaccination. Better attention to that question was very much wanted, and the consequence of its neglect was very much felt, he did not doubt, throughout all the Provinces, but a great deal more perhaps in the Province of Quebec, of which he could speak, than in the other parts of the country. He was not aware of what was going on in Upper Canada, but according to his view vaccination should be made compulsory all over the Dominion. He thought there should be a law that would force parents to have their children vaccinated. The Government had a right to pass such a law, and in doing so they would be consulting the welfare of the whole community. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied that the Government never had the subject under consideration, but its importance was never doubted. The Government had not called the attention of the municipal authorities to the subject or notified them to keep the streets in better order. The question of sanitary arrangements in a large city like Ottawa, was one not easily disposed of. He understood that the Corporation were at present introducing water works, and that, in connection with the sewerage of the city which was in contemplation would effect a very desirable change. But he thought the city of Ottawa was progressing as rapidly in sanitary improvements as any other city in the Dominion. Still he thought that the expenditure of money for removing the filth from the streets at this season of the year was well spent. He hoped that the municipal government of the city would be impressed with the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and give the matter their attention. As to the second question on the paper, he had to inform

the hon. gentleman that a Committee had been formed for the purpose of providing better ventilation for the Parliament Buildings, and they had the assistance of an architect. He confessed he had not much faith in the efforts of architects for ventilating buildings; but a very large sum had been spent to improve the ventilation, and now that the subject had been brought forward again, the attention of the Government would be given to it, and if anything could be done to improve the ventilation it would be done. With regard to the third question, he was not aware that small pox was more prevalent in Ottawa than elsewhere. He had no doubt the municipal authorities attended to the subject of vaccination, and all classes of people could be vaccinated free of charge. It was, however, one of those advantages that the people did not appreciate and was attended with great difficulty. The Government had no power to interfere in municipal concerns, and he could only say that the law is the same in Ottawa as in other places.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD said the hon. gentleman [Mr. Botsford] deserved credit for stirring the Ottawa people up to their duty in this matter, if they had been lacking therein. They commenced their waterworks only some two years ago, and had expended over half a million on them. The machinery was now up, the mains were laid through the streets, and the service pipe was to be put down immediately, and the engineer told him no later than this morning that they intended letting the water into the city by the 1st August, for the prevention or suppression of fires. The mains would be filled, service pipes distributed, and the city pretty well supplied with water this fall. In connection with this subject came the sewerage which, without the waterworks, would not be very effective. He would read an article describing the progress made from the organ of the Government, THE TIMES. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.)

A Member—The Government has no organ.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD—You have an organ. The hon. gentleman here read the article in question, and said its facts would convince the House the city was in earnest in this matter. Their debentures were being taken up at a good price, close to par, which supplied the money wanted. The sewer work was to be put under contract in a few days, the plans and specifications being ready. The sewers would drain the low ground of the eastern half of the city, 700 acres of land, and 400 of the Upper Town. Then the water from the water works would completely flush the sewers, carrying off the filth, small-pox and every other malady. (Laughter.) The TIMES article showed clearly the sanitary benefits that would be the result of the improvements in question. Hon. gentleman should consider that this city 46 years ago was a dense forest. The first tree was cut in 1827. They could compare favorably, at present, with Halifax, St. John, Montreal, or any other city in the Dominion. (Hear, hear.) He thought the citizens of Ottawa had done wonders for their means and advantages. Let them alone for another year. They had spent half a million on their water works, and had raised an equal amount which, they believed, would complete them. They had another half million for sewerage, and much of the work would be completed this Fall. No member could more regret the deaths in both branches of the Legislature, since Parliament was convened, in Ottawa, than its citizens, but he did not believe they were out of proportion either to the population of Ottawa or the numbers in attendance in the Legislature. Some gentlemen, including the members of this House who had lately passed away, had come here in bad health, so their deaths could not be laid to the account of the Capital. He did hope, however, that the Government would take any action possible to assist the city in improving its condition. He was sure that, as the citizens had enough to do to meet present burdens, they would accept a Government appropriation for this purpose. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He assured hon. gentlemen the city's large and costly improvements were designed to abate such evils as small-pox, and to improve the general sanitary condition of the city. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CARRALL said the reform proposed would be not only advantageous to the country at large, but agreeable to the eternal fitness of things, and would come in conterminous with the existence of a pure Reform Government. [Hear hear, and laughter.] Purity was their motive. (Laughter.) It was the principal element, base, substratum of their existence. He fancied it was wise in the hon. gentleman from a Maritime Province to direct the attention of the Government to the impure state of affairs within the very nostrils of the capital.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—It existed before this Government. (Laughter.)

Hon Mr. CARRALL—But it had been continued under the present Government,

aggravated and intensified. [Renewed merriment.] One of the members of this House was suffering from that foul and loathsome disease, small pox, and while he should be sorry to attribute to the Corporation of Ottawa any intention to consummate the destruction of any one belonging to this body, he was obliged to say there was a laxity in the enforcement of the vaccination law, truly deplorable. He understood that in Hull this disease could be had any day of any week. That was the state of things where the *elite*, the lumber princes, were concentrated, and all through the laxity to which he had alluded. He could only regret that this was the case, and trusted that the attention of the local authorities having been called to it, they would make efforts for an improvement which should be supplemented by the Government always working in the interest of purity. [Hear, hear and a laugh.]

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said if a Committee were to be appointed to consider this subject, they could not select a better member than the hon gentleman who had just taken his seat. He admitted the sanitary condition of the city was a subject for complaint. But the city had grown up suddenly since Government came here, and no new community could be expected to exhibit a state of things requiring no improvement. They could not look for the conveniences and advantages to be found in large cities. The sanitary condition of Ottawa, was said to be inferior to that of other cities of the Dominion, but in the largest, Montreal, possessing good sewers and an ample supply of pure water, small pox was always to be found. Perhaps it was the fault of those doctors who had always a supply of small gilt pills to throw at friends or opponents in the skilful style of the hon. gentleman opposite (Dr. Carrall.) (Hear, and laughter.) In Montreal the disease was partly due to some physicians who had promulgated the notion that vaccination was a poisonous operation, and should not be continued. [Hear, hear.] He certainly agreed with his hon. friends as to the need of measures for the improvement of the sanitary condition of the city, but a large city, with all the improvements could not be formed in a day. In Ottawa, the people had taxed themselves as heavily as those of any other city, to better its condition, and make it healthy. Though he was opposed to the Government coming here, he would say that he believed that in view of what had been accomplished, every encouragement should be given the citizens to carry on the work of amelioration, (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. FERRIER also testified to the existence of small pox in Montreal, and the injury done by the physicians who had turned the minds of many of the poorer class against vaccination. It was among those who had been affected by his writings, which were in French, the deaths mainly occurred. The hon. gentleman contended that there was no reason why measures should not be taken for the protection of human life as well as animals from contagious diseases.

Hon. Mr. MILLER replied that the reason why Parliament had not legislated in regard to the protection of human life was, that it had not the power. The subject was within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. The question of quarantine was, however, under the control of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD was not certain of the correctness of that view. The Confederation Act could be construed in a great variety of ways. Why not make neglect of sanitary duties a crime, so as to reach the father of a family or others having control of numbers of people, who had neglected vaccination? If made a crime, this Legislature could deal with it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said, as to the question of public health, this Legislature determined one or two sessions ago, and acted upon the decision, that it did not come within the sphere of its powers. In an early session of the Federal Parliament, the general Government took charge of the health of emigrants after they landed, and appointed health officers,

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—This was under a special clause of the act, allowing us to deal with quarantine.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.—We took charge of quarantine. A vessel with cholera arrived at Halifax. On looking into the question of jurisdiction and duty, the Minister of Justice, and, he was sure Parliament became satisfied as to the course which the Federal authorities should pursue, they passed an Act on the subject, all being of opinion that dealing with emigrants or persons on shore, was not within the Province of the general Legislature, but should be left to the Local. The Quarantine Act was then alter d to confine the execution of the duties under it, to persons appointed by this Parliament who were only to attend to persons on board ship. After emigrants landed they were to come under the charge of the local authorities.

The subject then dropped.

MANITOBA LAND CLAIMS.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD said the question he was about to put was a very important one to both old and new settlers, some of whom had no title to their lands, one of the results being that they could not make improvements thereon, as they had no security for their enjoyment afterwards. His enquiry was--

"Does the Government intend to put into operation at an early period the Act 36 Victoria, c. 6, which provides for the appointment of Commissioners to settle without cost, claims to land in the Province of *Manitoba*, which were not public property at the time of the transfer to *Canada*, and for the issuing without delay of Letters Patent in favor of the owners and occupiers of such land ?"

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied, Government intended appointing Commissioners at an early period. The delay was due to the illness of the gentleman appointed to the Chief Justiceship, who had not yet been able to take his seat.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY having urged the claims of the workmen on sections seven and four, to payment, whether they had been employed by sub-contractors or contractors, both on account of the value of the work done, and the inconveniences in many cases attending its performance enquired: 1st. "Whether the amount of unpaid claims on sections 7 and 4 of the Intercolonial Railway, set forth in the return laid on the table of this House, or what portion (if any) thereof will be paid, and whether laborers' unpaid claims for work done under sub-contractors will be respected ?" 2nd. "Whether any, and what amounts have been paid to, or on account of the first contractors, on sections 4 and 7 of the Intercolonial Railway, or either of them, since their abandonment of the works, and is it intended to pay any such amounts to them until after the unpaid claims are satisfied ?"

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the policy of the Government was to pay the workmen for section four, from the vote of last year, amounting to $25,984. He had been informed that had been done, $22,980 having been already expended in payment of labor performed under the direct claims. In no case had the Department recognised the labor under sub-contractors, the distinction being made from the fact that the contractors were precluded from subletting any portion of their contracts, and that those who worked for the sub-contractors had not as good a claim as those who worked for the contractors. In reference to section seven, Parliament voted $20,892, of which $20,413 had been expended, all in the same direction—namely, paying first, and only, the workmen. There was left a balance of $479, but he understood there was a number of claims filed for it, which had not been adjudicated upon. Any moneys coming to the contractors would be second to that going to the laborers.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said the honorable gentleman had not stated what the Government intended doing.

Hon Mr. SCOTT—The intention is not to pay money not voted by Parliament. [Hear, hear.]

JUSTICE IN THE NORTH WEST.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD pointed out the great evil of the want of a means of dispensing justice in the North West Territory, beyond the limits of Manitoba. At present they had to convey criminals from 100 to 1,000 and 1,500 miles, for trial at Winnipeg, travelling by ox-teams in summer and dog-teams in winter, at serious cost and inconvenience to the officers of the law. He contended there should be a tribunal at some central point of the territory, before which offenders could be brought without considerable delay. The difficulty of bringing them to justice, at present, acted as an encouragement to crime, and would produce a most injurious effect upon the people and the growth of the settlements. He asked this question in the hope of calling the attention of the Government to the subject, and securing the supply of the present serious want. He asked, "does the Government intend, when organizing Courts of Justice in the North West Territory, to appoint a resident Judge in that Territory, with the powers, authority and privileges conferred upon any of the Judges of a Court of Queen's Bench in the Dominion ?"

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the Government did not intend at present to provide for Judges in the Territories. The organization of the Courts in Manitoba would give four Judges for the judicial work of the North West. This large staff was deemed quite sufficient for Manitoba and the Territories at present. The organization of tribunals for that region, beyond Manitoba, might be a matter for future consideration. He did not at present know where a Territorial Judge should be located.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD again urged the consideration of this matter by the Govern-

ment, and offered suggestions with a view to the reform in question.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL pointed out the fact that the officers of Mounted Police, to be employed through the Territory would possess magisterial powers, enabling them to arrest and try summarily for all offences short of capital. Thus would the cost and trouble of carrying offenders long distances, to Winnipeg be obviated. He did not know if any better provision could be made for the object in view till the population of the Territory became more dense.

The matter then dropped.

The Speaker of Prince Edward Island, Hon. Mr. HAVILAND moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY, "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a Copy of all despatches from the Administrator of the Government of the Province of *Prince Edward Island*, to His Excellency upon the subject of the resignation of the seat of *Stanislaus Francis Perry*, the Speaker and a Member of the House of Assembly of *Prince Edward Island*, together with all legal opinions and documents therewith enclosed.

AFTER RECESS.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. MILLER moved that the second reading of the Insolvent Act 1869 continuation Bill be discharged and set down for Wednesday next—Carried.

The Ingersoll Board of Trade Incorporation Bill, from the Commons, was read a second time and referred to the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. RYAN the second reading of the Maritime Warehousing and Dock Company Bill from the Commons was read a second time.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons entitled the Pilotage Act 1873 amendments bill, which, he explained, was for an extension of time for the appointment of Commissioners.

The House went into Committee of the Whole upon this Bill, Hon. Mr. Dickey in the chair, and after some conversation the Bill was reported unamended. The 42nd rule of the House was then suspended and the Bill read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons, entitled the Prince Edward Island Temporary Provisions Continuation Bill, which he said was for the continuation of an Act passed last session to give effect to the conditions under which P. E. Island was admitted into the Confederation. The motion was seconded by the Hon. Mr. Hamilton, and agreed to.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons entitled the Public Works Loan Bill. He said that the Canada Public Works Loan Act was passed in 1873, and the Imperial Government had guaranteed the sum of £2,200,000, and they were allowed £1,100,000, making £3,600,000 with interest, guaranteed by the Imperial Government. Authority was now asked to raise a loan of £8,000,000, of which the £3,600,000 would form a part for building the Canada Pacific Railway. He moved the second reading of the bill, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Letellier.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said it was most wise for them to avail themselves of the power under the guarantee of the Imperial Government to raise such a large amount of money at 4 per cent., but he rose to ask the Government and the House, as they were to proceed to negotiate a loan of such a large amount, whether they could make better terms with their financial agents in London? Of course it was of the greatest importance that their financial agents should be bankers of eminence like Glynn & Co. or the Barings, but when it was considered that a commission at a half per cent. would amount on the sum to be borrowed to $200,000, it was a grave question when they were about to enter on a great public work, however prosperous the country might now be, whether they could not make any better terms with the financial agents in London under the circumstances. They should try and husband their resources and save their money as far as possible. He would be glad to hear the opinion of the Secretary of State, and of the members of this House whether it was thought possible that more favorable terms could be obtained for negotiating such a large amount.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied that it was not proposed to raise this large sum of money all at once, but from time to time. Of course the Finance Minister would give attention to the subject and make the best terms for the Dominion he possibly could.

The bill was then read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole for Friday.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons entitled the "Transports' Exemption from Port and Harbor dues." He said it was a bill of four and a half lines, and its object was to exempt transport ships carrying troops from the payment of port and harbor dues. The bill extended to the whole Dominion, and over-rides all local laws.

The bill was referred to a Committee of the Whole presently, Hon. Mr. HAMILTON in the chair, and was reported without amendment. After the suspension of rule 42, the bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT next moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons entitled "The Navigable waters obstructions removal bill." He said this was a bill very much needed in some parts of the Dominion. Some of the rivers and harbors were obstructed by wrecks, &c., and the bill gave the Minister of Marine power to remove these obstructions under an order in Council.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that it meant more than giving the power to the Minister of Marine to remove obstructions, for the second clause imposed very heavy penalties on persons who did not remove them themselves. The penalty was $40 for every day that the person liable neglected to give notice to the Minister, without lawful excuse. Now he wanted to know who was to be the judge of what would be lawful excuse?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied he supposed the Minister of Marine would be the Judge.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that by the terms of the Bill the person was bound to give notice forthwith, and yet he might be a thousand miles from the Minister of Marine. He thought that was not the sort of legislation that should be adopted. If a man had a boat or scow sunk, he was bound to remove it forthwith, or give notice to the Minister of Marine of the obstruction, otherwise, he was liable to a penalty of $40 for every day he failed to give such notice, and it was left to the discretion of the Minister to say what was to be construed into a lawful excuse. He did not think that was the sort of legislation, they ought to adopt. It was bad enough for a man who had taken down a load of stones, and who had the misfortune to have a hole knocked in the bottom of his scow and have her sunk, without being mulcted in a penalty of $40 in addition for every day he neglected to give notice of the disaster to the Minister of Marine. Besides, not many such men would know of the existence of this Bill

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that his honorable friend would no doubt appreciate the importance of the Bill when he remembered that very serious danger would be occasioned to important vessels by sunken wrecks in the harbors of Montreal and Toronto, or the harbors of the Lower Provinces. The qualifying words, "without lawful excuse," did not make the penalty imperative, and no Minister would be disposed to mulct a man in damages unless it was a case of gross neglect.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER thought that any party giving notice by mail through the post office would be taken as a good excuse.

Hon. Mr. MILLER was of opinion that notice given to an officer of Customs ought to be sufficient.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole for Friday.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Steamboats Law Amendments Bill, which he explained was intended for the better protection of passengers travelling by steamers, and for the more close inspection of boilers, and for compelling the carrying of more life boats.—Carried.

The Fisheries Act Extension Bill, from the Commons was read a second time on the motion of Hon Mr. SCOTT, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Letellier, and referred to a Committee of the Whole for Friday.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Bank of Ottawa Incorporation Bill, and the motion being seconded by the Hon. Mr. Campbell it was adopted, and the Bill referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce,

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Toronto) moved the second reading of the Great North West Railway Bill, which, he explained, was for the purpose of organizing a company to construct a railway from Thunder Bay to Lake Superior and Manitoba. The motion was seconded by Hon. Mr. Girard, and on being carried, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of the Marine Electric Telegraphs Constitution Bill, (from the Commons) which, he said was a Bill of some importance to the country. There were some monopolies acquired in laying down some of the lines that come to our shores, and the Bill was intended to protect us from any further monopolies for the

future. There was a provision that all companies to be incorporated hereafter have to make arrangements with the parties who are interested where the lines were brought ashore. It did not, however, interfere with existing rights.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY was afraid that the Bill was not of the moderate and inoffensive character that his hon. friend had described it to be, and he had some hesitation in accepting the Bill as it stood. By this Bill as he understood it, no company could land a cable on our shores without leave of the Governor in Council, and if the company could satisfy the Government that they could do the business, under this Act, they would be authorized to stop the existing telegraphs. At present we are indebted to the cable landed on the shore of Nova Scotia for the only telegraph communication we have with the old world, and yet this bill proposed to take the power to stop that line, unless the Company would give up what was called a monopoly in another place. He contended they had nothing to do with the monopoly in Newfoundland. The Company had obtained power to land cables there for a certain period, and the Dominion had no right to interfere. It seemed to him that by this bill it was proposed to stop the whole telegraphic communication across the Atlantic in the interest of some persons who would get an order in Council, and thus force the New York, Newfoundland and London Company to run a cable right to the United States. He had read a good many bills but he never saw one of a more monstrous character as affecting private rights. He felt, however, that it was only necessary to call attention to the matter to show that the bill must be carefully examined when it came before the Committee.

After some conversation, the second reading was agreed to, and the bill referred to the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

The St. Lawrence Tow Boat Company's amendment bill (from the Commons) was read a second time on the motion of Hon. Mr. Chinic, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bellerose, the object of it being to alter the name of the Company and change the date of the annual meeting.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Odell, the second reading of the Canada Mutual Marine Insurance Company Bill. The motion was agreed to and the Bill referred to the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

Hon. Mr. LEONARD moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons entitled Lamb's Waterproof Gum Manufacturing Bill.

A long discussion took place as to whether this was a bill for the Local Legislature of Ontario to deal with, or whether the incorporation sought should be given by the Legislation of the Federal Parliament. In the end the second reading was adopted and the bill referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS reported from the Committee on Banking, the Western Canada Permanent Building Bill, as further amended, and it was read a third time and passed,

The House adjourned at 12:20 p.m. until 3 o'clock on Friday.

FRIDAY, May 15th.

The House met at three o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of a bill from the Commons, to incorporate the Bank of Ottawa.—Carried.

He also moved the third reading of a bill from the Banking Committee, reported upon without amendment, entitled An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Maritime Warehousing and Dock Company.—Carried

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER moved the adoption of the report of the Committee on Banking and Commerce on a bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Board of Trade of Ingersoll." The motion was adopted, the bill read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Toronto) moved the adoption of the report of the Committee on Banking, Commerce, and Railways on a bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Great North Western Railway," and the motion was seconded by Hon. Mr. Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that this was a bill for the construction of a railway from Thunder Bay to Fort Garry, a line of country over which the Pacific Railway would run. He thought it his duty to call the attention of the Government to the fact, because if they allowed a bill of this kind to pass, it might lead to some inconvenience.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied that this act would not go into force until it received the Royal assent.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL was glad to see

that the Government had had that forethought.

The third reading of the bill was fixed for to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. CHINIC moved that the House concur in the report of the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways, on a bill to amend the Act incorporating the St. Lawrence Tow Boat Company. The motion was agreed to, and the bill read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved the third reading of the bill, as amended in Committee, to incorporate the Maritime Insurance Co. Carried.

Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR submitted the second report of the Select Committee on Contingent Accounts, and moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. DUMOUCHEL, that it be considered on Monday next.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON reported with other bills from the Private Bills Committee, the bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Collins Bay Rafting and Forwarding Co., as amended."

On motion of Hon. Mr. McMASTER the amendments were concurred in and the bill read a third time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. PENNY, seconded by Hon. Mr. WILSON, the amendments made in Committee to the bill to incorporate the International Transportation Association were agreed to and the bill read a third time.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved that, when this House adjourns, it stands adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock. —Carried.

THE OATHS BILLS.

Hon. Mr. WARK then moved that the entry on the journals of this House of the 23rd Oct. last, containing the message of the Governor General, acquainting this House of the disallowance of the oaths bill, be read.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said though he would not object to the motion, he did not see that, at this advanced period of the session, it would be of any use to discuss this matter. They were ready to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of putting his views before the House and the country. He hoped he would not afterwards press the motion following that just read, as the appointment of a Committee of investigation at present could do no good

The SPEAKER then directed the Clerk to read the entry on the subject in the minutes, which was done accordingly.

Hon. Mr. WARK had regretted there was not time to discuss this matter before the prorogation of the House last fall, but he had come to the conclusion that it was of sufficient importance to engage the attention of both branches of the Legislature so soon as they should come together again. He had seen a despatch from Ottawa, in one of the Provincial papers, some months before Parliament was opened, stating it had been ascertained that the law officers of the Crown differed from their predecessors who had given their opinion as to the character of the Oaths' Bill, and he concluded that if that was the case it would be far more necessary than ever to re-enact the law and send it home again for the Royal Assent, so as to have this question settled. He had, however, read with some little surprise a question put in the British House of Commons, the other day, by Mr. Jenkins, to the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the subject. Be it remembered a second opinion had been obtained from the law officers on this bill, and Mr. Jenkins enquired whether there was any divergence between it and the preceding. Lord Lowther replied it was not in accordance with precedent to give any information respecting the opinions of the law officers, but that it was an error to suppose, in the present case, there had been a divergence of opinion, and that Her Majesty's Government had every reason to believe that the advice received was entirely correct. Though at first he was a little surprised at this, on enquiry he found that both statements were correct. It had been ascertained that the law officers who first gave the opinion that the Oaths' Bill was *ultra vires* of our Legislature, had since been promoted to the Bench, being succeeded by two other eminent lawyers, whose opinion was entirely different from that of their predecessors, But these gentlemen continued in office but a short period, resigning with their colleagues of the Gladstone Ministry. The Disraeli Ministry then came into power with new law officers, and these were the gentlemen who confirmed the opinion furnished by the law officers under whom the Bill was disallowed.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Will the hon. gentleman have the kindness to state his authority with regard to the opinion of the law officers who immediately succeeded those who gave the opinion for disallowance.

Hon. Mr. WARK said he was not at liberty, but believed the report was substantially correct. (Hear, hear and laughter). He had it from authority he thought perfectly reliable, that Sir Henry

James and Sir Vernon Harcourt held a different opinion from both their predecessors and successors on this subject. So if this bill, instead of going home in May last, had gone in November, the opinion of these law officers would have been that the Dominion Bill should go into operation On the other hand the present officers, had they come into office six months afterwards, would have pronounced it *ultra vires* and advised its disallowance. If this was not divergence of legal opinion in the highest quarters, he did not know what was. These circumstances ought to lead hon. gentlemen to consider whether the time had not come to endeavour to ascertain or understand themselves, what their constitution was and meant, without referring all these legal questions to the decision of the law officers on the other side of the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) When they entered into Confederation the Provinces had no difficulty in deciding as to what were their constitutional rights, which he did not think had suffered any material change. The section of the Union Act, formed of the resolutions of some of the ablest lawyers and business men of the Provinces, well acquainted with all their constitutional rights, under which the whole difficulty had arisen, was the 18th. It was supposed to fetter or control the Legislation of this Parliament. But it did not appear to him, nor, in his opinion, to the authors of the bill, to have any bearing on the question of legislation. When the framers of the act determined that the Parliament of this country should consist of the Queen, Senate and Commons, the first question that appeared to have suggested itself was—what were to be the privileges of the Senate and House of Commons? Now, forty years ago such a question would have been thought irrelevant and unnecessary, because from the earliest period of the establishment of colonial legislation every one who thought on this subject came promptly to the conclusion that, no matter how limited the territory or the population controlled, the legislature possessed all the privileges and rights of the British House of Commons. All, including the West India colonies, assumed and acted upon this principle, and the people submitted to the action in accordance therewith. In order to show the necessity existing, at the time of Confederation, for defining the privileges of Parliament, Mr. Wark cited three decisions by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in two of which the action of colonial legislatures in defence or vindication of their privileges had been sustained, while in the third, reversed. He argued that, in view of this diversity of opinion, calculated to shake confidence as to the extent of the privileges of Colonial Legislatures, it was proper in the Union delegates to consider carefully what should be the privileges of the new bodies to be called into existence, in order to a plain decision. They had decided in a manner to leave no doubt as to the privileges of both Houses, which were to be the same as those of the British, the same equality being secured as regards the privileges of the members individually, of both Parliaments. That put everything beyond doubt, for it was well understood what those privileges were. Observe, they provided for the privileges of the two branches of the Canadian Parliament, before they went any further, afterwards deciding as to the manner in which the Senate was to be constituted, the tenure of office and qualifications of members. The other subjects, including the mode of electing the Commons, and the distribution of representation, followed in their proper order. The delegates then came to the distribution of the legislative powers. Now what powers were there to distribute? He did not believe the delegates either had power to limit or extend powers possessed by the Provincial Legislatures, and all knew what they were. The hon. gentleman argued that as they were then permitted to legislate on all subjects that did not interfere with the prerogatives or action of the Imperial Parliament, or as regards treaties with foreign powers, this Canadian Parliament was able to legislate on everything connected with the Dominion not assigned to the Local Legislatures. Parliament has to legislate for the peace, order and good Government of Canada; everything not specified in the list of assigned subjects being included in the phrase "the peace, order and good Government of Canada." This covered all matters within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures anterior to Confederation. Had the House punished a witness for refusing to take an oath, and he appealed to the Privy Council, and our law been declared inoperative, a very awkward state of affairs would have been the result. One of the very best proofs of what the authors of the Act intended by the 18th section was to be found in the Act of 1868, drawn up shortly after their return from England, to define the privileges, immunities and powers of the Senate and Commons as regards their officers, or those who published their proceedings. The

proof of those proceedings having been published by the House, was to be a bar to any action in a Court of Common Law, in respect to them. The very next Act on the Statute book was to provide for oaths to witnesses, in certain cases, for the purposes of this House of Parliament. There was evidently no impression on the minds of the delegates, when they introduced that Bill, that it at all conflicted with the British Act. His conviction then, was that the sooner they ascertained exactly what the constitution meant the better,—and that it was highly desirable this matter should be brought under the notice of Her Majesty's Government in some way in order to the settlement of the constitution. If this 18th clause would bear the interpretation put on it, the sooner is was amended the better, because they ought to be satisfied with nothing less than the rights they possessed before entering Confederation, and which, he believed, were still possessed by Canadians. A member of the other House, to-day, had spoken to him of the inconvenience of their inability, at present, to examine witnesses under oath. The Legislature of New Brunswick had an act for that purpose, which had never been questioned, but they could not pass such an act now, by the decision of the law officers of the Crown. He would move that the entry on the Journals of this House of the 23rd of October last, containing the Message of His Excellency the Governor General, acquainting this House of the disallowance of the Oaths' Bill, be read. And that the Message, with the papers accompanying the same be referred to a Select Committee to be composed of the Honorable Messrs. Dickson, McMaster, Bureau, Penny, Miller, Macfarlane, Wilmot, and the mover, for the purpose of enquiring and reporting to this House what measures it may be expedient to adopt in order to secure to this House and the other branch of the Legislature, the right of taking evidence upon oath.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER, after complimenting the hon. gentleman for the interest he had exhibited in this matter, said he was not aware of any difference of opinion between former and present law officers of the Crown, in England, as to the right of this Parliament to pass the Oaths' Bill. There has been no decrepancy whatever. He thought it would be well not to press this motion, but leave the matter where it was. At this late period of the session there could be no proper investigation of the subject. He really believed the Government, themselves, would have to take it up at a future date, so as to obtain as much power as possible for Parliament, in the interest of the proper working of their constitution. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the hon. gentleman's exertions would lead to some benefit hereafter.

Hon. Mr. WARK was glad to get an expression of the House on the matter, which should not, he thought, be left in abeyance, but settled. He would withdraw the motion.

ICE-BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said he had no doubt every hon. member was aware of the unfortunate events that lately occurred at the City of Quebec, producing great inconvenience to the trade and commerce of the St. Lawrence and of the country generally; he alluded to the detention, for seven or eight days, of a number of steamers and other vessels, some of which had a large number of passengers on board, and others very valuable cargoes, in consequence of the impossibility of reaching the wharves, by reason of the existence of the ice-bridge. He would not have brought forward this question were it not, in his opinion, and, he hoped in the opinion of the House, within the range of the powers of this Legislature, and were it not possible to remedy, to a great degree, this evil; and when he told hon. gentlemen that the existence of this evil had been a good deal owing to legislation on this subject, they would, perhaps, concur with him in saying that this legislation should be amended so as to prevent the recurrence of the evils that had been suffered. He had learned from Quebec that a number of vessels had been injured to the aggregate extent of at least $300,000 by the recent action of the ice. But apart from that circumstance hon. gentlemen would see the great injury that had been inflicted upon trade by the detention for so many days, at Quebec, of vessels with very valuable cargoes—vessels, moreover, of a very valuable description themselves, carrying too, a large number of emigrants, who had been induced to come to the country by the prospect, probably held out to them, of finding here a hospitable shore, on their arrival, but, instead, they found a mass of ice, which prevented the vessels reaching the wharves, on which they were to land, and which prevented these emigrants from reaching their destination for ten days later than they had anticipated. The result of such a state of things would be, he feared, very injurious to emigration to this

country; for those people detained, were not only disappointed themselves, but would convey their feeling of disappointment to their friends on the other side of the Atlantic, which would probably impel them to seek more hospitable shores, than our own had proved on this occasion. If we could prevent such occurrences in future, it would be to the advantage of our trade as well as of our immigration. Some hon. gentlemen, when he had given notice of this question, seemed to think the subject was beyond the powers of this Legislature. This notion arose in a great degree from mi-understanding the nature of the legislation which had taken place hitherto. In his enquiry on the paper, he referred to the repeal of the 78th sub section of the 29th sec. of the Act 29th Vic. chap. 57, passed by the Legislature of the late Province of Canada The clause gave power to corporations to make by-laws on certain subjects, and to establish certain rules and regulations, and among other powers, it gave the Quebec Corporation power over the ice-bridge on the river St. Lawrence—so as to prohibit any person from preventing the stoppage of the ice and the formation of a bridge, from Montmorency as far up as Cap Rouge—also from breaking or damaging this ice-bridge—the penalty being a fine not to exceed $800, or in default, three months imprisonment with hard labour. The powers given the Corporation were very summary, and the penalty for making any attempt to break up the ice-bridge, or prevent its formation, was a very severe one indeed, and the effect of the enactment went clearly to perpetuate the loss to the trade and commerce of the St. Lawrence and of Quebec, occasioned by this ice obstruction. This act was passed in 1865, before it was thought practicable for steamers built for the purpose, to break up the ice, or to ply during winter between Quebec and Point Levis. It was then thought that no boat could maintain an open passage between those shores at certain periods of the winter. But since that year ferry boats have been frequently kept going on the route, and would, this last season also, had it not been for the law and the stringent measures taken under it, to prevent the proprietors of those steamers and others interested in keeping the river open, from breaking up the ice when it was about to form into a mass which had remained during the winter opposite Quebec. He believed it was easy now, with the class of steamers and the means and appliances which science furnished, to prevent this winter formation opposite Quebec. Battures extended widely from each shore below the city, narrowing materially, at a point between Beauport and Point Levis, the deep channel of the river. These battures constituted the nucleus or forming base of the ice-bridge; the floating masses becoming jammed in the narrow channel, are allowed to settle and combine so firmly as to make a solid a solid structure from shore to shore. By keeping the channel at this point open, the wharves at Point Levis and Quebec would be preserved safe and free of access for the Spring fleet and trade. The open channel at the city would not damage the trade of the district in winter, as an ice bridge might be allowed to form towards Cap Rouge, some miles higher up the river. Winter steamers were not known at the time this law passed, and therefore an ice-bridge was formerly considered a great convenience, and hence the stringent provisions, at the instigation of the local authorities, for preserving this bridge and encouraging its formation. He believed it was quite within the competence of this Legislature to deal at present with this question, as it was a matter affecting one of the principal harbors of Canada and the use of our greatest river, and thereby concerning our trade and navigation. He was informed by a Quebec gentleman that last year or the year before last, the Mayor, with a body of Police, took possession of the ferry steamer and prevented her attempts to cut a passage through the newly-formed ice. Mr. Chabot, who was, he believed, an authority on the subject, stated they could have had the navigation open all winter but for this interference. He really thought that, making every allowance for the use which he knew the ice-bridge was turned to, and the facilities it gave for transporting the produce of the country from the South Shore, the great balance of utility and profit would be on the side of trusting for conveyance across the river to steamers which can now make regular trips, and whose owners he believed, were disposed to do so on reasonable terms, if allowed to prevent the formation of the ice upon the river. His attention was first called to this subject by a petition which he presented here some days ago from a number of the principal ship-owners and traders of Montreal, against this obstruction to navigation at Quebec, and in favor of an open channel all the year round. (The honorable gentleman here read the document which was signed while the "Sarmatian" was still lying at

the wharf, which probably suggested a reference to the hardship to the poor passengers, caused by her detention.) He continued :—The winter navigation of the St. Lawrence had been from time to time a favorite topic with Canadians, but if the regulations regarding the ice bridge were maintained, adieu to any prospect of an open St. Lawrence in winter. On this recent occasion at so late a period of the season as the 10th May as many as six steamers were lying off Indian Cove, unable to proceed to the wharves at either Quebec or Levis.

Hon. Mr. WILSON—Is that petition numerously signed?

Hon Mr. RYAN said he would read the signatures, which he did, including those of Messrs. Hugh and Andrew Allan, D. Torrance, H. Chapman, Joseph Mackay, D. Shaw, Jas. Ross, Thibadeau and others largely engaged in trade as shippers and ship-owners. A gentleman largely interested in the trade of Quebec, and who might be said to represent it, now here on business, on the subject of the proposed graving dock, and who was in England on this business during the Winter, had assured him (Mr. Ryan) that the trade in Quebec would join freely in the prayer of the petition he had read. The Government and, therefore, the public of the Dominion had suffered seriously by the late break up of the ice at Quebec, in the damage to the "Napoleon the Third," a strong iron steamer, which was, be believed, a total wreck as well as to the "Druid." At all events it would cost a large amount to put these vessels in repair, one being sunk and having settled under water, if his information was correct. He might also say that under the by-laws of Quebec city, very stringent penalties were imposed in the carrying out of the objects of the law to which he wished to direct the attention of the Government, and with this object he would ask whether it is the intention of the Government during the present session of Parliament to introduce a measure having for its object to repeal the 78th sub-section of the 29th section of Act 29 Vic, cap. 57 of the Statutes of the late Province of Canada, or by other means to prevent, as far as practicable, the recurrence of the serious losses, injury and inconvenience to the trade and commerce of the St. Lawrence which have recently occurred in consequence of the stoppage of ice and the formation of an ice bridge within the limits of the harbor of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER admitted the great damage to vessels and loss to trade occasioned by the recent ice-shove. It was not, however, the intention of the Government to introduce a measure this session with a view to the prevention of the ice-bride at Quebec. The matter might be looked at from two points—whether the bridge should be absolutely prevented forming, or simply be destroyed at an early period, having extended the advantage of easy communication between the two shores all winter, down to the month of April. This subject was worthy of consideration, being one of great importance to the trade of Quebec, and the country generally. It was but proper that the Government should have time to reflect on the matter, and ascertain whether there was a good case for the protection of certain rights granted by the Legislature of old United Canada. When it became advisable to look to the interests of navigation, there could be no objection to the Dominion Government's exercising its rights in regard to this subject, so that neither trade nor immigration should suffer, as lately. Between this time and next spring, a session of Parliament would take place, during which some measures with respect to the ice-bridge might be considered.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said it would be much easier to prevent the formation of the ice-bride, than afterwards to break it up.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said he did not recommend one plan against another, but thought if it was possible to meet the two interests it would be better.

The subject then dropped.

HOPEWELL SHIP BUILDING COMPANY.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN moved, that the petition praying for an Act of incorporation as the Hopewell Ship Building Company, be referred back to Committee for further consideration.

PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved that the fourth report of the Joint Committee on Printing, which he then submitted, should be considered on Monday next.—Carried.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Lower Canada Investment and Agency Company's amendment Bill, which he explained—Carried.

Hon. Mr. READ moved the second reading of the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Preferential Debentures Bill,

which, he said, was intended to remove any doubts as to the character of the Company's debentures. They had claimed they had a right to a loan granted by Canada to railways, and had brought a suit against the Ontario Government for it, which had been sustained. That Government on the other hand, held a claim against certain municipalities, which had no money for the railway. The present bill embodied an arrangement between all the parties, already a bill of the same description had passed the Ontario Legislature, fearing that there might arise some doubts as to its legality, and having had an act from the Parliament of old Canada, the company thought best to ask for an act of this Parliament to prevent or remove all doubts on the subject. Motion carried.

Hon. Mr. REESOR, said with respect to the order of the second reading of the Inspector of Produce Law amendment Bill, that a measure was at present before the Commons, dealing with all the inspection laws of the Dominion, and, in an interview with the Minister of Inland Revenue, he had agreed to incorporate the amendment of his (Mr. Reesor's) bill with that general bill, under which circumstances, he moved for leave to withdraw bis.—Agreed to.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL moved the second reading of the bill to extend the powers of the Whitby Harbour Company. He said it asked power for the issue of bonds guarding any issue of the Government in the matter. The Government had a lien on the property, which was very small. The Company asked leave to issue their bonds in receiving express authority from the Governor in Council; so everything proposed to be done would be brought under the review of the Government before any steps were taken. The Government would have power to attach any conditions to their issue. They also asked liberty to extend their works into deep water, and improving their harbor. Hon. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL pointed out objectionable features of the bill, and made suggestions for its improvement, being followed, in the same sense by Hon. Messrs. Simpson and McClelan, when the mover promised to consider the remarks made when it got to Committee. After a conversation as to the appropriate Committee, the bill was read a second time and referred to that on Private Bills.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SCOTT the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill for the construction of certain public works, with the benefit of the Imperial guarantee for a portion thereof. The various clauses were put and carried without amendment, when the Committee rose.

On motion of Hon Mr. SCOTT, seconded by Hon. Mr. Penny, the bill was then read a third time

It being six o'clock. the House rose, to meet at half-past seven.

AFTER RECESS.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. SCOTT the House went into Committee of the Whole, the Hon. Mr. Hamilton in the chair, on the Navigable Waters Obstructions Removal Bill.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL took exception to the second clause which imposes a penalty of $40 for neglecting to give notice to the Minister of Marine of the existence of any obstruction in navigable waters. According to the working of the Act, he contended that any person no matter where the river might be, would be liable to a penalty of $40 if he did not notify the Minister of any obstruction that he knew to exist. He therefore thought the clause should be amended.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Chairman) remarked that there was nothing in the Bill to meet the case of one vessel being run down by another. How was notice to be given in such a case? It might be months before it was known who was in fault.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT fancied there was legislation on the subject referred to, He also thought that the notice would clearly apply to a person representing the Minister, the same as principal and agent.

After some further conversation the committee rose and reported progress, asking leave to sit again to-morrow.

The House again went into Committee of the Whole, the Hon. Mr, Botsford in the chair, on the Fisheries Act Extension Bill, on the motion of the Hon. SCOTT, who explained that the object of the Bill was the extension and application of the Fisheries Act to and in the Provinces of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, and Manitoba.

The Bill was reported without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading (from the Commons) of the Montreal Port Warden Appointment Law Amendment Bill, seconded by Hon. Mr. LETELLIER.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill, Hon. Mr. Montgomery in the chair, and the bill was reported without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons, called the Marine and Fisheries Department Organization Amendment Bill

This Bill was also referred to a Committee of the Whole and passed, the change being merely the formal one of substituting the word "deputy" for "Secretary."

RE-ADJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Re-adjustment of the Representation Bill. He said this was a Bill affecting two constituencies in the County of Huron. Changes were made in the division of the two Ridings during the late Parliament, and the people affected by these changes were the residents of the Township of Tuckersmith. They were transferred to the centre Riding and they had petitioned to be restored to the South Riding where they properly belong to. There are 406 electors in the Township and of that number not less 330 have signed the petition asking for this change, and the others have been passive or have not taken any part in the matter; they are not opposing the petition. The Bill came up for consideration in the other Chamber, and it was passed unanimously. It was supported by a prominent member of the Government, whose eyes had been fairly opened and the film removed from them, so that he gave the Bill his support. He (Mr. Scott) was not aware that there was any opposition to the measure. Of course it was quite competent for the Senate to interfere with legislation of that kind, but in a matter that was local in its character, and where it was a natural change to make, and one that affects only the representation in the other branch of the Legislature, he thought this House might acquiesce in the reasonable proposition made to it and pass this Bill. [The hon. gentleman here produced a shape cut of cardboard, which he said was a representation of the County, the Township of Tuckersmith being a triangular piece on one side.] It could not be said that the change bore a political complexion, as both Ridings were represented by gentlemen of the same party.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. READ on rising said he intended to make a motion before he sat down of no ordinary character in this House, and asked Senators to follow him closely as he intended to deal with figures and facts and leave them to judge of the motion on its merits. In this House it had always been the custom, as it is the duty of the members, to judge of all the measures without party bias; and he felt assured this measure would receive the same consideration. As the Government had introduced this measure, he must look upon it as their Bill, and so treat it in this House. Now, what were the provisions of this extraordinary measure? They were this: The county of Huron returns three members to the Commons and it is proposed to alter the territorial limits of two of the ridings, and the only reason assigned by the Hon. Secretary of State, is that some 300 people have petitioned for it, and that it would make one riding more compact. This is not a sufficient reason, and I will show conclusively that there is something under lying this measure which will not stand the light of day. After the decennial Census of 1871, it was found that according to the provisions of the British North America Act, Ontario was entitled to six additional members in the House of Commons, and the Parliament of 1872 gave the cities of Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa, one member each, and one additional member to the counties of Huron and Grey, and one to the district of Muskoka and; I will show that in arranging for the additional seat in the County of Huron, it was done equitably in every particular. First, the total acreage was 822,712, now that was divided as follows:—North Riding, 313,328 acres; South, 256,297; Centre, 253,087. Houseolders—North, 3,759; South, 3,703; Centre, 4,002. Population—North, 21,865; South, 21,512; Centre, 22,791. This it will be seen is as equal a division both in acreage, householders and population, as could be made. What will be the result of the proposed change? The North is not to be disturbed, but it is proposed to take the Township of Tuckersmith from the Centre, and attach it to the South Riding for no reason assigned, but that three hundred persons have petitioned for it. It is alleged that it would make it more compact. What would be the result of this change? South Huron would contain 299,296 acres; Centre Huron, 210,088;

a difference of 89,208 acres; in house-holders, South Huron would have 4,300; and Centre, 3,405, a difference of 895; in population, South Huron would have 25,211; Centre Huron, 19,092, a difference of 6,119. Was this the Legislation we were to expect from men who had nearly revolutionized this country because members from Lower Canada, during a portion of the time of the union of the Provinces represented a few hundred less per head than the members from Ontario? But as soon as this Government got into power they commenced to disturb the representation of the people for party purposes, which I will show to the satisfaction of this House. I have taken the trouble to go to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and see how the township of Tuckersmith cast their votes the last three elections, and find this result—1867 it gave a majority to the Reform candidate of 194; 1872, after the division when two Grits only were in the field, it gave 133 against a man who, if he had not during his five years in Parliament given one vote in favor of the Government of the day, would have been returned without opposition, but he chose to vote for the Washington Treaty, believing its passage necessary for the peace of the country, and that vote killed him politically in that Riding; that was the only act they had to complain of. In the election just over of 1873 I find Tuckersmith gave 231 majority for the present member, being both Grits offering as no Tory "need apply" in Centre Huron. What inference is this House to draw from this? It is that Tuckersmith is a desirable township for a Grit to possess himself of. The fact is the present member's seat is protested, and it is said he is likely to be unseated, and consequently wishes to get this Township of Tuckersmith added to his Riding to insure his re-election, as he was elected by only a small majority. The Centre Riding can well spare this township, and being generous to their neighbors they respond to the South, who is saying to them we are hard pressed by these Tories; come over and help us, like good party men acquiesce. (Hear, hear.) Now I contend it is the bounden duty of this House to *stop this kind of legislation*, and if ever there was a time that we should speak out, it is now, in order to prevent this Bill passing; a baby, in size, but a giant in iniquity. (Hear, hear.) I had little supposed when the American system of dismissal of officers was disposed of in this House and the motion withdrawn after the Government here promising that no more arbitrary dismissals should take place that we should again be called upon to denounce these American innovations. In looking over an American work on proportional representation I find in the State of Massachusetts, in 1812 a party got a temporary possession of the State, and appointed a Governor by the name of Gerry, who, with his majority, set about and did so arrange the electoral divisions that some of them went nearly around others, and by this means a very large minority for the time, as the next election had no seats in Congress. This system has since that time been called "Gerrymandering." As this Bill has been taken up by the Government I shall call this act a "Mackenzing" act to re-arrange the County of Huron for party purposes. Now this is not the last of these bills, I find upon my desk a bill to re-arrange the County of Wellington, brought in by another supporter of the Government who only gained his election by twelve votes. His election is also protested and he is likely to be unseated, and now wishes, with the consent and assistance of the Government, to re-arrange a County now nearly equally divided in population so that if unseated he will have a pocket riding; and upon looking over the census returns of 1871, I find that the Riding will stand thus, if this Bill passes; 1400 for one, and twenty-five thousand in the other two. I will leave this House to draw its own conclusion. Then I find another Bill by another member in the same direction, the merits of which I have not looked into. Where will this thing stop? The Government in whose hands the representation should be, not having the honesty to interfere, but lending its aid and furthering such iniquity, which if allowed, might urge the minorities to desperation and anarchy, which might be the result, if we, the judges between the people and the Sovereign on each side did not interfere. In the House of Commons, the Bill to re-arrange the County of Huron, after an animated debate, passed without a division in all its stages, as the Opposition are powerless, but in Committee they asked to have it amended so as not to come into operation until after the next session, and it was stated on the floor of the House that the Bill was intended to make sure of the re election of the present member, should he be unseated. [Hear, hear.] After these explanations, I move the following amendment: That the Bill to re-arrange the representation of the County of Huron, in the House of Commons, be

not now read a second time, but be read this day three months. [Loud cheers.]

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER regretted the style in which the hon. gentleman opposite had tried to characterise this measure. If the same remarks were made in another place regarding the members of this House he thought they would be felt. As to the great injustice which the hon. gentleman pretended was to be done by this Bill, he could not see it, and he must say that when the other branch of the Legislature came to the Senate with a bill that had passed them without any division or discussion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It did not pass without discussion, for I read some very earnest speeches that were made upon it. If the hon. gentleman says there was no division I agree with him.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said that at all events the bill passed without a division It applied to the Lower House alone, and he thought the Senate had no right to complain when the Commons were remodeling their own House. He did not pretend to say that the other House had a right to remodel this House, and he thought that the Senate as the representatives of the Crown, should not say to the Commons that they would not allow them to re-adjust the representation. He did not pretend to say that the Senate had no right to interfere, but this was not a measure coming from the Government. He did not think it was right to make a personal attack on the Premier, and style the bill as an attempt to Mackenzieise the country. They should not do or say anything which was not in accordance with courtesy, and he could not see that there was any reason for giving this bill a three month's hoist. When it was passed by such a large majority in the other House, he thought they should not interfere, especially as it was intended for reorganizing the constituency. There had been many instances of divisions having been made where larger populations than others had been allowed the same representation; and when measures of that kind were brought before this House, he did not remember a single case where there was anything said against what was adopted in the other House.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL was surprised at what had fallen from the hon. the Minister for Agriculture, and for his own part he had arrived at a very different conclusion. There were circumstances when it was quite right and peculiarly the duty of this House to take action on a bill of this kind. He did not think that the bill could be defended at all. It was brought in and carried through the other branch of the Legislature by the force of a large majority. Now, he thought the people of this country had a right to expect the Senate to interpose for their protection. What would be the effect of legislation of the same kind in other parts of the Dominion? They had heard from the mover of the motion that a large number of votes were to be transferred from one riding of the county to another. They knew that there was a petition pending against the return of the gentleman who occupies in another place the seat for the South riding Now if it were assumed that he would be obliged to return for re-election next month, the effect of this bill would be to give him 200 votes more than he otherwise would have. Was that fair? He had not listened to, but had read the debates in another place, and there it was avowed that the object of this bill was to give so many additional votes to this gentleman if he should be obliged to run his election over again. It was suggested that there was a clause in the bill that it should not come into operation until after this Parliament, but that was poo pooed, and he felt justified in saying that the object was—indeed the avowed object was to take 200 votes from one constituency and give them to another at a time when an election was imminent, or at least likely to take place. Take the case of Montreal and see how this would work: Let us suppose 200 votes taken from Griffintown or Montreal East, and added to the Western division just before an election came on! Could anything be more unjust? He did not think there could, and when a majority was inclined to carry with a strong hand an arbitrary measure of this kind that would have the effect of which he spoke, and which was contrary to fair play, good sense and and sound reasoning, it was time for the Senate to interfere in a matter which so much concerned the people. When the hon. gentleman had said that there was no discussion on the bill, he found that it was necessary to retract that statement, for there was an animated discussion at one of its stages. He did not lay any stress at all upon the fact that there was not a division. They all knew what the minority of the Conservative party was in the other Chamber, and they could have no object in pressing for a division when they knew that they would be defeated. When they saw that the avowed object was to transfer those 200 votes from one constituency to another, where was the

use of pressing for a division? The Senate should consider also that these people who were the petitioners, and no doubt members of the Reform party, had already exercised their privilege by voting for Mr. Horton who represents the central riding of the County of Huron. They had returned their representative, but they now said they would like to be annexed to the south riding that they might return Mr. Cameron. Why should such a privilege be granted? They got up this petition and they asked to be allowed to vote a second time! Was that the sort of legislation the Senate should allow to pass because the majority in the other House was strong and arbitrary? He said there never was a better evidence of the tyrannical and arbitrary disposition of the Liberal majority, than a bill of this kind. It was in accordance with the law that the representation of the people should be settled every 10 years, after the census was taken, but this was contrary to the spirit of the law. This was not a case where they should hesitate, but one where their constitutitional duties called upon them to interfere. If the Senate showed that they should not interfere in a matter of this kind, it was time, as had been said in another place, that they should be reconstructed.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—Abolished! (A laugh).

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL continued to say that he would be the last to suggest the taking of any steps which would operate against the influence of the House, but he would ask those who were not carried away with a desire to return another Grit to the other branch of the Legislature if they were willing to consider quietly and calmly, whether in the interest of the whole country it was wise to allow a large majority to override all that was reasonable, and to transfer from one riding to another 200 votes which had already found representation in the other House?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER asked when was the change effected which divided the the County of Huron into three ridings instead of two?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that it was last year, in accordance with the British North American Act, after the census was taken. The county was divided into constituencies that were nearly equal in population. The whole county was of an irregular shape with an extraordinary countour. Something like a representation of its shape had been exhibited by his hon. friend (Mr. Scott), but it did not excite the interest of those who desired to be informed on the subject. The truth was that the county is divided into equal parts so that there was representation according to population, just what the Reform party had been calling for, and upon which they had based there struggle for years; but now they would upset that and say they would not have it. He could call such conduct nothing better than organized hypocracy. They would not now have this representation by population, but they would take away the Township of Tuckersmith from one riding and add it to another, making the representation of the population very unequal. This was the policy of the professed Liberals, but the conservatives were more liberal than they, because the Conservatives would not take away from one constituency what properly belonged to them and give it to another.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—That is too Pacific for the party.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the demand of the representative of the south riding of Huron was to get the township of Tuckersmith from the other riding, and that demand was allowed by the majority in another place. Now, supposing they took a warm interest in the west division of Montreal, what would be said if they took 200 votes from Griffintown; or if in Quebec, they took 200 votes from Champlain and gave them to the centre division? If such legislation was to be allowed, every person whose election was doubtful would be endeavouring to reconstruct his constituency so as to make his seat safe. He hoped the Senate would do their duty to the people of the whole country by interfering and giving time for the sober second thought of the majority of the Commons who after they had got over their present flush of triumph, would feel more like dealing with the subject in a juster direction, and would not force on such legislation as this. He would vote for the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Quinte Division.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL said he had a very few remarks to make, but the fact was he had matured his conviction as to the course he should adopt, and if he had entertained any doubt, his mind would have been at once made up after the remarks that fell from the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture. The Senate was not to be bullied or terrified into passing measures, from the other Chamber simply because they were passed there by a majority. By a parity of reasoning every measure would have to be passed in this Chamber that came from the Commons, because none could be pass-

ed without a majority. He desired to take strong grounds against this state of things. He wanted to act on his matured conviction, and so soon as he could not do so he would make way for a better man. But he desired to take issue with the leader of the Government on this matter, for that honorable gentleman had said that this bill was dealing with the composition of the other Chamber and it would be indelicate for the Senate to interfere. Now he had consulted the Librarian on that point, and his opinion was that it was not only competent but wise and proper for all measures to be discussed in this Chamber.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said he had not denied the right of this House to discuss the measure, and he protested against words being put into his mouth.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL said that he understood the honorable gentleman to say that because the Bill was passed in the other House by a large majority it was not competent for this House to oppose it. Now he appealed to the House and to the country through the Fourth estate if they were not to discuss this measure and come to a righteous judgment upon it, what on earth were they there for? They were there to revise the legislation of the other House. He went on to allude to the heated debate that took place in reference to the appointments made of officials by the late Government when they were on their trial, and argued that as the member for South Huron was also on his trial, the same rule should apply in this case with regard to the passage of this bill. If the bill were allowed to pass, and a new election took place, the electors of Tuckersmith would have two representatives in the House which would be an injustice to the rest of the community. He argued that the fact of the people having petitioned for the change should not influence the House in this instance, and moreover, if they founded legislation on the presentation of petitions they might spend all their time in passing a prohibitory Act. He thought passing measure of this kind now would be inflicting a wrong on the electors of the whole Dominion.

Hon. Mr. REESOR thought it was unfair to say that the object of the bill was to get the electors of Tuckersmith to vote a second time. It had also been said that if this bill passed, another bill would be brought forward affecting the interests of East and West York, because a portion of the county was just in the same position as Tuckersmith. Now it so happened that in Ontario, all the electoral divisions for the House of Commons were made districts for agricultural associations, and every district had its agricultural society, and held annual or semi-annual fairs. It was therefore desirable where it was practicable to have these districts as compact as possible. If there was one thing more than another that we pride ourselves for in Canada, it was the respect which the Legislature paid to public opinion. The responsible Government always shewed a respect for the wishes of a majority of the people, while our neighbors, who were elected for four or five years did just as they pleased while in office. He might refer to a case in the riding of York in which he resided, and which is represented by Mr. Blain. It was proposed to take a portion of the constituency from East York and add it to the West, it being just on the border. As an elector of East York he saw no objection to the change. It seemed to him that the cases were precisely similar, because by both changes it was intended to make the division more compact, and bring all concerned more near to their respective business centres. It should also be remembered that no petition had been presented against that of the people of Tuckersmith from the Riding they wanted to leave, and the people themselves ought to be the best judges of what was most convenient for them. He knew it was said that there would be a small disparity created in the population of the Ridings by the change; but his hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) when he was a member of the late Government, made no objection to the disparity in population that existed in many constituencies for many years. He instanced the Counties of Elgin, Brant, Simcoe, and Bruce, where he showed that very great differences in the number of the population was to be found. In the case of Tuckersmith, four-fifths of the electors petitioned in favour of the change, and there was not a single petition against it by any township affected, or from any part of the county. He therefore said it was most unfair for the members of this House to interfere and prevent the people from getting what is for their own local accommodation. And what difference could it make even in a political sense? Both the South and Centre returned liberal representative at the present time and would no doubt do the same in case of another election. He held that they should have some respect for public opinion, and should regard the justice of the

fair demands of the people of Tuckersmith in the County of Huron.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—If the majority of the people were conservative instead of being liberal would this Bill be asked for?

Hon. Mr. REESOR said that when the measure was brought in by the late Government for the re-adjustment of representation, it was urged upon them that the divisions should be compact, and be as equally divided as to population as possible; but the late Government disregarded that request, because it was thought they would gain a political advantage. They insisted on making a very different change. He thought it was unfair to attribute the introduction of this Bill to political motives.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—I can attribute it to nothing else.

Hon. Mr. REESOR said that was not the spirit in which the measure should be considered. They ought to take measures on their merits, discuss them and vote upon them on their merits, and every one had a right to vote as guided by his best judgment.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND could not agree with the principle laid down by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that they ought not to exercise an independent judgment and scrutiny in relation to this bill, or that because it was a bill affecting the other Chamber that they should not interfere with it.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—I did not go so far as that.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said, at all events a point was made out of the fact that the bill had passed the Commons without a division. Now, he held that the members of this House were here to exercise an independent judgment on all matters that came before them, and it should be no guide to their conduct whether a measure was carried in the other House unanimously or by a narrow majority, they were to look at the facts. If they did not criticise and act independently they would be a mere registry office, and he was going to say, if that were the case, the sooner this great Dominion got rid of this Chamber the better. He did not think that a bill of this kind should emanate from a private member. Such measures should be undertaken by the Government. If such were the case, he thought there would not be so many bills, and he thought they had been forewarned about other bills that would suit the convenience of gentlemen in the other House. He thought the passage of this bill would be a dangerous precedent, and he would like to know whether there was any petition from the constituency to which Tuckersmith wished to become attached. The seat of a gentleman who had great interest in the bill was now trembling in the balance; and if he should happen to loose his seat he would go back, in case this bill were passed, and seek re-election, having 200 votes in his favour added to the constituency. In his opinion this bill, if carried, should not take effect until the dissolution of the present Parliament.

Hon. Mr. FLINT spoke at some length on the same side of the question, arguing that if measures of this kind were to be carried unchallenged there was no use for an opposition; still he thought that a healthy opposition was the best thing any Government could have.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that when he heard his hon. friend (Mr. READ) on the other side, he began to think of the French revolution and all manner of things, from the picture he had drawn of the flood of Democracy that was sweeping from one end of the country to the other. Still, he could not but think at the same time of Dr. Cumming's prophesies—a very great deal about nothing at all. He believed the fact was that the two ridings in the one county were represented by members of the same political party, and each was satisfied that Tuckersmith should be transferred to the South. The other House was willing that the change should be effected. He went on to give illustrations of similar changes having been made under the Administration of the late Government, notably in the counties of Montcalm and Joliette after the Redistribution Act; while in Montreal, immediately before the last election but one, a very important change was made in reference to Griffintown which had been mentioned by his honourable friend [Mr. Campbell.] Sir George Cartier had brought in a bill making the three centre wards one constituency, and dividing the others into two, but he afterwards found it convenient to change that arrangement, so that if changes like that proposed by the present bill could be looked upon as a flood of Democracy, it had been flowing over the country for years. He did not see that any valid objection had been offered to the change, except that if the bill passed, the township of Tuckersmith could vote twice in case of another election, but that was only a supposition as there was no election pending of which they had any knowledge in this Chamber.

After some observations from the hon.

Messrs. Macpherson and McClelan (Hopewell.)

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied, stating that in introducing the bill he did not go into the matter as fully, perhaps, as its importance demanded, or as it had turned out, for he looked upon it as a purely domestic matter. The history of Tuckersmith was a matter of notoriety, and when it was placed in the centre division of the county the change was protested against, and the thing was thought too palpable for the change not to be understood, so the people made up their minds to return Mr. Cameron. He assumed, when he brought the bill forward, that no hostility would be shown, because it was one that only affected the other Chamber, and he considered it was not good taste or good policy, and he had now to say, that if the bill passed a second reading he would add a rider by which it would have no effect until the next general election That got rid of the whole argument of the hon gentleman for Kingston The hon Secretary of State went on to compare the condition of representation according to population under the late Administration, citing the condition of the counties of Elgin, Brant and Bruce, to show that this was not the principle on which the late Government acted. In regard to Tuckersmith out of the 406 voters 330 had signed the petition, and there was no petition against it, but there was perfect unanimity on the matter in the two ridings, and further, the bill had been passed by the Commons. Under these circumstances was it for the hon. gentlemen in the Senate to say to these people "you shall not get what you desire It is an intrusion of democracy." It was a perfect farce to talk about democracy in this connection. He was of opinion that the Senate ought not to allow a majority to ride over the will of the people, but in this case it was just the opposite, for the people were indignant at the change that had been made, and wanted to be restored to the constituency to which they formerly belonged. He took this case as standing alone, and the rejection of this bill would be to deny the people their rights after it had been shown that it was purely a domestic matter affecting no one else; and it would be going out of their way for the House to say—"you shall not have what you ask; it does not affect any other constituency, but we say we will refuse because we have our own reasons for not allowing your constituency to be re-organized." He hoped the good sense of the Chamber would prevail in this case and allow the bill to be read a second time, as it would not come into force until after the next general election.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER did not think he should give a silent vote on this question, but first of all he wished to ask the Secretary of State or the Minister for Agriculture, whether this Chamber since the opening of Parliament had shown any factious opposition to the Government of the day?

Hon Mr. LETELLIER—Up to this time, certainly not.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER went on to say that he was sure there was no desire to come into conflict with the members of the other House, but at the same time they must express their convictions. He wanted to know were there petitions from the riding that was going loose and the riding that was going to gain Tuckersmith? It would be a misrepresentation to say that the petitions of the people did not receive attention, and he was persuaded that the members of the Senate were guided in their actions by what they believed to be the best interests of the country. He argued that the Government should take the responsibility of introducing a measure of this kind, and not leave it to a private member.

After some remarks from the Hon. Messrs. Kaulbach and Miller, the Hon. Mr. Bureau moved the adjournment of the debate, a motion that led to a good deal of rapid conversation, and Hon. Mr. Sutherland made a speech in support of Hon. Mr. Read's motion. Hon. Mr. Reesor again attempted to be heard but was called to order several times by the Hon. Mr. Montgomery rising and insisting that he should only speak to the question of adjourning the debate. Ultimately the motion for adjourning was withdrawn, and the House divided on Hon. Mr. Read's motion:—To leave out of the motion for the second reading of the Bill the word "now," and after "time" to insert "this day three months." The following is the division:—

CONTENTS,—The Hon. Messieurs Aikins, Alexander, Allan, Armand, Bellerose, Botsford, Bourinot, Campbell, Carrall, Chapais, Chinic, Dever, Dickson, Dumouchel, Flint, Girard, Hamilton, (Kingston,) Haviland, Holmes, Kaulbach, Lacoste, Macdonald, (Victoria,) Macfarlane, Macpherson, Montgomery, Read, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Sutherland.—30.

NON-CONTENTS,—The Hon. Messieurs Baillargeon, Bureau, Chaffers, Christie, (Speaker,) Cormier, Leonard, Letellier de

St. Just, McClelan, (Hopewell.) McMaster, Malhiot, Miller, Penny, Reesor, Scott, Seymour, Simpson, Wark.—17.

So it was resolved in the affirmative. The question being then put on the main motion as amended, the same was also resolved in the affirmative.

Leave was then given to the Hon. A. W. McClelan to attend and give evidence before the Select Chmmittee of the House of Commons on Public Accounts, if he should think fit, and the House adjourned shortly after midnight until 3 o'clock on Saturday.

SATURDAY, May 16.

The House met to-day at three o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. TETELLIER, the amendments in Committee to the bill entitled an act further to amend the act respecting the inspection of steamboats, was agreed to, and the bill read a third time.

The bill to amend the act 27th Vic. chap. 49, incorporating the Lower Canada Agency and Investment Co., was reported from Committee with amendments.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL explained them, one being intended to prevent, under any circumstances, the charge of interest above eight per cent, and another to exempt the Company from giving information to the Government, which might trench upon the affairs of private individuals, unless there was strong reason therefor. He moved concurrence in the amendments, and the third reading.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. READ moved the third reading of the bill to authorize the Brockville and Ottawa Railway to issue preferential mortgage debentures and for other purposes.—Carried.

MR. FLEMING'S REPORT.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD asked if the report of Mr. Sandford Fleming would soon be laid before Parliament?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied it was in the Printer's hands. The Minister of Public Works, in reply to a similar question, yesterday, stated the Government were pushing the Printer, to secure the report at the earliest moment. It would be ready in a day or two.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN brought in a bill to incorporate the Hopewell Shipbuilding Co., which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved the order of the day for Hon. Mr. Alexander's notice of motion, that, when the Supply Bill came up, he would move that it was inexpedient, at present, to grant $500.000 towards the construction of the Baie Verte Canal, having been called, he stated he would allow his motion to stand over for the present.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU thought it would be better if the honorable gentleman withdrew it, as it was not in order to have it on the paper at present.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER, dissenting from this view, replied it was not intended to bring the motion up till the Supply Bill appeared. The order should not have been called to day.

Hon Mr. BUREAU pressed his objection to the notice standing on the paper at this time, and cited "May" in support of his view. If left there it would stand on the journals of the House. It could be renewed, however. He appealed to the chair

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER justified the position he had taken. He had simply given notice, not for this or any particular day before the Supply Bill came up, but for that occasion alone, that he would propose his motion. He saw nothing objectionable in his course.

His Hon. the SPEAKER said that, having been appealed to, he must give his opinion that the notice was not in order, because it referred to a document not before the House. It could not properly be brought forward until the House was in possession of the document in question to which it related. That was the principle laid down by "May."

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said this was only a notice of motion, and he must dissent from the decision of the Speaker.

GREAT NORTH WEST RAILWAY BILL.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD, of Toronto, when the notice for third reading of this bill was called, was understood to say that as some of the provisions of this bill might interfere with that respecting the Pacific Railway, he proposed to amend the former by introducing a clause providing it should not go into operation until sanctioned by order of the Governor in Council. He found that other bills had a similar provision added.—The amendment was agreed to and the bill read a third time.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER moved the third reading of the bill respecting the Collins Bay rafting and forwarding company as amended.—Carried.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE moved the second reading of the bill for the incorpora-

tion of the St. Croix Printing Company.—Carried.

MANITOBA LANDS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the Dominion Lands Appropriation bill. He said, in 1870 an Act of Parliament was passed providing for the extinguishment of the Indian titles in the North West, for which 1,400,000 acres of land was appropriated for the benefit of the Half-breed families. The late Government passed an Order in Council giving every Half-breed parent a grant, as well as every child; but subsequently it was found the Act did not justify a share to the heads of families. It was intended apparently to pursue a liberal policy towards the heads of those families, but when it was found that the Order in Council in their favour was in excess of the Act, the order was revoked by the Act of last year confirming the grant to the children. This gave rise to great dissatisfaction in the Province. Now it was highly desirable to conciliate this offended feeling, by dealing as liberally with the parents as with the children. They all felt that in taking possession of the extensive North West, their policy should have a generous basis. The U. C. loyalists when they came to Canada received liberal grants of land for themselves and children. Ought not the same liberal rule to be applied in the great North West, many of whose people went there from 25 to 30 years ago, such as the Selkirk settlers and others. The Bill was designed to grant the Half-breed parents and the Selkirk settlers the lands they considered they were entitled to. With regard to the latter, it was proposed to devote 160 acres to each settler; and an allotment was made to them, but it was found that the population was 200 to 300 in excess of the estimate formed, and consequently the land fell short of the amount required to meet the provisions of the bill. He understood an hon. gentleman who had acquired some familiarity with this subject was not disposed to favor the bill, but he must remember that in Ontario they gave free grants in some 50 old townships to perfect strangers, and assisted emigrants and settlers in other ways besides. Would it be reasonable to follow a different policy towards our own people in the North West? What they proposed to do was to place all parties there who had claims on the Crown on an equal footing. The late Government agreed to donate land instead of a mere pre-emptive right to settlers on the Assiniboine and Red Rivers. He moved the second reading.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS was understood to say that he could not agree with the Secretary of State that this bill explained itself. He would like to have heard it stated the amount of land to be donated under the bill to the half-breed heads of families, in addition to the grants to be made to the children. In 1870, in consequence of the rebellion in the North West, delegates were sent down by the inhabitants to Ottawa, viz.: Father Ritchot, Judge Black, and a Mr. Scott, to see what terms could be made with Canada with a view to the removal of the grievances complained of by the half-breeds and others in that country. The provisions of the Manitoba Act of that year were the result of that delegation. With the donation of the 1,400,000 acres of land provided that act to quiet the Indian title with the half-breeds, and the gentlemen authorized to speak in their behalf were thoroughly satisfied with it. The land was to be given them for themselves and children. Not only were they (the delegates) satisfied, but also the half-breeds interested, and he could state this the more positively, for during the time he had control of these lands which, so soon as the country was transferred to the Dominion of Canada were placed under his (Mr. Aikin's) charge, as Secretary of State, and hence it might be supposed that he knew more about them than most hon. members. He remarked that the late Sir George Cartier was under the impression that inasmuch as the half-breeds themselves were agreed, that these lands should be distributed between the children and the heads of families, there could be no dissatisfaction whatever. Acting under this impression, townships containing these 1,400,000 acres were selected and surveyed, and government commenced apportioning 140 acres to each half-breed head of family as well as child. The number of half-breeds being about 10,000, the land would have given to each 140 acres, with which they were all satisfied. Subsequently, heads of families began to dispose of their rights to those lands; some dissatisfaction was felt by persons interested in these half-breeds, and a protest was entered by a gentleman in Parliament, who put a resolution on the notice paper to the effect that under the provisions of the Manitoba Act, those lands were intended for the half-breed children and not the heads of families. The Minister of Justice

said the Act would bear that construction. And so long as the parties themselves were satisfied to quiet the Indian tittle in that way, it made no difference to the people of Canada; if the grants were made to the children and not the heads of families. He (Mr. Aikins) stated positively, that during the time he had control of those lands, up to the 1st July last there never was any document presented to him or intimation conveyed indicating the dissatisfaction of the heads of families with the arrangement that the land was to go to the children. He believed they were perfectly satisfied with it. Now he would refer to the old settlers of that country the whites. During the time the Manitoba Lands Act was under discussion, his and the attention of his colleagues was called to the old Selkirk settlers who had gone into the country between 1813 and 1835, but had received no consideration for their services in helping to settle it. It was urged that if the half-breeds were entitled to anything, the Selkirk people deserved as much, so far as these settlers were concerned, whether they had rights by purchase or lease. Whether they were tenants, &c., or proprietary occupants they ought to be treated in the same way as the half breeds in being confirmed in their holdings by getting a Patent therefor, as also in getting a free grant of land of equal extent. The late Government he would state quite concurred in this view and the decision was arrived at to confirm all their hol ings and to give them a free grant of 140 acres. The number of the Selkirk settlers he was told by a gentleman connected with the Hudson Bay Company, a member of the House of Commons, was 340. The quantity of land set apart was 49,000, thus placing them on the same footing as those of mixed blood. Subsequently it was ascertained that the settlers numbered 535, instead of 340, w: ich disturbed the calculations and it was quite necessary that the quantity of 49,000 should be increased. As there were 10,000 half-breeds, there was little difficulty by the aid of the census taken in that Province, in ascertaining the proportion of children. Instructions were given to divide the lands among the children, 194 or 195 acres was the quantity to which each child would be entitled, but under the system of survey 100 acres was the best adapted for purposes of allotment, and the Government were determined that the quantity 1,400,000, should not be exceeded in any way. It was thought that if there was a small balance coming to them, and if they could not get it in land they should get it in scrip, so that they could get the whole amount in one form or other, as about 195 acres would have been the proportion for each child, of the 1,400,000. The number of children would be 7,180. and the heads of families 2,820. By giving 160 acres to each head of families hon orable gentlemen would find by this Bill that it would require 451,200 acres in addition to the 1,400,000 to settle or quiet this Indian title. The grant to these heads of families would take about 21 townships containing 36 square miles each.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—In addition to the amount provided by the original Act?

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Yes; in addition to the 1,400,000 acres. Another feature of this Bill deserved the attention of the Hon. Secretary of State; the Selkirk settlers were only getting 140 acres, children and heads of families alike, while by the present Bill half-breed heads of families received 160 acres, and their children by the previous Act would get 195 acres. Yet the honorable gentleman said he was placing all these people on an equal footing. but this was a most extraordinary species of equality.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That settlement was made by the Act of Parliament. The half-breed children were allowed 1,400,000 acres. It was not possible to go beyond that.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS hoped the honorable gentleman would not declare that it was beyond the power of Parliament to grant to the Selkiek settlers the same amount of land as the others received. He objected to the quantity of land proposed by this Bill to be granted to the half-breeds, and that the Selkirk settlers were refused an equal amount.

Hon. Mr. SC TT—I propose giving the parties to whom the hon. gentleman refers all the land they are in possession of.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Yes, but I condemn the inequality of treatment evidenced in giving the one class 160 acres and the other only 140 acres. Another anomaly of the Bill was the Half-breed mother was to get 160 acres, or scrip therefor, under restrictions such as might be directed by the Governor in Council, while her daughter, by existing legislation, as soon as she reached 18 or 21, would get her patent. Why should the Half-breed mother be placed in a different position from the Half-breed child? There is another matter not in this Bill to which he would call the attention of the House; by the provisions of the Manitoba Act, the right of cutting

hay enjoyed by settlers was proposed to be taken into consideration, and allowed for in land. He believed that this Government intended to go very much further than the late Government would have gone into the matter or was ever asked to go. [An ironical cheer from Hon. Mr. Letellier.] Here Mr. Aikins further explained the right of settlers on the Red River and the Assiniboine to collect hay on the two miles—in rear of their holding on the river—at a certain time in July, and said that owing to a change in the bed of the river, this privilege which was very valuable a few years ago was in many cases useless at present. The right of common consisted in the settlers using this land for pasturage. These were the two interests that had to be considered under the provisions of the Manitoba act. He learned that it was the intention of this Government to give the settlers whose holdings fronted on those rivers, the two mile in rear of those holdings in fee simple.(Hear, hear, from Hon. Mr. Letellier.) In other words to give them a strip two miles broad and 40 long, or 160 square miles, or 102,400 acres to the 451,200 granted under the bill in addition, and in addition to the 1,400,000, and quite independent of the amount of their present holdings. He denied that this was a legacy left to the present by the late Government. These half-breeds were to get in the aggregate about 2 000,000 acres. No proposition of this kind was made to the late Government to concede the land in rear of their present holdings for the easement they enjoyed. Nor was it ever proposed to give the heads of families 160 acres each. He thought he would not be discharging his duty did he not call the attention of the House to these facts. So far as he was concerned, he would not sanction the principle of such large donations to these people as, up to the 1st July, 1873, they were perfectly satisfied and never asked such gifts, and more than that, he believed they were not entitled to the benefits now proposed.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said he was sorry the hon. gentleman had taken a course hostile to the bill, which he ought to have supported. He complained of the proposal to give 800,000 acres more to this half-breed population, but what did that amount to in comparison with the peace and contentment which would thereby be secured. After all, moreover, we were merely granting to those North West people their own lands, there was an abundance left for all parties besides. [Hear, hear.] Why should there be any complaining in this matter, when strangers were not only allowed but invited and encouraged to take free grants of those Nort West lands for the purposes of settlement. We were giving one large block of 400,000 acres to a colony of strangers, the Mennonites of Russia, and large quantities to persons from Ontario and Quebec. The hon. gentleman went on to argue the justice of recognizing the Indian and half-breed rights in the land, which was their own originally, and to show the inconsistency and cruelty of an opposite course. A company, which had to bring settlers from the States at its own expense, was receiving grants for them. All this liberality to these strangers was proper, was good policy, but in the face of it, with what reason or fairness could they refuse their own people, long in the North West, and who had helped to settle and civilize it, the land they believed was justly due them? If there were not millions of acres of land unoccupied, Parliament might haggle with these half-breeds, but it was absurd to do so under the present circumstances. The Secretary of State had explained the difference in the results of the grants to the old white and the half breed-settlers respectively. The numbers of the former were under estimated, and hence the land did not go as far as expected. The Manitoba Act had not provided for, and, consequently, not done justice to the heads of the half-breed families; on the other hand we were paying strangers to settle in the North West, and giving them free farms. Now, he could see no reason for refusing the other class their indisputable rights. If justice to the half-breeds had marked the policy of the late Government, it is very probable that some very bad incidents in the history of Manitoba would not have transpired; a little generosity might have preserved Canada from serious difficulties and the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Letellier indicated the idea of calling these grants to the half-breeds donations, and contended there was, at least, no generosity in giving the one party of half-breeds 160 acres and the other none at all. He was sure the House would approve of the bill, and shew a disposition to do not so much an act of generosity as an act of justice.

Hon. M. GIRARD expressed his approval of the principle of the bill, which was intended to meet objects designed by the late Government, in the interests of the half-breeds whose claims had not received the treatment they deserved. That Gov-

ernment promised but 140 acres to the Selkirk settlers, which they were getting and 160 to the half-breeds. We could not be surprised at the half-breeds receiving a little more land than the whites, since they had Indian blood in their veins, and represented the aboriginal possessions of the territory. They were naturally dissatisfied at not being granted what the last Government promised them. Every new settler and the discharged settlers, who had been paid for their services, were allowed 160 acres apiece. He thought the heads of the half-breed families would have been content with a share of the land allotted to the other members, but the by-law providing for this division had been pronounced inconsistent with the letter of the law. He argued that, considering the antecedent rights of those heads of families, and the liberal treatment of not only their children, but of strangers, by the Dominion Government, it would have been unjust as well as unwise to prolong their discontent by refusing them the claims which they made in all fairness and equity. He explained the nature of the hay privilege, and exposed the idea of the enormous value of the two mile strip and the other tracts proposed to be given the half-breeds. He maintained that on the ground of long possession, services to the settlement, and for other reasons, the half-breeds were entitled to all the bill would concede them. (Hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND said it was very unfortunate this land question had not been settled long since. From the first grant of 1,400,000 acres, it was proposed to allow the half-breeds and old white settlers, whom he (Mr. S.) more particularly represented, 140 acres apiece; but since the Manitoba Act on this subject was passed, the grants had been so manipulated as to give the half-breed children 190 to 195 acres each, while the new Bill was to hand over 160 acres to each head of a family. He differed with his honorable colleague (Mr. Girard) as to the old whites being not entitled to as much land as the half-breeds. It appeared the whites must be satisfied, and do without more at present, but seeing it was proposed at first to put them on the same footing, he did not think the Selkirk Colonists would be content with the discrimination against them which this Bill would create. The honorable gentleman explained that owing to the narrow frontage of many of the old settlers' farms, on the river, even when they received the two mile strip in question, they would not have more than 70 acres apiece It would be very great injustice to take away from those settlers the river lands, without which they could not subsist, the remainder being inadequate to their support. He would not offer any resistance to the Bill, because it proposed to settle the land question, the want of a settlement of which had produced much agitation. But he earnestly urged the Government and the House to place the old white settlers on an equal footing with the half-breeds, assuring members that with ever this concession, those colonists would not have any land for speculation or other than necessary purposes

Hon. Mr. SCOTT quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had preceded him that it was very much to be regretted the whole subject was not dealt with in a more liberal spirit in the beginning, as it would have saved a great deal of heart-burning, trouble, and expense. The discrepancy between the amount of land expected and received by the half-breeds, arose entirely from an error on the part of an officer of the branch af the service in carge of this interest. It was supposed that the 1,400,000 acres was intended to give 160 acres.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS dissented from the statement.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT gave Col. Dennis as his authority. The hon gentleman pointed out the difficulty of withdrawing lands granted the half-breed children, in order to a fresh division for the benefit of the parents also. Confirming the grant to the children, which they had under the old act to do, allowed them 190 acres each instead of the 160 originally intended, and pointed out the error of the bill of last session granting but 160 acres, and of the under estimate of the Selkirk settlers. He stated that were he approaching the matter for the first time, he would be prepared to give twice or thrice 140 acres to the men who had gone out to the North West so many years ago, planted the British flag there and endured all hardships in the founding of the present settlements and introduction of civilization. It was assumed the Selkirk settlers would have been satisfied with what they got; doubtless they were entitled to more, but as remarked by an hon. gentleman, land was cheap in that country, and free grants could be had in abundance by *bona fide* settlers. He proposed to amend the bill in Committee by striking out the third and fourth clauses and introducing a general clause; providing that all persons satisfactorily establishing an undisturbed occupancy of any lands within the Province of Manitoba, prior to, and in actual

and peaceable possession thereof on the 8th of March, 1869, shall be entitled to receive letters patent therefor, granting the same absolutely in fee simple. That he thought, would cover every possible case that could arise. He understood there was a considerable number of settlers in remote districts on the Red River and Assiniboine. Sir George Cartier had contemplated giving them their lands free.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS said that was right enough. He had stated this before.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the only object of the Government was to satisfy the North West people, and avoid further trouble and expense. They had found, when they came into office a Commission, sitting to settle this question at an expense to the Dominion of $40 a day. The whole privilege would not have been worth the amount which would soon have been spent to define it. (Hear and a laugh.)

After some further remarks from Messrs. Scott, Sutherland and Aikins, in reply.

Hon. Mr. REESOR advocated a just and generous policy towards the people of the North West. Any mistakes made in dealing with the half-breeds, hitherto, might well be rectified. The losses and evils of all kinds which might result from their ill-treatment, should convince all of the importance of an early and fair settlement of the settlers' claims. We had the experience of the United States as a solemn warning in this matter.

The motion for a second reading was then put and carried; contents, 36; non-contents, 2.

The House then went into Committee on the Bill, when Mr. Scott moved his first amendment.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole upon the Bill, Hon. Mr. Allan in the chair, and during the sitting

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL remarked that he had heard that immediately before the surveys were made, certain persons who were living in Manitoba took the trouble to stake out portions of lands in order to claim them as their property in addition to the land they were occupying.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with several amendments which were concurred in by the House, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. SCOTT, who also moved the suspension of the 42nd Rule, and the the third reading of the Bill.—Carried.

SECOND READINGS.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Federal Bank Charter Time Extension Bill.—Carried.

He also moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Bank of Nova Scotia Bill.—Carried.

He further moved the second reading of the Ontario Bank Charter Amendment Bill (from the Commons).—Carried.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Provincial Steamship Company Incorporation Bill.—Carried.

Hon Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of a Bill from the Commons, entitled the Victoria Bank Change of Name Bill.—Carried.

MESSAGE.

A message was brought from the House of Commons by their Clerk, to return the Bill intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Lochiel, Hawkesbury and L'Orignal Junction Railway Company," and to acquaint this House that they have agreed to the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill without any amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER, seconded by Hon. Mr. Scott, the House adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock.

MONDAY, May 18.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

After routine, the Bill to give certain powers to the Port Whitby Harbor Company was reported from Committee, amended, and on motion of Hon. Mr. VIDAL read a third time.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD moved the third reading of the Bill to incorporate the St. Croix Printing and Publishing Company.—Carried.

NEW BILL.

Hon. Mr. RYAN introduced a Bill to amend the Act 29 Vic. Cap. 57, of the Province of Canada, which was read a first time.

REPORTS.

Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR moved the adoption of the second report of the Select Committee on Contingent Accounts. He said the clerk's accounts had been examined in the usual way, by a competent Committee, and found correct. Seconded by Hon. Mr. DUMOUCHEL and carried.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved the adoption of the fourth report of the Joint Committee on Printing, and explained its character—Adopted.

PERRY'S INDEMNITY BILL.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the Bill from the Commons entitled "Perry's Indemnity Bill." He explained its object, which was to indemnify Stanislaus Francis Perry, for having sat and voted under the circumstances therein mentioned. He explained that though a member of the P.E. Island Legislative Assembly might send in his resignation to the Speaker, and thus resign, by what must have been an error, the Provincial Act made no provision for the resignation of the Speaker himself. Mr. Perry wishing to become a member of the House of Commons and being Speaker of the Local House himself, had no option but to send in his resignation to the administrator of the Government of the Island. Defeated at the first elections after Confederation, he succeeded in gaining a seat in the Commons at the last. He petitioned the Commons for leave to take his seat. The Committee on Privileges and Elections reported that he had been elected bya very large majority, and he had acted as far as possible in good faith, having taken every step in his power to divest himself of the position of a member of the Island Assembly, and recommended that as he was not disqualified as a candidate, an act of indemnity be passed, and he be allowed to take his seat. He (Mr. Scott) understood that the petition presented against him, and the opposition offered, was due to the private feelings, hostility of the defeated party, which should not influence this House.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND criticised the tone of the hon mover and the style of his reference to the petitioner in this case. The hon. gentleman should have followed his own sentiment just expressed, and avoided the introduction of local politics. He thought it was in bad taste to charge the Local Legislature with malice in refusing to fill up the vacancy caused by Perry's retirement. He (Mr. H.) disclaimed any feeling of hostility or malice towards Mr. Perry who had been on the same side of politics as himself in the Island, and elected Speaker by that party. By the Island laws a Speaker had never had any authority to resign his seat during the recess, and under the principle of the British constitution no member of the British Commons could resign his seat during recess, except by accepting an office under the Crown or the Stewardship of the Chiltren Hundreds—there was no inherent right of resignation. The Island had never sanctioned a Speaker's resignation except when the Legislature was in session. In September last, in consequence of confederation, an election for Parliament took place, Mr. Perry having sent in his resignation to the administrator of the Government in order to stand for a constituency. The administrator was bound, within seven days, to issue a new writ. On his referring to the law of the Colony, he found that the only clause which authorized the resignation of a member was the 79th section of an act passed in her present Majesty's reign, chap. 21, declaring that any member might resign his seat by giving information to the Speaker, or during absence from the Island, or on the death of the Speaker to the Lieutenant Governor for the time being. The law did not provide for the resignation of the Speaker himself. The administrator in this case, who was also the Chief Justice, after consulting two lawyers of high standing outside of politics decided to refuse the writ, communicating the matter to the Governor General. Mr. Perry was defeated at the September elections. By the laws of the Island the speaker of Assembly was an ex-officio member of the Board of Trustees of the the Lunatic Asylum, and Mr. Perry's views as to his position might be judged from the fact that he presided at a meeting of those Trustees, taking part in the business as usual after his resignation had been sent in. A dissolution took place in January, when he sent to the administrator his resignation for the second time, but in view of that gentleman's previous opinion, he did not then issue the writ. Mr. Perry also transmitted to the Clerk of the Local House of Assembly a notification of his resignation of the Speakership, but he never sent in a notice of his willingness or purpose to resign his position as a member of the House of Assembly. When the House met in March last, and the clerk read the notice of Mr. Perry's desire to resign the Speakership, there was not one word as to his desire to resign his seat as a member.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—Did I understand you to say that he had sent his resignation as a member to the administrator?

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—Yes, in two instances; but his (Mr. H.'s) contention was that there was no authority for the administrator to act on that resignation. When the resignation of the Speakership was read by the Clerk of the Local Legislature, it then become valid—the

House accepted the only resignation before them, that of the Speakership, but for the illegal vacancy in the membership no writ has yet been issued. The House of Assembly by a resolution declared they had not sufficient legal evidence before them to declare the seat vacant and to order a new writ of election to be issued. The hon gentleman proceeded to argue that this was a novel or exceptional bill and that if Mr Perry's right to be elected to the House of Commons was so clear as alleged, and his resignation legal, it was a great pity this Parliament should be exposed to trouble and loss of valuable time to pass a bill of indemnity. But this bill went even further than was usual in such cases, as it declared null and void any proceedings pending decision, as to the validity or invalidity of this election, in the Courts of the Dominion He contended that the action proposed by the bill would be retrospective, and opposed to sound principles of legislation and jurisprudence. He again asked if Mr. Perry had acted legally why did he want this Act? and concluded by insisting that its passage would constitute a bad precedent in indemnifying parties who had rendered themselves amenable to penalties, thus encouraging further breaches of the law.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said the law was as the honorable gentleman had stated, but he understood that Mr. Perry had resigned to himself first, his position of membership. If he could resign as Speaker he could have no longer a seat as member. He (Mr. P.) had always been under the impression he had done as much as could possibly have been expected of him in the matter of resigning. He had been elected to the Commons afterwards by a very large majority. In spite of this he had been followed here by a writ from the Island, charging him with sitting illegally, which offence, could it be proved, would entail upon him a fine of $2,000 a day. It was the opinion of qualified lawyers and able men in the Commons that his resignation was perfectly legal.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—Why pass this Bill then?

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said it was believed that no prosecution should reach him; still it was argued, if there was any doubt on the question he was entitled to the benefit of it, with which object this Bill was introduced. The question, so far as the Island people were concerned, as to whether a new writ should be issued or not had been made a party one. To refuse the Bill, and allow judgment against Mr. Perry, for illegally occupying his seat would be a most harsh and unjust proceeding. Far better to send him to prison for the rest of his days than exact a penalty of $2,000 a day for the time he had filled the seat. He considered the present proceedings against him nothing less than a piece of persecution. He trusted the House would condemn it, and approve of the Bill. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. MILLER regretted the opposition of the hon. member from Charlottetown, (Mr. Haviland), and trusted there would be no division on the bill. He argued at considerable length in favor of it. He thought that this was a question peculiarly relating to the other branch of the legislature, as it only affected the seat of one of its own members and that such questions were constitutionally for the consideration of the Chamber interested. The subject had been considered by a committee repersenting both sides of politics in the Commons, and comprising some of the leading lawyers of that body, who had unanimously reported in favor of a bill of indemnity to Mr. Perry. The bill had passed in the other House without a division. After such action in the Commons in regard to one of its own members, the Senate should not frustrate their rights or wishes. The hon. member (Mr. Haviland) had gone back to the common law which had been superseded in this country by their statute law. It was true, the Act of the colony of Prince Edward Island did not make provision for the case of Mr. Perry, but that was clearly an omission or mistake, It was plain from the reading and spirit of that Act, it never had been the intention of the legislature to prevent a speaker from resigning his seat. Mr. Perry had done every thing in his power to rid himself of his disqualification; he had left nothing undone towards the accomplishment of that object in good faith. Would it, then, be fair to punish him for what was not his fault, but a plain, obvious fault or omission in the law? He denied that the bill had no precedent, and instanced the case of the late member for Lunenburg and other members of the late House of Commons, in favor of whom a similar law had been passed by the Parliament of Canada. The latter law had been rendered necessary from circumstances attending the formation of the Union, and the present bill grew out of a precisely similar condition of things—the admission of P. E. Island into the Union. He could not see any force in the argument that the bill was to have a retroactive operation; if

the bill was right it should have such an operation. It was absurd to talk of the vested rights of parties who had brought suits before the passage of the bill. Would they permit suitors who in this way had attempted to forestall the action of Parliament and oust its jurisdiction, to have any advantage by such sharp practice? He had little sympathy with such an argument, and did not believe it would receive any consideration from the House. The French population of the Maritime Provinces numbered about 90,000 souls, and Mr. Perry was the only representative that large body had sent to the Dominion Parliament After having been elected by an overwhelming majority his election had not been petitioned against and it would be a most unjust and ungracious act to prevent him from enjoying his seat free from the annoyances he might be subject to without an act of indemnity. He trusted there would be no objection to the second reading of the bill (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr CAMPBELL hoped the hon. gentleman would not press the amendment

Hon Mr. HAVILAND said he did not intend to press it to a division. He only wished to lay the whole of the facts before the House fairly, that the question might be fully understood. He would not have spoken so warmly, but for the uncalled for observations of the Secretary of State.

After some further remarks on the subject, from Hon. Messrs Scott, Haviland, Campbell, Letellier, Boteford Miller, Vidal, and Recsor, the motion for a second reading was carried. The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, and reported it without amendment, when it was read a third time.

MISCELLANEOES.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill from the Commons, respecting the Electric and Hardware Manufacturing Company, which he explained was designed to allow two companies to amalgamate and carry on business as a single body hereafter —Passed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the House into Committee of the Whole, to consider the Bill, from the Commons, entitled Navigable Waters Obstructions Removal Bill. He said the title and preamble of the measure explained its object. He then proposed some amendments to render the Bill more effective, which were agreed to. The Bill was reported as amended and read a third time.

The Bill to incorporate the Imperial Bank was received from the Commons, with an amendment, made, for the reason, that the clause as it stood, would have had the effect of deterring British capitalists from subscribing for the said stock.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved that the House do not insist on the last amendment.—Carried.

Another message was received from the Commons, announcing their concurrence in a number of bills sent from the Senate.

On motion of Hon. Mr HAMILTON, of Kingston, the House then adjourned till Tuesday.

TUESDAY, May 19.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, of Kingston reported several bills from the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon Mr ALLAN moved the third reading of the Bill to change the name of the Victoria Bank of Canada to that of the Manufacturer's Bank of Canada. Carried

The following Bills were also read a third time:

To amend and explain the Act to amend the Charter of the Ontario Bank.

An Act respecting the Bank of Nova Scotia.

MARINE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the third reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the construction and maintenance of Marine Electric Telegraphs." He proceeded to explain the measure, and said he had the authority of a gentleman in the other Chamber for the statement that he had conversed with Cyrus Field, of the Atlantic Telegraph Company, on Friday week, on the subject of this bill, and that consequently Mr. Field could not be described as ignorant of what was going on in Parliament respecting it. This was a sufficient answer to the objection that the promoters of this bill were taking advantage of the ignorance of that Company. He contended that if they had any legal status or rights as opposed to this measure, they would have taken good care to be present for their assertion. The Nova Scotia Act on which the Company had based hypothetical rights as regards that Province, some years ago, was disallowed in England. If this bill passed we should have several ocean lines of telegraph, and a cheaper service. The bill simply proposed extending to other Companies rights now held by one, which had purchased out a French Company, and made other successful exertions to preserve its monopoly. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. READ said this bill was quietly allowed to receive its second reading on the assurance that private rights were not to be interfered with by it. Now they were told they would be interfered with. Moreover some hon. members had left for home on the understanding that no change would be made in the bill as first agreed to in Committee. Time had been allowed all parties for the purpose of information and a proper consideration of its provisions. He believed the House should legislate with extreme caution on matters like the present. The vested rights of English and other capitalists should not be carelessly dealt with. The interested parties had been given only two days to appear and state their case. In view of their enterprise and large investments in this line, it would be but right to leave this bill over till next session, so as to give them time to come to Parliament and urge their claims. A catch-vote should not be taken on this bill without a proper understanding of its merits. (Hear.)

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said the vested rights, so far as he understood, consisted of a monopoly on the Island of Newfoundland, in consequence of which all the telegraphic messages passing between Europe and America went through the Company's hands. The very same Company tried to get from New Brunswick years ago, the exclusive right of carrying their wires through the Province. He was then a member of the Government, and with his colleagues resolved no such monopoly should be permitted. (Hear, hear.) The act of Nova Scotia granting a monopoly was disallowed. Amongst the results of this system, was the charge of 50 cents in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia for messages that cost but 25 cents in Quebec and Ontario. Merely sending a message across the Gut of Canso, a mile, cost 50 cents. He was most decidedly opposed to these monopolies, and hoped the bill recommended by a large majority of the Committee, would pass.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said that although he was not favorable to monopolies, he would not interfere with vested rights, summarily. He would move in amendment, that the report of the Committee be not now received, but that the bill be recommitted to make the 16th section read as follows:—

"In case any Company heretofore incorporated has legally acquired any privileges of landing wire or cable for a marine telegraph upon the coast of the Dominion of Canada, or of any other country, such Company shall be entitled to exercise and enjoy any such existing privilege unimpaired by this act, but no Company heretofore incorporated by any such special act, shall acquire any additional exclusive privileges of landing wires or cables as aforesaid."

Hon. Mr. REESOR thought the 16th clause was reasonable in itself, and should not be altered as proposed. However, the bill had been carefully considered in Committee, and was not susceptible of improvement in the House. The opponents of the bill had not shown any vested rights or vested wrongs that it proposed to take away. They had not pointed out exclusive rights in the Dominion belonging to this Cable Company, because none such existed. If they had, no measure passed here could affect their rights in Newfoundland. He believed we ought to oppose monopolies, which had done so much mischief in the States. The 16th clause simply protected us against any further privileges to this Company.

Hon. Mr BOTSFORD said he could not assent to this bill. [Hear, hear.] If the Telegraph Company had no right in Nova Scotia, where was the use of inserting a proviso respecting "any existing rights the company might have in carrying messages over Nova Scotia?" [Hear, hear.] If they had no rights this proviso injured the bill; if they had rights, they ought to be protected in them, at all events till an opportunity was given them to meet any objections thereto. He fully believed the company were in possession of certain privileges, which enabled them to conduct telegraphic communication over Nova Scotia, and ought not to be deprived of them in the way proposed. It was not that the bill stripped them of rights, but required them to concede privileges. It was not in their power to concede to any company that might be formed under our legislation or that of Newfoundland. Unless the company did this, however, the legislation required has to be denied, and if they had any right to send messages over Nova Scotia, the Bill destroyed it. He should vote against this species of legislation.

Hon Mr. PENNY was sorry to have to vote against this bill, which he would do because it struck at vested rights. He argued it was very much of the nature of a private bill, but one of which no notice had been given. Todd laid down the distinction and the rule. In this case no one pretended to be a suitor, and yet there must be somebody that wished to upset this monopoly, for monopoly it was. [Hear, hear.] What he com-

plained of was that the parties who apprehended injury in this matter had not been present to state their case. This bill was of the hybrid species, and required a notice in the interest of the private rights. If the stockholders had no rights, as argued, there was no harm in allowing a protection clause. The House had no information as to whether they had rights or not. For his part he believed they had not. He did not desire to assume their existence, and protect them, but to avoid the wrong of a kind of legislation injuriously affecting those rights. The rights they proposed to take away were given by other people. The Secretary of State had said there was a clause protecting all rights. He (Mr. P.) would like to see it. (Hear, hear)

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The 16th.

Hon. Mr. PENNY argued it afforded no protection to any rights of the Company. He would rather strike out that clause altogether. What had we to do with the coasts of any other country than our own? (Hear, hear.) If there were any rights in existence, they were not protected by this clause.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the effect of the bill was to put all parties on an equal footing

Hon. Mr. PENNY observed, the fact was it took away a monopoly, to which he had no objection so far as that was concerned He did not want any clause to protect rights that did not, but those that did exist. Let monopolies be removed by fair means. When he saw the 16th clause, instead of being what it pretended, it was one apt to deceive, under the pretence of protecting some party's rights, while it protected nothing at all; he was prepared to vote against it.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL in a humorous strain criticised some features of the Bill which he thought objectionable. Though he did not like monopolies he found fault with the haste exhibited in the promotion of this Bill. The company had not had time to prove their vested rights in the shores of this Dominion. The Government were pushing the measure with somewhat indecent haste. [An ironical cheer.] He believed the company had no legitimate rights whatever. The Government's action gave colour to the suspicion that there was something beyond actual appearances. He would vote against the Bill.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said the proceedings in regard to the Bill had excited his suspicions, and he would vote against it.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER related what took place in the Committee. A delay was granted till Tuesday, 19th, to allow interested parties to appear and be heard. None came and the Bill was passed by a large majority. It was intended to protect the Dominion against this powerful telegraph monopoly. There was no monopoly in the interest of any province of the Dominion, and it was not desired a Newfoundland monopoly should extend itself to the Dominion. That one was so strong as to influence the Legislature of the Island and even defy it and the Government through Cyrus Field, an American. Without that monopoly, the Island politics would have exhibited a different character and results. He would be sorry to attack the vested rights of any company; but this Bill did not. It enabled other companies to be formed under certain regulations, and participate in the privileges now enjoyed by the present company, so as to enlarge and cheapen the telegraphic facilities of the Dominion, and relieve it from the dependence upon a mischievous monoply. Because such bodies might render services, their powers were not always to be increased. The 16th clause, instead of being useless, would prove of great advantage. He hoped the Bill would pass.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD remarked that harm might be done by such legislation, in driving telegraph companies away from Nova Scotia, to other routes.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL did not think the bill should pass in its present shape. Under certain circumstances they should legislate against monopolies. At present they were asked to do away with a monopoly in Newfoundland—with a very exceptional thing, and in a very exceptional way. As his hon. friend from Alma (Mr. Penny) put it, correctly and logically, the bill was a private one, and yet it was introduced by the Secretary of State in the category of public bills. It must have been introduced in that shape for some object—a bill having for its avowed object the abolition of a monopoly. (Hear, hear.) The hon gentlemen who represented the Government, affirmed and re-affirmed it was not intended to interfere with existing rights. If so, why object to the amendment designed to make that perfectly clear? The gentlemen who laid their telegraph wires from England to this country, landed them in Nova Scotia, and had used them for 20 years. Assuming they had no statutory right, they might have some other right. We do not know that a power was not given by the Imperial Legislature to land those wires in that Province, there being no record of

British private bill legislation in our libraries. Where was the necessity for hurry in this matter, or for any bill to deprive certain gentlemen of a monopoly in Newfoundland, without giving them an opportunity of showing what their position was and what their rights? This legislation might be had as well next as this session. Why should not a clause be inserted beyond all doubt saving existing rights? How could this Parliament, which was being pushed so much by the Government, in regard to this bill, grant rights to telegraph companies in another country? This clause was a blind, as the hon. gentleman from Alma had observed, to make believe a protection existed which did not; it was contrary to common sense to assume the possession of the power to land wires in a foreign country.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—They may by an arrangement say this—if you allow a different cable to land in such a country, in which you have rights, we shall allow it or yours to land in ours.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL again urged the House to create that protection to existing rights which this clause pretended to give, but which it did not furnish That was the purport of the amendment, which should certainly be adopted [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said it has been admitted by all who opposed the bill that it was in itself desirable, provided it could be passed without invading vested rights. There was no member of this House who would be more resolutely opposed to the invasion of vested rights than he should be. and if he believed any such would be trenched upon by the passing of this measure he should oppose it. [Hear, hear.] But he did not think that any such vested rights as were claimed in this case existed. He agreed with the honorable gentleman from Alma who, while opposed to the passing of the Bill, said he did not believe in the existence of any vested rights spoken of. He [Mr. M.] did not think that any hon. member believed in his heart there were any vested rights involved here which would be touched by the passing of this Bill [Hear,hear.] There was no necessity for amending a Bill, nominally to make it safe. when it was safe enough without amendment. A good deal had been said as to insufficient notice to the parties concerned. It was within the knowledge of almost every honorable gentlemen present that there had been considerable communication by telegraph, from the east and the west, within the last ten days on this subject. Now were there any vested rights involved or endangered, would not the parties interested have made out their existence? A vested right could not be indefinite or misty. It must be acquired under an Act of the Legislature or some authority. In sending these telegrams across the Atlantic, what would be more easy than to say to this Parliament—we are protected in this right by such and such an Act of the Imperial Legislature or of Nova Scotia? Would not that be the natural course to pursue, and not telegraphing gentlemen here to exert their influence to prevent this Bill being passed? We knew there was no vested right, and that if one existed, conferred by the Imperial Parliament, the passing of this Act would not interfere with it—[hear, hear,]—because any act of ours, passed in contravention of one of that Parliament, was worthless and fell to the ground [Hear, hear] But, moreover, if no Imperial Act existed, the Imperial Government had a right to veto any act of ours and certainly would veto it in the event of injustice. They exercised a veto in respect to a Nova Scotia Act conferring privileges upon this very Company. In what sense? Not because it was depriving the Company of a vested right, but because it was conferring rights and privileges upon them, which gave them a monopoly. which was opposed to a sound public policy to set aside. In view of that fact, could there be any question of the view the Imperial Parliament would take of this subject? It is one in which this country is deeply concerned. From the time the Atlantic Cable has been in existence it has been impossible for the Dominion to have any direct communication by it with the mother country. Our messages had all to go through New York, a state of things which ought not to exist. [Hear, hear.] Newfoundland stood geographically between this country and Europe, so that it was almost impossible for another company to lay a cable while the present monopoly existed. Surely if we could, without infringing upon any vested rights, put an end to the existence of this monopoly, and so obtain an independent British and Canadian telegraph line, it was our duty to do so. [Hear, hear.] We knew very well the cost of telegraphing was enormous, and very much more than it ought to be; this monopoly had a perfect right to make its own charges though this whole Continent found them a serious grievance. The Government had been censured for endeavouring to force through this bill. The object, he

considered, was a very laudable one. He also believed there was a good deal of danger in delay. We had to deal with a very powerful body, which already exerted prodigious influence in Newfoundland, of which they were practically the government. They had, it was said excited their influence in the Island to prevent its incorporation with the Dominion. (Hear, hear). No doubt they had done this to secure the protection of their monopoly. It did not, then, lie with the opponents of the bill to impute any motives to those in favor of its being passed this Session. It might come quite as well from friends of the bill in favour of its passing at present to ask its adversaries what were their motives for delay. The season for laying cables was at hand It was quite possible companies might be prepared to lay a cable if allowed to do so, and he therefore hoped the bill would be read a third time (Hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. READ repeated that his object in speaking on this occasion was to protect all interests, a duty which belonged to this House. Mr. Field should not be persecuted for any political or other reason He again urged a delay previous to action.

Hon. Mr. MILLER spoke at some length in reply to the objections to the bill. He held that his hon. friend from Toronto (Mr Macpherson) had very satisfactorily answered the objection as to the private parties interested not having had sufficient time to make their views known here. They had ample opportunity of asserting any rights possessed. He had been told by a member of the other House that some eleven days ago, he informed Mr. Field that a bill of this character was before Parliament. But these parties having control of the whole telegraph system of the continent might have presented their case to us through the wires if no other way was convenient. (Hear, hear.) If there were any rights to set forth, then why were they not presented? The fact of parties having received time enough for the purpose had disposed of any objection he had to the bill. (Hear, hear.) He thought it a necessary measure, and that this monopoly should not be allowed to treat this country as it had done for many years [Hear, hear] He went on to argue that the company had no exclusive rights in Nova Scotia, and that the vested rights claimed for them were nothing more nor less than the vested rights created by the Nova Scotia Act of 1851, creating the Nova Scotia Company. They had been transferred. There could be no better tribunal for considering and passing judgment upon those rights than the legislature which created them. In 1867 an application was made by the British and American Telegraph Company, for an Act of incorporation. The company under whom those vested rights are claimed appeared before a Committee of the Parliament of Nova Scotia, and by counsel through their friends, and after an ample discussion of the whole question that body decided by placing an act on the statute book against the contestation of the Company, granting to the British America Telegraph Company the right to use the shores of Nova Scotia, and erect telegraph wires and posts upon its territory.

Hon Mr. BOTSFORD—An exclusive right.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—No exclusive rights, such as were usually denomined vested rights. This Legislature equally indicated their opinion with regard to this question. Last session of Parliament the House of Commons passed an act recognizing no such vested rights in Nova Scotia, but granting the Montreal Telegraph Company the same rights in Nova Scotia which they enjoyed any other place, and so marking their opinion on the subject as to make a special mention of Nova Scotia in the act. He contended, therefore, that there were no exclusive vested rights within that Province to be interfered with. He admitted frankly this Cable Company had vested rights in Newfoundland and thought that in legislating with regard to that Island which was ouside the Dominion, they must act as if it were a foreign country. How was it rational that this Dominion should permit a foreign country or a small colony like Newfoundland to stand in the way of inter-Continental communication, so far as we could prevent it, between the old and new worlds? The Government of the Island now contemplate, it was said, buying up the line across the Province, and using it as a means of colonial revenue. (Hear, hear) It has been reported that some of its public men said they could gain $400,000 a year by purchasing that line under their pre-emption rights. Could we tolerate for a moment such interference with telegraphic communication between this Continent, or Canada and Europe? The thing was too absurd. It was in the interest of the public not to allow this giant monopoly to be stronger or richer than at present. We had no evidence that the stock had not paid a handsome profit, or that the whole investment of the present

stockholders had not been returned. It was properly asked that the little Colony of Newfoundland should not be in a position to say—or the legislature that stood in its stead—that they would control and monopolise as they pleased the facilities for these great national undertakings. Why should not Parliament tell them—If you desire to use our country, we ask you to give us the same privileges, and consent to a reciprocity of advantages as regards the territory over which they have now no control. (Hear, hear.) He could not see there was anything unreasonable in that. The hon. leader of the Opposition and other speakers asked, if there were no vested rights, why object to a clause to provide for them? That argument was based upon a confusion of the question, and was ingeniously invented for a purpose. There were no vested rights of this company's within the Dominion, but the bill said to Newfoundland, as to any foreign country, if you want privileges over our country, we require similar in return. (Hear, hear.) Because the amendment would completely emasculate the bill and destroy every object and advantage connected therewith, he would oppose it. The bill had only the great natural object of clearing the obstructions now existing between this Dominion and the old world, with regard to telegraphic communication. This object could not be opposed on any principle of justice or sound policy. He had therefore much pleasure in giving his support to it. The amendment was intended to strike at the principle of this bill, under the specious plea of vested rights, which was its only recommendation to the people of this country. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. VIDAL was understood to say he thought the bill was being brought in the wrong place, and that it should be fought in Newfoundland. If he saw that it struck at monopoly, he would support it, but that if it assailed vested rights he would oppose it. He feared this monopoly must exist till the bill was fought in Newfoundland, and a sense of the evils of such a system prevailed. He thought there were some defects in the bill, and would be ready to refer it again to the Committee, did he imagine any improvement could there be made. The bill at any rate was legislation in the right direction, but he regretted it would be an entire failure. He supported it, however, in the consciousness that it would injuriously affect no vested rights.

Hon. Mr. RYAN wished to reply to some of the remarks which had fallen from the advocates of this measure. An erroneous opinion seemed to pervade their argument that the company which first embarked in this great enterprise of laying the Trans-Atlantic Cable had realized great profits by what was called their monopoly. Now in reality the whole of this large capital originally subscribed has been a total loss. On the failure of their first attempt, the company, undeterred by adverse circumstances, issued and subscribed to a new stock, which was made preferential, and he [Mr. Ryan] had with some others in Canada taken a small portion of this stock rather to encourage the undertaking than in expectation of its being profitable; he therefore, as a shareholder, could inform his hon. friends what the result of this preferential stock [in addition to the original stock totally lost] had been. He could speak from the result to himself, which was that each £100 sterling of his stock was cut down to £67 sterling and that the market value at the present moment, was about £50 sterling, [hear, hear,] and he [Mr. R.] would be very glad to let any gentleman have his stock for what he paid for it, and as no one seemed disposed to accept his offer, he thought the question as to the great profits of this company was pretty clearly settled. [Hear, hear.] As to the rights of the company, which he considered were invaded by the Bill before the House, the honorable gentleman [Mr. Miller] who had recently spoken, although arguing that the company had no *exclusive* rights yet could not deny that they possessed *vested* rights in Nova Scotia, though the distinction between the two descriptions of rights was not very clearly defined. It was clear, however, that this Bill was meant by its provisions to declare to the Cable Company, that unless they are prepared to concede to certain parties about to form a new company, but whose names are as yet unknown to public fame, or this House, the exclusive privilege for which they had paid, of landing wires on Newfoundland and passing over it, we, the Legislature of this Dominion, shall oblige them to take up and remove their cable from our shores. Whether that would be just and equitable, or even in our own interest, wise and prudent, he left to the judgement of the House. [Hear, hear.] The cable Company might find other ways of reaching the Eastern shores of the United States than by passing through Nova Scotia. They might, for instance, carry their cable under water from Heart's Content to Boston or New York, where a great desire was felt for more direct com-

munication with Europe and British North America would thus lose the advantages, if any, derived from the present system and throw the control of the wires more completely into the hands of the United States. He would yield to no one in a fair opposition to monopoly or in the support of measures for the country's good, but a primary consideration with him was to respect the equitable claims of institutions whose establishment had been beneficial to the civilized world. The language of his hon. friend (Mr. Miller) in reference to Newfoundland had somewhat surprised him, and he would ask was it a judicious course or likely to encourage the union of that Island with the Dominion to talk in a dictatorial and imperious strain of coercing her in her freedom of legislation, over which she had the right of undisputed control? He feared that a threat had been held out not only in this debate, but that the bill before the House was in itself a standing threat to the effect that unless Newfoundland granted the legislation which we required, and which involved a breach of contract on her part, we would deprive her of the telegraphic connexion with this continent which she now possesses, and which, tearing up the cable on the coast of Nova Scotia as we threaten to do, would destroy. With reference to the time which had been given to the company to prepare its defence against the aggressions of this bill, it was only about seven days ago that the first intimation was sent to Mr. Field, to New York; unfortunately that gentleman was not there, but in the far West—in Utah, among the Mormons, (laughter), on his way to San Francisco. Of course he was thus deprived of the chance of understanding the detailed enactments of the bill, or of making any but the short general suggestions to oppose it. About the same time a communication was sent to the central office of the company in London, and they lost no time in telegraphing to the Minister of of Justice here, to to enquire the effect which the present bill would exercise on the rights of the company. Those who have seen that Minister's reply to the company's enquiry have come to but one conclusion that the company was led from its tenor to believe that no interference with their equitable or vested rights was attempted. This will account in some degree for their not having sent more urgent protests by telegraph, for they were lulled into confidence by the assurance which had reached them from so high a quarter. Hon. members might however rest assured that so soon as the company became acquainted with the true state of the affair, and what the actual provisions of this bill are, that they will exert every legitimate means in their power to render it nugatory, (hear, hear), because it clearly attempts to interfere with rights which are very valuable to them and to which he (Mr. R.)thought, after their great sacrifices in first embarking in so grand and hazardous an enterprise and after their undaunted perseverance in bringing it to a successful issue, they had an unquestionable claim. He would therefore vote for the saving clause of the Hon. Mr. Kaulbach. (Hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH in reply said that it was sought by the bill to exclude the present company from the rights which they were now in the enjoyment of unless they gave up the rights which they had in Newfoundland. He could not see that there was any justice in this attempt to deprive them of their rights to carry this line over Nova Scotia, though they had no exclusive right. Now what was attempted to be done was to take away those rights unless they gave up their rights in Newfoundland, and that appeared to him to be trying to take an unfair advantage of the company. When they first entered upon the work it was well known to be, and was recognised as a great enterprise; and he looked upon it now as a very hard thing that they should not enjoy the fruits of their labour. If the monopoly was broken up, no doubt another company would be formed. But with regard to the existing company if they had no legal rights there was no harm done, but all he wanted was that the company should have protection for the legal rights which they enjoyed. He thought it was not fair that the rights which they could claim in a Court of Justice should be taken away by special enactment. The company asked for no legislation at all, but only that they should be allowed to retain whatever rights they have, and which they could establish in a Court of Justice.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said that in his own Province, the Electric Telegraph Company connected themselves with the Western Company and they doubled the rates. The policy of the present day was to have cheap postage and cheap telegraphy, and he did not think the majority of the House was in favor of keeping up monopolies. They were not conducive to the prosperity of the country, and what were called rights he looked upon as wrongs. They knew that in the mother country the Government had taken charge of the

telegraphs and had put them in the same position as cheap postage.

The House divided on the Hon. Mr. KAULBACH'S amendment, when there were 24 for it and 31 against it. The following is the division list:

YEAS.—Hon. Messrs. Aikins, Alexander, Armand, Bellerose, Botsford, Campbell, Carrall, Chapais, Chinic, DeLery, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Girard, Haviland, Holmes, Kaulbach, Lacoste, Macdonald (Victoria), Penny, Perry, Read, Ryan, Shaw, Trudel. —24.

NAYS.—Hon. Messrs. Baillargeon, Benson, Bureau, Chaffers, Christie (Speaker), Dickson, Flint, Foster, Guevremont, Hamilton (Kingston), Haythorne, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McClelan (Hopewell) McDonald [Toronto], McLelan (Londonderry), McMaster, Macpherson, Malhoit, Miller, Montgomery, Panet, Reesor, Scott, Seymour, Simpson, Sutherland, Vidal, Wark, Wilmot, Wilson—31.

The motion for the third reading was then put and carried, and the bill passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON presented the report of the Standing Committee on private Bills returning the Bill entitled an Act to incorporate the Provincial Steam Ship Company, without amendment. This Bill was read a third time and passed, on the motion of Hon. Mr. Botsford seconded by Hon. Mr. Ferrier.

A Bill from the Commons entitled an Act to amalgamate the Canadian Telegraphic Supply Manufacturing Company (Limited), and the Toronto Manufacturing Company [Limited], under the name of the Electric and Hardware Company (Limited) was reported from the same Committee without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON presented the 5th, 6th and 7th reports of the Joint Committee on Printing, in which was recommended that Messrs. MacLean, Roger & Co, be awarded the contract for printing. He moved that the reports be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT mentioned in connection with the report that 34 bills had passed a third reading in the House of Commons and they had not yet been presented to this House. This was owing to the printer not having them ready.

After some further conversation the motion for considering the reports on Thursday was adopted.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN presented the report from the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons, appointed to assist the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, and it was ordered to be laid on the table.

MOTIONS.

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. McLelan, that the bill from the House of Commons on Friday last, intitled 'An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Royal Canadian Insurance Company,' be now read a second time.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. READ said he would ask the House to dispense with notice of motion in reference to the motion which he had to propose which was that an address be presented to His Excellency, praying for a return of receipts from all sources from the 30th April down to the latest date, so that when the matter of the tariff came up they might discuss it with propor data before them

The Hon FOSTER seconded the motion and it was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said that suggested to him the necessity for putting a question to the Government upon a subject that had already been alluded to by a member of this Chamber. He wanted to know what prospect there was of important measures being brought before the Senate before the last days of the session. They were now within a few days of prorogation, and not one single important measure had been brought up yet. It was made a cause of complaint against the late Administration that important measures were delayed, but he thought they had a right to expect and see when they had a Reform Government in power, that no such delays would take place. They should have had the Pacific Railway Bill before them ere now, as well as the Tariff and the Controverted Elections Bill. It was quite impossible that they could discharge their duties and responsibilities to the country if the bills were not brought up in time to give them due consideration. There were gentlemen in this Chamber who could give valuable information to the Government, and he thought that now when the great Reform party were in power the country had a right to expect much better things from them. [A laugh.]

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that the Pacific Railway Bill had not yet been discussed in the other House, as the resolutions were considered before the Bill was taken up. He thought the Commons were at present discussing the Bill. With regard to the Tariff Bill, they had not been able

to get it because of the constant defect of the printer.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL, pursuant to previous notice asked :—

1st. Whether it is the intention of the Government to assume the Bay of the River St. Clair at Sarnia as a Dominion Harbor?

2nd. Whether the Government has taken or intends to take any steps to test or to extinguish the claims of those persons who are proprietors under Patents from the Crown of the land covered by the waters of the Bay at Sarnia?

3rd. Whether the Government in the event of the Bay not being assumed as a Dominion Harbor, will submit to Parliament a Bill to vest the Bay in the municipality of the town of Sarnia,—or in Trustees—and conferring powers to determine a uniform limit to which wharves may be extended, and to make such other regulations as may be necessary to preserve the Bay for the use of the Public?

Hon. SCOTT said with regard to the first question he would call the attention of the Department to it, and in reference to the second question no steps had been taken. The third question would be answered by the production of the papers.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL then moved, That an humble address be presented to his Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency, the Governor General, will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a Copy of the reports relating to the Bay of the River St. Clair at Sarnia, recently made to the Government by C. E. Michaud, C. E, and Wm. Kingsford, Engineer of Western Harbors, who were sent respectively to survey the Bay and to report upon an alleged encroachment on the rights of the public to the free navigation of its waters.

The motion was adopted.

Several bills from the Commons were read a first time and their second reading fixed for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 6:15 p.m until 3 o'clock on Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY, May 20.

The House met at three o'clock, after routine,

Hon. Mr. PENNY moved the third reading of the bill to amend the Act incorporating the Royal Canadian Insurance Co.—Carried.

INSOLVENCY.

Hon. Mr. MILLER moved the second reading of the Bill to continue the Insolvent Act of 1869. He explained that his object in moving, with regard to this bill, which, strictly speaking, should be left to the Government, was to elicit the opinion of the House, as to the propriety at this late period of the session, of not undertaking to deal with a new Insolvency Act. If the members consented, and the Government did not oppose the Bill, he would regard it as an expression of the opinion of the House that they considered it too late in the session to discuss and pass a new Insolvency Act. Such an important subject should certainly not be discussed and dealt with hastily. He believed it would, under present circumstances, be desirable to continue the present act with its amendments.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT desired that the sense of both Houses should be expressed on this important question. He believed the feeling in this Chamber was that it would be much better if the Bill the Government had prepared, should be allowed to stand over till next session, so as to allow its discussion by Boards of Trade and the mercantile community. No inconvenience could arise from continuing the existing act in the meantime.

The Bill was read a second time; after some discussion, during which, in answer to Mr. Haviland's representations as to the need of an insolvency law in Prince Edward Island, in place of the one that had expired, Mr. Letellier said in case the new Insolvency Bill was not pressed for in this House at present, there would be a provision in the new bill, already introduced into the Commons, reviving the old law of the Island.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills, after explanations and in some cases a little discussion, were read a second time, and referred to appropriate Committees.

To Define with greater Certainty the Liability of Carriers by water. Hon. Mr. Scott, said it was similar to the English Bill, and, he was told, embodied the provisions of the Code of Lower Canada on the subject.

To Establish a military college in Canada (similar to West Point in the States.)-Hon. Mr. Letellier.

Nova Scotia Subsidy Explanation Bill. —Hon. Mr. Scott. He said it was to allow Nova Scotia interest on her readjusted debt of $9,000,000 agreed to instead of the original amount of eight millions, the rearrangement as to this interest being the result of the Bill of last year, charging the

Dominion with the surplus debts of Ontario and Quebec. The difference by this correction of the bill would be $10,000 a year in favour of Nova Scotia, to which the other House thought she was entitled.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD had a different recollection of the arrangement of last year, between the representatives of the Lower Provinces and the Government. He understood Nova Scotia was to come into the settlement on the basis of interest on eight and not on nine millions, and more for the reason that she had by cleverness, persistence and good management, obtained better terms than some of her sister provinces. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) It was thought she should be satisfied with interest on the old debt of eight millions which would have placed her on an equal footing with those provinces. He thought that understanding ought to have been adhered to.

A lengthy discussion ensued, hon. Messrs. Messrs. Miller, McLelan and Kaulbach expressing surprise at the opposition of the representative of New Brunswick, and arguing skillfully from the concession of better terms to Nova Scotia, her circumstances, and the habits of her people, who were larger relative contributors to the Dominion revenue than the people farther West, that she was fully entitled to the trifling advantage conferred by the bill, and which was admitted to have been kept from her by mistake. It was urged that it would be unjust and foolish to deny that important Province her right in this matter. The hon. gentlemen also controverted the statement of the Senator from New Brunswick, as to the understanding with the Privy Council last year.

Hon. Messrs. DEVER and WILMOT argued the case of New Brunswick, in reply, maintaining that she contributed more to the revenue in proportion to population than any other Province, save, possibly, British Columbia, whose good quality in this respect, Dr. Carrall had insisted upon.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT corroborated Mr. Botsford's impression as to the agreement of last year.

The bill was read a second time, referred, reported and read a third time.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE, seconded by Hon. Mr. Armand, moved the second reading of the bill authorizing one Meunier, to construct a toll bridge over L'Assomption River.

After some discussion as to the principle of dealing with bills of a private character in this Parliament, which appeared distasteful to Mr. Bellerose and other members, who favored this bill partly because others of a similar character had been agreed to this session,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT, in response to suggestions thrown out by Mr. Ryan, on the subject of the proper course for these Houses in the matter of bills to be submitted, said the Government would probably consider as to a means of securing a decision upon the nature of bills hereafter. He believed the present, as it dealt with a navigable stream, was within the capacity of the Dominion.—Motion carried.

ICE-BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Hon. Mr. RYAN moved the second reading of the bill to repeal certain provisions of law and regulations thereunder, injurious to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence.—Carried.

Bill referred to Committee.

EXTRADITION OF CRIMINALS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Extradition Act of 1873. He explained, it was suggested by the Colonial Secretary, and was intended to take cognizance of the number of crimes for which offenders could be extradited. The bill was not to apply to the United States, but only to the countries that reciprocated in the matter, Denmark, France, Germany and Belgium. It would not take effect till approved by the Imperial authorities.

Bill referred to Committee and read a third time.

DUTIES OF CUSTOMS BILL.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of this bill, whose object, he explained was to raise the new duties agreed upon, at the instance of the Finance Minister in the other House, so as to obtain the money needed to meet the occuring obligations of the country and carry on its promised public works. He believed the bill should and would meet with the approval of this House also.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said that it was very well known that the duty of dealing with the tariff of the Dominion devolved entirely on the other Chamber, and it was not prudent that this Chamber should, except in some extreme case, alter it. At the same time it was not contrary to Parliamentary usage that the Senate of the country should express its opinion with regard to any tariff proposed. He did not propose to discuss the question as to what the deficit of the present year was, but to

make one or two observations as to the expenditures proposed by the new Administration. He wished it to be understood that in the remarks he would make he did not desire to reflect upon the Government of the country so much as upon the system they had followed in making up their estimates. There were certain large items of expenditure, on which they would all agree, for our great highways of commerce, such as the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence Canals, the River St. John, the River Ottawa—such expenditure as this was calculated to afford facility for commerce and for the settlement of our vast territories, and therefore he thought the Government were warranted in taxing our resources to the utmost to carry them out. But there was a class of estimates which the last Administration brought before the Legislature, and which the present Government had brought before it that he considered very objectionable in their present shape. He spoke of the large items for local works, such as harbors, &c., which it was proposed to extend without any condition. He found nearly half a million in the estimates for harbors and piers in Ontario, and, though a member for Ontario, he protested against such a large sum as this being expended unconditionally. What was the effect of such a system of expenditure as this but to encourage the supporters of the Government of the day to come and get the largest amounts they could out of the public chest for the improvement of their respective sections? The people had not been educated so properly as to understand the result of such an expenditure. People generally thought that the representative did the best who got the most money spent in his particular constituency, and did not reflect on the effect such expenditure would have on the country in general. He would suggest whether it would not be well that in future the Government should make it a condition in every case, that when money was granted for a local purpose the municipality in which it was to be expended should appropriate an equal amount for the same purpose? He went on to say that if we compared the way in which we manage some of our institutions with the way in which our neighbors managed theirs, it would seem that we did not certainly manage ours as economically as they did theirs. Where could a canal be better situated than the Welland for revenue purposes?—and yet the financial results of the working of the canal were not equal to what the canals in the United States were. With regard to emigration, he said that our expenditure for this purpose this year was put down at $357,610 in the first estimates, and a further sum of $56,000 for the same purpose appeared in the supplementary estimates, thus making about $413,000 for emigration this year. He would say that such an amount or double that amount would not be an unwise expenditure, if our North West Territories were opened up so as to receive millions of population—so as to receive, as the United States had done during the last few years 200,000 people every year, but when they looked at the way in which this $400,000 was spent in Europe they saw that it rendered us very little service. He held that such an expenditure at the present moment was not wise, and said that if they looked at the accounts they would see that half the amount he had mentioned was frittered away, and that, in addition to it, and to the enormous sums they were giving the different Provinces as subsidies, they were giving the latter large sums for emigration. At Castle Garden and the other immigration establishments in New York city, where 200,000 people were received in one year, the total expenditure was $488,000, while the receipts *per capita* amounted to $375,000. He did not know that our neighbours were expending large sums in Europe.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said that our neighbors were not expending anything in Europe for immigration. They had a large population, and all the vessels going from that country to Europe were immigration agents.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER attributed the large immigration our neighbors enjoyed to the fact that they had a large territory open to settlement. He hoped this Government would not undertake to build the Pacific Railway themselves, but allow private companies to do the work, and those companies would become immigration agents for us. With reference to penitentiaries, he had examined the returns for the United States, and found that there was an excess of the expenditure over the revenue of these institutions in 1868 of $189,369. In 1870 of $138,000, and in 1871 of $237,000, while the cost of our penitentiaries this year would be $328,000. He asked the Government to weigh well these different points during the recess, so that next session they would be able to come down with a very greatly improved system of public expenditure. He had not one word to offer against the changes in the tariff, though he should have preferred to see the ship-

building entirely free from taxation. (Hear.) He said, as an Ontario man, that such an important interest should be fostered and encouraged to the fullest extent, and he was sure that Ontario would assent to this His opinion was that the Government should avail themselves of the necessity of raising three millions more money in some way to give encouragement to the manufacturing interests of the country. He thought that they would have made no mistake if they had raised the duty on articles now in the 15 per cent list, to 20 per cent. He went on further to state that goods paying 15 per cent *ad valorem* duty would amount in imports to $52,616,682, which at that rate would produce a duty of $7,892,502, showing a probable increase of $2 630,834.

Hon. Mr. READ remarked that he wished to approach the subject under discussion in a spirit of moderation and candour and in accordance with the usages of this House, and felt it his duty to make some objections and severe criticisms. He claimed the measure was of that character to warrant him in doing so. What was this measure? It was to increase the burthens of the people to the extent of three millions of dollars. In his remarks he should confine himself entirely to the Financial portion of the subject and not at present touch upon the sources from which the extra money is to be derived. In doing so he would refer to the speech of the Finance Minister when he introduced this measure into the House of Commons and which after being revised and printed in pamphlet form was distributed for guidance and information. He had heard upon the floor of the House, as well as in other places, that this was a measure we had very little to do with, but exclusively belonging to the other branch of the Legislature. To this he entirely dissented and claimed the undoubted right to deal with all questions, both financial and otherwise, in accordance with all understood constitutional usages in England which right was accorded to them by the British North American Act passed at the Confederation of these Provinces, or else what is it here for? If not, this House would be but the Recording Secretaries of the House of Commons, and we might as well go home and allow the Clerk to do the recording, which would be a great saving of time and money, as well as exposing our health at this late hour of the night. (Hear, hear.) It will be in the memory of all in this House, that the House of Lords in 1860 refused to repeal the then existing duty on paper and impose an additional penny in the pound on the income tax, and that while they agreed to the extra income tax they refused to allow the duty to be taken off paper, although it was so passed in the Commons. The conclusion he arrived at was this, if they had the power to impose taxation, they had the power to resist taxation, and this right has not been disputed by the Commons; but the expediency of their doing so upon only the most urgent occasions is another thing. In reviewing the Financial statement of the Government he felt a great diffidence especially as he was surrounded by gentlemen of great business capacity—men of experience as bankers, merchants, lawyers, mostly on the retired list, and in doing so he claimed their indulgence, if in the course of his remarks, he did not explain intelligibly to them his figures. He courted enquiry and would feel a pleasure in answering any question regarding the figures he presented for their consideration. The Finance Minister admits he has no official experience which, from his measures, he was not inclined to dispute. The first proposition he started with was that he had assumed the responsibility of his predecessors, and that they had left a deficiency. This he did not concur in and would prove to every member of the House, if statistics are correct, of which he had the same opportunity of judging and making calculations as the Finance Minister that that was not correct. He would ask hon. members of the House to follow him closely: The Finance Minister commences by saying we have lately had years of plenty, but it must be remembered that at present the agricultural interest of the country, although not seriously depressed, cannot be said to be in as flourishing a condition as it was a few years ago. To this he took exception. In Ontario, is it not so, and in other portions of this great Dominion? He believed it was so in New Brunswick and in Quebec, and from the silence of Senators he concluded he was correct in saying there is not depression in agricultural communities in this country; and, furthermore the Finance Minister's statement is not true. The next proposition was, that we had stood still, but had not retrograded, both of which he ventured to dispute. He would now proceed to the merits of the question. The Finance Minister admits, first that we had a surplus of ($1,600,000) one million six hundred thousand dollars in the year 1872. While that is true in the main, it must be remembered we took off the duties on tea and coffee, and 5 per

cent off the amounts collected from Customs, which would have amounted to the sum of one million two hundred thousand dollars. In further looking into these matters he found the total trade of Canada for the last six years: 1868, $119,797,879; 1869 $130,889,946; 1870 $148,357,829; 1871, $170,268,589; 1872, $194,070,190; 1873, $217,197,096; now as the fiscal year ends 1st July, we have not the returns; further he found the bank capital thus: paid up to 30th June, 1870, $29,801,130: 30th April, 1874, $58,793,312; increase in three years and ten months $28,992,182; bank deposits 30th June, 1870, $31,161,473; 30th April, 1874, $60,249,772; increase in three years and ten months, $29,088,289; revenue 30th June, 1868, $13,687,928; 1873, $20,133,576; a difference of $6,445,548 in five years, $1,200,000 taken off the last year. This to his mind proved that the country had not stood still, but had advanced rapidly, as he had no difficulty in shewing, and the Finance Minister could not but admit that in six years we have had a surplus receipt over expenditure of $6,949,747. So much for the policy of the late Government. He would now advert to this year's transaction, and show how it will stand. Mr. Tilley in his budget speech for 1874 informed us that he expected to realize $21,740,000. Has that expectation been fulfilled? From the returns brought down to 1st April $16,052,374 had been realized; from 1st April to 10th May, the latest returns, show that no less a sum than $3,745,846 have been paid into the Exchequer to the amount up to 10th May, $19,798,220. This brings us within 51 days of the financial year, and for estimating this period he would take the same period last year, adding thereto the monthly increase of revenue for seven years which is a very small addition; the result will be $3,281,600, the total revenue being for 1874, $23,079,820, against the estimated receipts of $21,740,000; a difference in favor of Mr. Tilley's estimate of $1,339,820, whereas the estimated expenditure was $22,586,727, leaving a surplus of $493,093. which, with the surplus admitted by the Finance Minister for 1873 of $1,600,000, will be $2,093,093 to start with for 1875. He had disposed of the fallacy of a deficiency for the year 1874, and now take up the estimates for 1875, as given us in the speech of the Finance Minister, in which he claims that no less a sum than $24,549,000, being $1,962,273 over the estimates of 1874, that extra amount would pay the interest upon a very large amount. To meet this amount we must conclude that he had no reason to suppose that our resources will be less this year than the last; but every evidence is that it will be much greater. The tariff of 1874 will produce $23,079,820, add to which the yearly increase for seven years of $110,080 per month, amounting to $1,320,960, and you have a total of $24,400,780, or $148,220 less than the requirements for the year which can be very easily paid, out of the surplus of near $2,000,000. This is the actual state of the finances without the additional taxation; he therefore would conclude that the extra taxation to be imposed and for which the House of Commons have concurred in has something else in view than to meet any deficiency left them by their predecessors. It was no use of his saying that Parliament now assembled are fresh from the polls, and they wish to have it appear that what was asserted at the elections was true. They now take this means to prove it, having as they assert a majority in the Commons of 110. The opposition being powerless for good they, as had been seen, did not divide the House upon the merits of the Government measure. He asserted most solemnly that this was a cruel and mischeivous tax calculated to disturb the whole business of this country and it is known that since the 4th April, when the Bill was introduced that the city had been flooded by deputations from all branches of industry in the country, pleading with the Government for all kinds of interests in this country asking to be saved from a vexatious tariff brought in by the incapable Finance Minister with an incapable Government and entertained by a servile majority in the House of Commons. But thanks to the country at large bad as this is, a much worse bill was just introduced, proposing to collect the Revenue in a different way, which outside pressure compelled the Government to change to such an extent that their own boasting was not discernable. In view of our having a Commissioner at Washington negotiating with the United States for reciprocal trade relations with them, and in view of our projected Public Works upon which we intend spending a very large sum of money, which amount is expected to be borrowed in the English market at a very early date, although very little of it will be expended this year, he did say that this tariff had been framed more with a party than a patriotic view. This may be strong language, but the circumstances of the case demanded it. If this was the only damage it was calcu-

lated to perform we would feel happy, but let him draw a fancy picture. They were now admitted by their neighbours to be the third rate Maritime power in the world in commercial tonnage,—a proud position, but this Bill is to some extent calculated to interfere with that branch of industry, although the sting in that direction has been forced out by outside pressure. What, he would ask, were the feelings of the brave sailors on 14th April last, when by lightning they received almost in every seaport the intelligence that the Parliament of Canada had dealt a heavy blow at their industry without just cause? he would not say with malicious intent. Fancy the flag of Canada in every sea flaunting freely in the breeze, and fancy upon receiving this intelligence the same flag half-mast high, and you have an idea of one of the provisions of this mischievous measure. The other provisions he would discuss at a future stage of the Bill. (Loud cheers.)

Hon. Mr. FLINT said he agreed with his hon. friend (Mr. R.) who was a very Boanerges on this occasion, that no cause existed for the present measure of fresh taxation, and that it was unwise on the part of the Government to propose it. If there had been a deficit, it could not have amounted to much, and it would have been wise in the Government at the commencement of their career, to have endeavoured to tide over the period between this and next session, which would have given them more time to acquaint themselves with our finances and requirements, before asking for these three millions (Hear hear.) With the large amount of banking and other capital in the country, the Finance Minister could easily have borrowed the small amount needed, or issued more Dominion notes, which would have furnished more small change, which was greatly wanted by the country for the carrying on of its business. The hon. gentleman criticised this Minister and some of his proposals, severely condemning the original set as very unwise, and well calculated to raise the storm of popular hostility encountered. He thought the Government made a serious mistake in this matter as well as in entrusting Mr. Cartwright with his present portfolio.(Cheers and counter cheers.) He denounced the duties on tea, as discriminating against the poor man, by charging him a far larger rate in proportion to the value of the article he consumed than was asked of the well-to-do, better able to pay revenue. He thought it was a mistake, at any rate, to place duties on the necessaries of life, and particularly on such an article as cheap tea, so extensively consumed by the poor, who were unable to obtain varieties in diet, much less luxuries. He also found fault with the duty on ship materials. Tea duties were not necessary, he believed, but if so, they should be placed on the higher grades, and not on any under 20 cents a pound.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH followed in the same strain, contending there was no deficit, and that it was foolish and injurious to the country to strive to create such an impression, when there was a large surplus. He gave facts and figures to show the revenue was healthy and productive, and urged objections, strongly, to some of the features of the tariff, which tinkered at everything, and disturbed every branch of Trade. He complained of its being discriminative against the Lower Provinces, which already contributed more than their proportion, per head, to the Dominion Exchequer. The duties on molasses, cheap teas and shipping materials, would fall with unequal weight upon the maritime population, and tend to injure the important interests with which they were identified. He urged in justice to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, a bonus or drawback of 50 cents a ton on shipping, and a duty on coal from the States equal to that on Canadian coal to the States, 75c. per ton, to encourage the coal trade of Nova Scotia, A serious blow has been struck at our present credit and future prosperity. The necessaries of life and the great industries of the country ought to be as free as possible from taxation. Stimulate our industries, and make this a cheap country to live in, then prosperity will attend us. We have taken a high position among maritime nations, our sails whiten every sea, and we have done a large part of the carrying trade of the United States. They have seen their error, and are now giving a bonus and released the shipbuilding materials from taxation. Our fishing interests will suffer most from the present tariff. For Dominion and Imperial interests we have given equal rights to U. S. with our fishermen, and now nearly everything which goes into the construction and equipment of the fisherman's craft is to be taxed, and that beyond the larger class of vessels. Did the Government know the wealth we derive from our fisheries, and the hardships, dangers, and privations attending those who labour in that great industry, they would not impose this cruel and unjust law.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said, he rose to say,

he hoped to retain the attention of the House for a short time that he might present a few facts and figures which he thought would be somewhat new and interesting on this important question now under debate, a question which he believed every hon. member should take a deep interest in, since it involved a further taxation of no less a sum than some three more million dollars, on an already heaviiy taxed people. He said it was true the portion of the Tariff and Excise to which he would especially direct their attention is a portion somewhat treated with an amount of levity and indifference that was somewhat to be regretted. Hon. gentlemen seemed to be quite indifferent as regarded taxation on the people of this country so long as it was placed directly on what is known as the Spirit and Tobacco portion of the Tariff. He could not quite agree with them in this view, he thought the forces of excessive taxation to a people might be arrived at as effectually through this medium, as by others less popular, especially as he thought he could clearly show that the Lower Provinces of this Dominion are clearly the sufferers in this case. By a careful examination of the duties paid the several Provinces he found that either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick paid more per head on foreign liquors than Ontario or Quebec. He believed they also paid more on domestic liquors. Under the head Brandy he found New Brunswick paid duty last year $97 153.72; Ontario only $89,274.47. On Geneva New Brunswick paid $95,146.86; Ontario $34,462.11. On whiskey New Brunswick $54,553.60; Ontario, $18,3?1.01. And so on, and even uniting Quebec and Ontario as against Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, he found a vast difference against New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as any gentleman may see by comparing the returns. He could also point out the large amount paid into the Excise Department by New Brunswick and Nova Scotia for spirit, &c., that is leeching the vitals out of the West India trade of those Provinces for Rums of a superior quality taken by them in return for fish, &c. He found also by comparing the trade returns for United Canada during the six years preceding Confederation the average to be $84,815,465, whereas the average for the six years succeeding Confederation amounts to an average of $153,436,588, clearly showing that a union with the Lower Provinces is no loss to the trade relations obtained by Confederation with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. But now he could bring their attention to a vital point. Before Confederation it was promised to New Brunswick by the promoters of that scheme that all the advantages of Union would be given the people, including the Intercolonial Railway through that Province under no greater taxation to the population than some $3 75 per head, whereas the present tariff asks from them 26,000,000 of dollars from 4,000,000 of people, or in other words $6.50 per head. Might he not say then, had they not broken faith with New Brunswick, and at what stage will this taxation stop, especially in view of the fact, that is well known to all this Dominion, that the present gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches and known in this country as the great reform party have obtained power from the delusive war cry of *retrenchment*, and the lessening of taxation if the people would confide in them that power they so long desired. He would say no more but allow this Dominion to decide the matter with these gentlemen. In doing so he frankly thought they would not be satisfied with the reasons given by them, "That we are not yet taxed as highly as the United States, or other countries." To him this reply, and poor argument was simply the reply of gentlemen who plainly are not statesmen, for to statesmen the great object should be to keep this a cheap country to live in, and hence induce over taxed people to come and settle amongst us, and thereby increase our exchequer without increasing our individual taxation. He would farther say the people are deceived, as he seriously believed they expected a reduction of taxation from these *reform* gentlemen instead of an *increase*. There is no article on which might be expected an advance of duty except on wines, and here he would say after several attempts at tariff making that which they intended to increase they have succeeded in reducing below every thing that is reasonable, especially in view of the fact that wines that will cost some $4 per gallon will now only pay sixty cents, if not got in even at 30cts, whilst the liquors of the poor have to contribute to the revenue from one hundred, to one hundred and fifty per cent. He would further remark, that to make matters even worse, and notwithstanding the modest declaration of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who introduced this tariff into this House, "that the Government took time and prepared this measure with great care," he was of opinion that this wine duty, after all their care and hatching, cannot be collected without involving more expense in doing so than the whole thing is worth. He would simply ask the Government how

they can tell the quantity of alcohol contained in the two qualities of wine they mention in the tariff, so as to levy the two duties, of 30 cents in the one case and 60 cents in the other, without the aid of a still, or an analysis to test the several samples arriving. He was sorry to see the Government and the country in this unpleasant position, and he would ask that they withdraw the Bill and have it amended if this could be done. If they would not do this he felt it his duty to protest against the whole principle of the tariff, as against New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the object of which seeming to be to compel the Provinces to abandon the importation of foreign liquors in favor of Canadian spirit. The excise is wholly in favor of Canada, and amounts to almost *Prohibition* in Liquors and Tobacco, to the lower Provinces, from any other market but Canada. The whole excise should be swept away. It is the angel of decay wherever introduced. There is no reason we should have it in this new, and what ought to be free young country. The mere influence of any monied interest should not sway any Government to continue an institution that is so hateful to every country. The people will keep you to your pledges of reform, and will not be satisfied with less. They will not be satisfied with a false cry of diversion against your predecessors in office to enable incompetents to leech the country by further, and badly arranged taxation. In conclusion he could not be satisfied with the political economy of the hon. Minister of State, when he says he is informed that the taking off of the late duty on tea made no difference in prices. He could assure the hon. gentleman it made a reduction from 40 to 30 cents per pound, and to him such an argument was very unsatisfactory, and hardly what might be expected on so important a matter as taxing an article of food so universally used. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. WILMOT argued that the tariff was particular within the functions or purview of the other House, whose members were responsible to the constituencies for their action in regard to it. He had no doubt this Senate had the power of amending a money bill, but would be very sorry to attempt it, unless some very strong case for it, or grievance could be shewn that they might appear to be acting in accordance with the wishes of the people. (Hear, hear). He defended the tariff charges as in the right direction. The Government had gone some length, moreover, towards meeting the views of the Protectionists by raising the 15 per cent to 17½, therefore the manufacturers could not complain.

After some further discussion in the course of which Hon. Mr McLELAN surprised some hon. members by correcting the impression that Canada was the third maritime power in the world, alleging, instead, that his information from the Marine and Fisheries Department placed her in the rank of the sixth or seventh maritime power.

Hon. Mr. DEVER. in reply to questions and criticisms, contended, in concluding, that the tariff on liquors was so loosely and dangerously framed that, did he choose to take advantage of it, he could soon make a fortune at the expense of the revenue. He held that the expenses of the country would be met by its income, at present, as the estimates of revenue made by Mr. Tilley were being exceeded. He did not see any reason for increasing the duties, especially in the case of a Government that had got into power on its loud professions of reform. (Hear, hear).

Hon Mr. SCOTT replied to the various arguments and criticisms of the speakers hostile to the tariff bill. He held as to the first and chief objection, that the new taxes were unnecessary, that it was scarcely conceiveable the present Government would ask for three millions did there exist no necessity. He explained the financial position of the country at present, by quoting the figures of the Finance Minister, as to the income of the present year, the expenditure and the expected results for the ensuing year. No safe estimate of receipts for the year ending June 30, 1874, could be formed from the payments in consequence of the new duties anticipated. One firm in Toronto had paid a million on liquors in bond, and others also had discounted the future. Mr. Tilley's estimate of outlay fell far short of the mark, $150,000 more having to be spent in Prince Edward Island, $200,000 to $300,000 on the North West, and other sums, including $200,000 for the elections, which were not foreseen, but for the latter of which the country got good value. (Hear and a laugh.) As to outlay, the public works in the Lower Provinces had demanded more than was looked for, and the Post Office needed $75,000 and surveys in the North West over $10,000 wholly unprovided for. Assuming the $19,800,000 paid into the Exchequer up to 10th May would equal Mr. Tilley's hopes, he (Mr. S.) thought that no Hon gentleman would venture to say that the difference between it and $23,000,000 would be made up to the end

of June. Thus there would be a deficit in the estimates of last year. When Ministers came into power they found the Government of Canada committed to a large expenditure for canals, $30,000,000 in all, of which $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 would have to be expended this year, although charged to capital account, it would have to be raised on our credit, to maintain which, unimpaired we must raise enough revenue to cover the interest. What would be said in London on our attempting to borrow eight or ten millions for canals, and many millions more for an Intercoloni l and Pacific Railway, if it could be charged that we had to issue shinplasters to meet our ordinary expenditure? (Hear, hear.) We could not raise a dollar in such a case. The Pacific Railway had to be gone on with, under the bargain with British Columbia, then $25 000.000 had to be raised this ensuing year for the ordinary services of the country, not speaking of our great public works. He pointed out the evil that would attend a deficit at present, and the risk connected with a close approximation of expected receipts to outlay. He went on to condemn the language applied by Mr. Read to the Finance Minister, as un-Parliamentary, and to state, his colleagues were prepared to share the honor or the shame of his tariff if need be. (Hear, hear.) Did that hon gentleman believe the Government would be such fools as to ask more money than was necessary merely to lay it aside, or pile it up in banks? The thing was absurdity itself. It was thought unsafe in framing the tariff for the needed three millions to proceed on other data than the experience of the last five years furnished. The income might be more, but it might be less from a failure of the crops or other causes. The Government had endeavored to lean as lightly as possible on those industries that could least bear taxation. As to the shipping, if Canada was the third maritime power in the world as some hon. gentlemen opposite argued, surely the shipping interest could bear the $15,000 laid upon it. That shipping interest had received large benefits of late years in the immense expenditures for light houses, improvement of channels and so forth, for the improvement of navigation. He believed the tea duties would make little or no difference in the price to the consumer, having heard that, though teas fell after the removal of the duties, in a few months they rose to the old prices. He expected an early return to the prices prevailing before the tariff was raised by the present Finance Minister. On brandies and other strong liquors, $200,000 would be raised but the principal source of fresh revenue would be the 17½ per cent. duties, raised from 15, which would produce $1,100,000. The pressure from all parts, put upon the Government, was not to reduce these but raise them to 20 per cent. Government took the middle course, however. They believed the country required this money to sustain its credit and provide the interest of expenditures for public works. If wrong, a year would show the mistake, and fresh action could be taken by Parliament. A considerable portion mi ht not be spent, but, if not, the country would be relieved to a corresponding extent in settling the taxation hereafter. (Hear, hear.)

Hon Mr. MONTGOMERY supported the Government in this matter, and insisted upon the properiety of endorsing the action of the Lower House in regard to matters of money and taxation. The Commons were responsible to the people and not the Senate.

Hon. Mr. DEVER corrected the Secretary of State as to the result of removing the tea duty. They did, as a consequence, decline in price.

Second reading carried.

The Bill was reported from Committee of the Whole by the chairman, Mr. Ferrier, without amendment.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the third reading.

Hon Mr. READ objected, saying enough progress had been made with the bill at present, and he might move an amendment to morrow.

Hon Mr. LETELLIER hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw his objection. He had the right to press it of course, but it was desirable to get on with the business, and take the remaining stage on this measure at once, if there was no serious intention to move an amendment.

Hon. Mr READ, refusing to yield for a time, did so at length, in response to the appeals of Messrs. Skead, Botsford and Letellier. The 42nd rule was then dispensed with, and the bill read a third time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill respecting Hopewell Shipbuilding Company —Hon. Mr. McCLELAN.

Insurance Companies Amendment Bill. — Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

Consolidated Silver Mining Company's Bill.—Hon. Mr. LEONARD.

On motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER the House adjourned at eleven p. m.

THURSDAY, May 21.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER the Bill respecting Carriers by Water, as amended, was read a third time.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER moved the third reading of the Bill to incorporate the Montreal Link RR. Co.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH moved the third reading of the Bill to incorporate the Canada Mutual Marine Insurance Co.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. LEONARD moved the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the Consolidated Silver Mining Co.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND pointed out the bill was to give power to a Co., including strangers, to carry on mining in Utah, a foreign country over which the Dominion had no authority. The House should pause before assuming to exercise such power. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said there was no difference between this bill and that of the North Star Silver Mining Co., which passed here. The Dominion would not assume to control that Co. in the States, but the local authorities would, doubtless. The great advantage our legislation would secure, was the means of exercising influence with the directors or head office of the Co., here in the interest of any Canadian employes who might have claims against them.

Hon. Mr. MILLER thought the bill would not be strictly constitutional; but what difference was there between the incorporation of this and Insurance Companies on either side of the line, which were in the habit of doing business in either or both countries. Could we not incorporate a Co. to do business in the States, as well as they could incorporate companies to transact business in the Dominion?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL supported the objection to the clause giving power to carry on business in Utah. The Dominion had no authority in the matter. Insurance Companies did business by the comity of nations, a different thing from mining and like enterprises.

After further discussion the motion was carried on division.

The Bill to incorporate the Hopewell Shipbuilding Co. was, on motion of Hon. Mr. McCLELAN, read a third time.

The Bill to enable Joseph Mennier to build a toll-bridge over the L'Assomption was read a third time, as amended, on motion of Hon. Mr. Bellerose.

FISH PROTECTION.

Hon. Mr. FLINT complained of the great destruction of fish in the Lakes in rear of Kingston, Belleville and other towns on Lake Ontario, by Americans and others, which, if allowed to continue, would soon denude our waters of a valuable resource for the poor. Fish was becoming scarce all the time, the settlers not being able to put an end to the destruction, partly in consequence of the long distance offenders would have to be carried to a Government officer. He urged the importance of action towards the protection and fostering of this valuable interest, and gave an instance of the great success of this policy as regards a lake of his own, and concluded by asking:—Whether it was the intention of the Government to adopt measures for the better protection of Fish in the Inland Lakes and streams in rear of Kingston, Napanee, Belleville and Trenton.

Hon. Messrs. SIMPSON and SKEAD supported the recommendation of a better system of fish protection, indicating the good results to the people which could not fail to flow therefrom.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT pointed out the difficulty of watching all the Lakes between the Ottawa and Lake Ontario, but promised to discuss this question with the Minister of Marine; he had no doubt that, so far as the resources of the department went, the minister would be willing to lend them aid for the protection of the fish.

THE BALLOT.

Hon. Mr. PANET called attention to the unsatisfactory condition of the Militia, particularly in the District of Quebec, especially as regards the strength of the muster-roll. The ranks in some corps were very thin, there being nothing like prescribed or necessary strength. He advocated measures of improvement, and enquired: If it was the intention of the Government to amend during the session the Militia Law of the Dominion. In regimental Divisions where the Volunteer system presently in force has proved ineffective, is it the intention of Government to enforce the ballot as provided for in the Act respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada, 31st Victoria, Chapter 40, or by what means is it intended to fill the ranks when Volunteers cannot be procured?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT replied it was not intended to make any change this session, nor to enforce the ballot. He learned from the gentleman at the head of this department that they had all the volunteers wanted at this time.

RECIPROCITY TREATY.

Hon. Mr. CARALL enquired—have the Ministry any information which they can place before Parliament regarding the negotiations understood to be in progress at Washington for Reciprocal trade between this country and the United States of America?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied it was not in the power of the Government to say anything about the position of the negotiations at Washington.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of the bill, from the Commons, to provide for the trial of Controverted Elections, which he explained was to exchange the present tribunal, the Parliamentary Committee, for the ordinary legal tribunals of the different Provinces. The bill was framed upon the principle of the English and Ontario Acts, which had worked well so far. The Superior Court would act for Quebec, the Courts of Error and Appeal, Queen's Bench and Chancery for Ontario, the Supreme Court for N. S. and N.B.; for Manitoba, Queen's Bench, and British Columbia, Supreme Court and Civil Justice.

He believed the amendments made would meet all the requirements of the people, and that this law would constitute a valuable and needed reform.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL admitted the bill would make an improvement on our present system of trying Controverted Elections. No doubt there had been the evils of delay, heavy costs and partial decisions under the Committee system, while decisions might hereafter be looked for within a reasonable period, and free from partisanship, which our Judges were above. But it might be found that petitioners would be put to as much expenses as formerly. Experience would decide, however. On the whole the changes would probably result in turning candidates from such courses as might subject them to trial before these Courts. He was glad to see this experiment tried, and believed the tribunals provided by the Act were the best possible for the purpose in view. He was much pleased to find the Judges were not to be persons appointed *ad hoc*, whose decision might be open to suspicion occasionally, but the members of the Bench. The Election Court in Ontario was composed of the three Senior Judges, who had a great deal of work thrown on them by the Ontario Act. He proposed to amend this bill by providing that, in case the present Judges have more work than they can get through with, any Judge in Ontario may be directed to assist in disposing of the cases on hand. He had the assent of the Minister of Justice to this change.

The bill was read a second time, amended in the above sense in Committee of the Whole and reported.

BILLS FROM THE COMMONS.

Several bills were received from the Commons, with amendments, which were concurred in, including those affecting the Crime of Libel Bill. Hon. Mr. CAULBACH explained the latter, saying the bill was thus assimilated to the Ontario Act. Costs were to be collected as in the case of debt.

SECOND READINGS.

The following bills were read a second time:—

To enable the Great Western RR. Co. to further extend and improve their connections.

To extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Co.

ADULTERATION.

A bill was received from the Commons to impose License Duties on compounders of spirits.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER explained it was to prevent the adulteration of good drink and drugs. The Minister of Inland Revenue would, under it, have officers employed to test articles suspected of adulteration and the various compounds. The officers would be men of skill, which would furnish the public a safeguard in the matter of the consumption of all those commodities.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER highly approved of the measure, which would be highly acceptable to the country.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked if there would be an appeal from the decisions of analysis in certain cases, pointing out the possibility of erroneous judgments in country or remote districts.

After some discussion on the subject

Hon. Mr. RYAN expressed his cordial approval of the objects of the bill, urging,

however, the importance of some central authority or judge, before whom appeals from the decisions of local analysis might be brought. He also suggested a laboratory in some suitable place, and urged the bill would be imperfect without provision for the employment of high skill in the carrying out of its aims.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the procedure in this would be much the same as in other cases. There would be appeals from doubtful decisions. If the necessity arose, he thought the Inland Revenue Department would manage to find capable officers for pronouncing upon such appeals. The present was the English Act adapted to Canada.

In reply to Hon. Mr. FERRIER,

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said the government were taking action as to the inspection of gas. The bill was read a second time and discussed in committee, particularly the clause respecting the fine for adulteration of food and drink. The committee rose and reported progress, Mr. LETELLIER promising to look carefully into the bill in the consideration of amendments proposed, and serious defects pointed out by Mr. DEVER.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the bill from the Commons, respecting promissory notes, which he briefly explained.—Carried.

The Canada Pacific Railway Bill, from the Commons, was introduced by Mr. LETELLIER and read a first time.

The House rose at six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL read the report of the Senate Committee appointed to consider the numerous petitions for a Prohibitory Liquor Law, which referred to the evils of the liquor traffic, and among other things, recommended a commission to enquire into the legislation and means adopted by other countries for the suppression or diminution of intemperance, with the results produced, and so forth. He moved the consideration of the report on Saturday.—Carried.

Hon. Mr LETELLIER moved the third reading of the Controverted Elections Bill, as amended by Mr. Campbell's clause, making the Act applicable to all proceedings upon election petitions pending under the Controverted Elections Act of 1873.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the third reading of the Insurance Companies Amendment Bill.—Carried.

PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON submitted the sixth report of the Joint Committee on Printing. He said he did not intend to move the adoption of the report, because it recommended the acceptance of a tender for the printing which he did not approve of. True, Mr. Taylor, the present printer, had been blameworthy at times, but the firm had had great difficulties to contend with, having had to build up a new establishment, and bring material and men from a great distance. Their men had not been here long till they were tampered with and induced to strike, and he believed that in the short time Mr. Taylor had the contract he had to pay a great deal more to those hands than under ordinary circumstances. The hon. gentleman reviewed the different tenders, declaring several times it was a mistake to take the contract from Hunter, Rose & Co., and give it to Taylor for the mere saving of $700 a year. (Hear, hear.) It was penny wise and pound foolish undoubtedly. He said Taylor had quit all connection with newspapers, and was enabled to throw all his energies into the printing, for which he had sufficient plant. He urged it would be repeating the original mistake to withdraw the printing from Taylor, and give it to the firm of MacLean, Roger & Co., for a saving of $900 a year,

Hon. Mr. WARD contended it was the correct principle to accept the lowest tender, provided the proper security could be furnished. He would move the adoption of the report. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER sincerely regretted the hon. gentleman who submitted the report could not agree with the majority of his colleagues of the Committee in this matter. He argued it would not be fair to refuse to accept the lowest tender after bringing the work to public competition. It was necessary to act in good faith in this matter, and particularly if the lowest tender offered adequate security. Otherwise, why call for tenders? Why not have saved time and trouble by simply renewing the contract with the present contractor? True the difference between the accepted and rejected firms was not much, but the moment these Houses, by their representatives, committed themselves to the course of soliciting tenders, we must either abide by the decision of the majority, or declare the tenders were not called for in good faith. (Hear, hear.) There was one safeguard in this matter, in the shape of a clause in the contract providing that in case it was not

fulfilled up to the letter, it might be resumed. He believed that had a similar clause been inserted in the last contract, they would not have had to put up with so much delay in regard to their printing, for they could have re-let the contract. He did hope the successful tenderers would hereafter give satisfaction. If not, Parliament would have the remedy in its own hands. He asked the hon. mover to suspend his motion till they were in possession of the opinion of the other House which, while it need not be imperative as to the action of the Senate, might be desirable as helping to guide hon. members. They would fail in duty if they placed themselves in opposition to the Commons unnecessarily.

Hon. Mr. WARD had no objection to postpone his motion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL followed in the same line as Mr. Simpson, admitting the mistake of accepting Taylor's tender because it was the lowest, and assuming the possibility of similar failures and difficulties were he to be deprived of the contract on the same principle. He went on to speak of the fitness of Taylor's establishment, his experience and other advantages for the performance of the work required, contending it could not be expected his rivals of the other firm could be in as good a position in this respect. He dwelt upon the claims of the old contractor for services and sacrifices, and urged the rejection of the report and the acceptance of his tender.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE strongly condemned the withdrawal of the contract from Hunter, Rose and Lemieux, to give it to Taylor for a slight saving, and characterised the experience of Parliament in this matter as one of utter disappointment. The Houses had been delayed for bills and other printed matter, while the work had really cost more than it could have been executed efficiently for by the old contractors. He thought MacLean, Roger, & Co. had the right to the contract, as their tender had been put in on the understanding that it would be given to the lowest, and that Taylor had not the slightest claim upon the Legislature.

A long discussion on the subject ensued, in which Hon. Mr. FERRIER admitted he had no personal knowledge of the TIMES establishment, and was probably mistaken in saying it was a one-horse affair, and advocated an efficient system in future, as regards the printing. Hon. Mr. SKEAD urged the carrying out of the same principal of accepting the lowest tender in the case of the paper contract, to which Mr. Hope had the best claim. Hon. Mr. McMASTER and Mr. LETELLIER twitted Mr. CAMPBELL with inconsistency, in now objecting to the lowest tender for the printing, after advocating its adoption in the case of Taylor and other contractors for public work. Hon. Messrs. AIKINS and REESOR strongly advocated the claims of Taylor, and predicted evils and failure from the acceptance of the TIMES contract. Hon. Mr. BUREAU spoke for the report, and Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD called attention to the duty of considering the decision of the Printing Committee, which possessed a representative character as regards both Houses. The opinions of these gentlemen should be an element in this case, should influence the House to a certain extent.

Hon. Mr. WARK at length moved that the further consideration of this report be deferred till to-morrow.—Carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SIMPSON, the seventh report of the Joint Committee on Printing was adopted.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Patent Act of 1872.—Carried. Third reading also.

ICE BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

With respect to Hon. Mr. RYAN'S bill, to prevent obstructions to the navigation of the St. Lawrence,

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER was understood to say that the Government would take the matter in hand between this time and next spring, with a view to the objects of the bill.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said that under those circumstances, and considering the advanced period of the session, he withdrew the bill.

JUDGES' SALARIES.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the bill to amend the law readjusting the salaries of the Judges. He explained that the salary of the Lieut.-Governor of P. E. Island was fixed at $7,000. The salary of the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, in Ontario, was to be $6,000 and the three new Judges in that Province would receive $5,000 each, the same as the others. Bill reported from Committee and read a third time.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the Standard Marine Insurance Co.—Carried.

NORTH WEST POLICE.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act respecting the Police Force in the North West, explaining it provided punishment for the sale of liquor in certain objectionable cases. He added, in reply to Mr. ALEXANDER, that the police numbered 300 and were provided with light field guns—were a flying artillery. There was a large nomadic force out west, and it was doubtful if we had enough police embodied.—Bill read a third time.

The following Bills were read a second and third time, under suspension of the rule:

Public Works Amendment Bill.

Vagrants' Act Amendment Bill.

Extra Judicial Oaths Suppression Bill.

Dominion Lands Act (Manitoba) Amendment Bill.

The Bill to amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba Bank, was read a second time on motion of Hon. Mr. GIRARD.

The House adjourned at eleven p.m.

FRIDAY, May 22.

The House met at three oclock.

A number of bills were reported from the Banking and Commerce Committee by Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, of Kingston, some with and some without amendment.

THIRD READINGS.

The following bills were read a third time:—

To enable the St. Francis and Megantic Railway Co. to issue bonds.

To enable the Western Railway Co. to extend and improve its connections, and issue stock.

To extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Co.

To amend the Act incorporating the Bank of Manitoba.

To incorporate the Mercantile Marine Insurance Co. of Canada.

The Banking Committee made a further report containing a recommendation that, hereafter, it be a requirement that $200 be paid into the Private Bills Office by each promoter instead of the $100 heretofore exacted.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER spoke in support of the report. He said it was naturally thought that this increased charge would probably prove the shortest way to the cure of the difficulty in connection with legislating upon Private Bills, that ought to go before the Local Legislatures. Hitherto Private Bills cost less here than at the Local Legislatures, and at the present new rate there was no ground for complaint.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON moved that the members of the Senate be summoned to consider the report to morrow.—Carried.

TANTEMAR BRIDGE.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD called the attention of the Government to a return laid on the table with regard to a very large expenditure on a bridge of the Intercolonial Railway over the Tantemar River. No tenders were asked for the construction of that work, and the omission could not be explained on the principle of a sudden emergency, for the return showed it was contemplated the autumn previous that the expenditure should be incurred. Furthermore, no public notice for competition was given those parties who might be disposed to undertake the repair of this bridge, consequently it was given to an individual without a contract, and if the expenditure had been according to the returns, it was lavish for the amount of work performed. The statement furnished showed that a pier was to be taken down and a new one constructed for $19,000. The parties who had charge of the work delayed it till they said it was too late in the season to complete it, and afterwards put some addition to this pier which cost over $14,000, while the whole work of taking down the old pier and building another was to have cost only $19,000. He had no hesitation in saying the whole affair showed a lamentable want of skill and practical knowledge. The expenditure for it was most lavish, the work not being what should have been produced. He had the opinion of an experienced engineer and practical man that the work done was not up to the mark, and that the pier ought not to have been removed. He (Mr. B.) had no doubt this sum of $14,000 had been taken out of the income or revenue of the Intercolonial and European and North American Railways, which accounted, to that extent, for the smallness of the returns as compared with the increased traffic upon those railways. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER thanked the hon. gentleman for having enquired into this matter, which had not fallen under his own notice. He believed this subject was already before the Public Works Department. The information given by the hon. gentleman would serve, in future, in helping to prevent the recurrence of such

irregularities. The present Government were not responsible for this one, which he hoped would serve as a lesson to it, however.

In reply to some remarks by the Hon. Mr. READ.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER expressed regret that the return with which the Post Office Department was concerned, was not yet before the House. The attention of the Postmaster General had been called to it.

THE ELECTION BILL.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said, in introducing this measure, it was one that more particularly concerned the House of Commons, whose views with respect to it should prevail. It should be left entirely to their judgment. Experience had satisfied the present government that it was necessary to have a law applicable to all the Provinces. A General Election Law had been yearly promised since Confederation. It was admitted on all sides that it was necessary to make a change of the law with the object of obtaining elections in a manner more consonant with the views of the people, with honesty and with a desire to furnish that protection against injustice and wrong doing which unquestionably should exist. The system of two days' polling in Quebec and Ontario had led to much bribery and corruption at times, with all their attendant evils, on the ascertainment of the result of the first day's voting. The government hitherto had, moreover, the right of naming the election days, which enabled them to improperly influence the people with false impressions as to their strength in the country, by bringing on the elections likely to prove favourable to them first. The difficulty was to find a remedy for this obnoxious state of things, and the only one that seemed suitable, was simultaneous voting. Ministers were, in this matter, giving up a valuable advantage hitherto used with much effect by parties in power. But the benefits of the simultaneous method, which the government decided to try last general election were made most apparent. Thus members of the government had shown themselves consistent with their professions of many years, while in Opposition, and proved their sincerity beyond doubt. Of course a few exceptions to the rule of simultaneity, were necessarily made in constituencies very remote, and of great extent, such as Algoma. Another important feature of this bill was the qualification of the electors. For his own part, Democratic though it might be, he would have preferred granting the franchise to every man who might, at any moment, be called upon to take up arms in defence of his country. But, as it was the general opinion that some qualification should be required, it was decided to fix the present franchise. On the other hand, however, there was an end to the pecuniary qualification exacted of the candidate, who was no longer to have the judgment as to his fitness decided by the amount of money in his pocket, but by the brains in his head and by his general character. (Hear, hear.) So property on the one side would be represented by the electors, and intellect, capacity, and honesty by the candidates. As to the qualification for the voters, it would certainly have been difficult to devise a qualification that would have affected equally all the Provinces. To give satisfaction in this respect, and avoid the expenditure of a large sum of money, which legislation by the Dominion would have entailed, the government resolved to take the existing qualification for the electors for the Local Legislatures, which, doubtless, secured all the rights they could claim. But unfortunately an exception had to be made of P. E. Island, the little Province that came into the Union last, but was thought least of. (Hear, hear.) For its Legislative Assembly there was universal suffrage, while for the Legislative Council, a property qualification, which it was thought advisable to adopt for electors for the House of Commons. This was only for the present, however, it being left to the Legislative Assembly, more particularly representing the masses, to lower the franchise as much as they chose at the next meeting of the Legislature. The government of Canada would be ready to accept any action on this matter. Another new feature of the bill was the abolition of the old nomination days, which were of no advantage that he could see, but, on the contrary, proved often the occasions of excitement and regretable violence. The change need not prevent meetings of the electors before the polling and discussion of public questions. Twenty electors, by a requisition, might hereafter put a man in nomition, the candidate depositing $50 as an evidence of good faith. The next change he would notice was very important, being designed and calculated to diminish the temptation of the electors and the evils of corruption—the new feature was the ballot, which would go far to prevent undue influence of any kind, and secure honesty in the elections. It looked more manly, he admitted for a person to go forward

and vote openly, but when they considered the weakness of some, and the pressing necessities of others—the strong inducements held out in the shape of the offer of relief for, perhaps, starving wives and children, they could not but admit the desirability of such a protection as the ballot could afford. They had a duty to provide for the weakness of humanity under such circumstances; and as the mother country, England—and he was glad to regard her in that relationship—(Hear, hear,)—had not thought it improper or derogatory to moral principle or manhood, to adopt the ballot, Canada need not be ashamed to copy her in this matter. He believed secret voting would be accepted as a boon and a protection to many often placed in a position of helplessness. It was the tempter that deserved the chief punishment and not the poor man. (Hear, hear.) Every one must admit that by this bill the Government was not striving to get more power over the people, or even to retain that previously possessed, for if this had been their object, they would have let the law stand as it was. It was felt by them all that the men now in power, when they had the opportunity, must stand true to their professions, of many years, out of office. (Hear, hear.) Though the Senate had a right to scrutinise this measure, and suggest improvements, he thought that when they considered it affected only the Commons, it behoved this House not to take strong ground in the matter, but while considering the principle of the bill, leave to the Commons the work of settling its details as well as its important provisions. He hoped the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bellerose) who had a notice of motion on the paper, touching the pecuniary qualification of candidates, would withdraw it, as it was contrary to the spirit of the measure. He contended this qualification should not be based on money, which could not give intellect or other qualifications requisite to a good representative, and also that it would be unjust as well as unwise to shut out of public life young men of character and promise simply because they did not own a couple of thousand dollars. (The hon. gentleman resumed his seat amid cheers.)

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he did not at all reproach the Government for not bringing this bill forward at an earlier period of the session, for he knew the difficulty of Governments in this respect. Nor should he raise the least objection to the hon. gentleman going on with his bill, though not printed. With reference to the bill itself, he apprehended it was unnecessary for his hon. friend to press his views upon it in the manner witnessed. The bill was very much the same bill the late Government brought forward, with some exceptions, which might recommend themselves to some members, and some of which he himself approved of, individually. He thought that in the bill of the late Government different election days for the whole Dominion were contemplated, though the elections were to be simultaneous in one Province. He concurred in the view that it was desirable that there should be but one day and the same day, as far as possible. The hon. gentleman took great credit for having, in advance of the bill, adopted this principle in the recent elections, but he made no reference to the complaint that this very principle was departed from as regards Nova Scotia, the elections for which were postponed till those in the western part of the Dominion were decided. Gentlemen on his side of the House complained that this delay was intentional, designed to prejudice the chances of their party in Nova Scotia, by means of the results of the elections further west. In this instance, at any rate, the Government did not observe the principle which the hon. gentleman glorified them on having adopted in advance of this legislation. (Hear, hear.) They brought the results of the elections here to bear on those in Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—It was not needed.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—That was another matter; but the Government was entitled to no credit in this respect. He thought the fixing of one day over the Dominion for elections would prove of great advantage, by shortening the period of excitement, saving time and avoiding the evils hitherto connected with delay. As to the ballot, he could not approve of that mode of choosing candidates, but would rather preserve the present ancient method. (Hear, hear.) He did not think there was the same occasion for the ballot here as in the old country, or that there was undue influence brought to bear by persons of large estates or large capital, upon the electors. He believed men here voted as they pleased, as a general rule. The exceptions, as in some cases of pressure by large manufactories, were few. Nor did he think the experience of New Brunswick went at all to show there was less expenditure on the elections by ballot than under the open system. He was informed by gentlemen from that Province

that her experience, as regards illigitimate expenditure, for which the ballot was thought by the Minister of Agriculture a remedy, was the same as that of the other Provinces. In the United States the ballot had certainly not diminished this expenditure. (Hear, hear.) He disliked making it imperative upon the people to conceal what they were about to do. There was, to his mind, something unpleasant in it. A man did not like to pursue such a course, nor to impose it on others. There was something sneaking in putting in a ballot. It was not the straightforward, manly way in which one would desire to perform any action.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—Why was it followed in voting in large companies and similar bodies?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the motive was different in club and similar elections. This mode was followed among a small circle of gentlemen for the purpose of preserving quiet and harmony. That was very different from performing a public duty. There was nothing analogous in the cases. He did not see there was any occasion in the social position of the electors to render this concealment necessary. The bill to a certain extent was open to objection. He noticed, moreover, as a defect, an exception in the case of Prince Edward Island, which has not for the present to possess the franchise extended to the other parts of the Dominion. He was content to see the bill tried, to ascertain how it would work. (Hear, hear.) He agreed with his hon. friend, it was not desirable for this House to interfere with a bill of this kind, respecting elections to the House of Commons. We should offer our criticism upon it, but unless it interfered with some principle of real value, in our judgment, we should not propose alterations, for they would be received very jealously in the other House. Notwithstanding, hon gentlemen might hear his hon. friend (Mr. Bellerose) on the motion he had put on the paper, with respect to the qualification of candidates. He again called attention to the departure from the general rule of the bill in the case of the elections of Prince Edward Island. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND fully endorsed the sentiment of the last speaker that this was not a bill with regard to which it would be right for this chamber to obstruct the legislation of the other House; but, at the same time, when they saw any glaring errors or inconsistencies in a bill, they were justified in pointing them out. This Upper House had the privilege of criticising, improving, and if possible, amending a bill in its details. He agreed with many of the principles laid down in this Bill. They had had simultaneous polling in Prince Edward Island for twenty-four years, and their elections were over in one day, and the system had worked satisfactorily. He thought it unnecessary in a young country like this to have a property qualification for members of the House of Commons. He thought that as long as a man was honest and had capacity for public business it was of little consequence as to the amount of his credit at the bank, or the value of the real estate he might possess. (Hear hear.) The only thing he felt sore upon in this Bill was the provision with reference to the franchise. He thought that there should be a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion. This Bill would rob a third of the electors of Prince Edward Island of their votes. They had had universal suffrage in Prince Edward Island for twenty years, and it had given so much satisfaction that if a man got upon the platform there and advocated a retrograde movement to a property qualification for electors, he would not get twenty voters in the Province. He replied to objections to the same treatment for Prince Edward Island as the other provinces had received, saying as to a register of votes, there was none for the Legislative Council either. Why not leave the necessary assertion or proof of qualification to the oath of the voter for the Assembly as well as for the Council? The Government rather than disfranchise any electors, should have gone out of their way to provide the means of registration with a view to the qualification of all who had a just claim. He would move to strike out the 42nd Clause when the House went into Committee. (Hear hear.)

Hon. Dr. CARRALL argued this House had power to deal with this measure, and said he never had other belief than that putting in a ballot was voting in a sneaking way, and he might set the example of the States against that of England in the argument on this subject. British Columbia had not had time to test the matter thoroughly, while Nova Scotia had eliminated the Ballot Act from her statutes. He did not approve of the suffrage clauses, and argued it was competent for the present Government to have made the franchise sufficiently elastic to suit the whole country. [Hear, hear.] He also differed with the Government as to the qualification for candidates, on finding the bill did not provide for a residentiary real

estate or pecuniary qualification, or that the aspirant should be a citizen by birth or naturalization. That defect ought to be remedied. With reference to the clauses respecting the closing on election days of places in which liquor was sold, he thought that the effect of this in British Columbia in some cases would be that taverns would have to be closed, to the inconvenience of travellers, who were sometimes 250 miles from a polling place.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE said he was sorry to be unable to comply with the request of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, to withdraw his amendment on the paper, The property qualification of the candidate was something on which the elector could rely, was a guarantee to some extent that, as he had an interest in the country, he would vote on matters affecting property and the interest of the public in a manner safe and conducive to the public interest. But he had other reasons for opposing certain provisions of this Bill. He feared that if the principle of a non-property qualification for candidates was assented to, they would soon have universal suffrage proposed. He did not propose in his amendment any amount of qualification for candidates, as he considered that now Confederation had taken place, and some of the Provinces in the Dominion contained but a small number of individuals who could qualify if the amount was a large one, it might be advisable to reduce it.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said that while he agreed that they might express their opinion with regard to the Bill, they should remember that it had been very carefully prepared by Government, and had been thoroughly discussed in the other House, and not make any amendment to it. He believed that the members from the Province of Ontario would unite in offering no amendment to the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE approved generally of the Bill, and the more so that it was largely copied from the election law of Great Britain. He expressed his pleasure at the doing away with public nominations, and approved of the ballot. He could see no reason for exacting a money or property qualification from candidates for Parliament. He thought, however, that a uniform franchise should be adopted for the whole Dominion and universal suffrage. (No, no.) He held that education and intelligence prevailed so generally among the people of Canada that we should adopt that franchise.

Hon. Mr. READ expressed himself opposed to universal suffrage, and thought that a man who lived a few years in a country like this should be able to earn enough property to qualify him to vote under the law which had hitherto existed. He thought the Bill was on the whole a good one, but he took exception to the ballot.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH thought that there should be a property qualification for both candidates and electors. He did not approve of doing away with public nominations, and he thought that the amount of the deposits when nominations were made should be raised to $100, and that it should be made essential that all candidates should be British subjects, which this Bill did not do. With reference to the ballot, he said that he thought if there was any country in the world in which the electors were free from corrupt influences it was Canada, and he believed that the more political opinions of person, both candidates and voters, were publicly expressed, the more likely we were to have pure legislation.

The discussion was continued by speakers on both sides for a considerable time.

Hon. Mr. FLINT pointed out that the first clause of this Bill provided that sheriffs and registrars should be Returning-officers, but made no provision for a third Returning-officer in counties in which there were three ridings. He thought this clause should be amended, as it left too much in the hands of the Government as it stood. He very much approved of the Bill generally.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN agreed that they should not make any great alteration in the Bill unless in some particular in which a change was urgently required. He still felt unconvinced as to the advantage to be gained by secret voting, for in this country we had no large class which was so much dependent on others that they could not vote as they saw fit. He thought that voting by ballot would result in a great amount of hyprocrisy and deceit, inasmuch as it would enable men to promise to vote one way and then vote another. Nevertheless, as the House of Commons was in favor of this sytem, and as it had been adopted in other countries, it might be well to try it here. He did not, however, anticipate any good result from the experiment. He hoped the Government would meet the views which the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, who had first spoken, had expressed.

Hon. Mr. REESOR approved of the Bill as a means of protecting voters from

the exercise of any improper influence, although he did not think that it was particularly needed in Ontario for that purpose. He did not consider a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion practicable, and pointed out that the Legislature of Prince Edward Island would meet within a few months at the furthest, and would then be able to choose any franchise for that Province which they pleased.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he did not propose to enter into all the points raised by the hon. gentleman opposite, as it seemed unnecessary. He said there were two points upon which amendments had been proposed, one for a property qualification, by the hon. member behind him, and the other by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, who had suggested a uniform qualification over the whole Dominion. With regard to the first objection, there were very few cases where a man would possess enough influence to be returned to Parliament without possessing sufficient property to qualify him under even the existing law; but he could not see why, if the people chose to elect a man to represent them, they should not have that right. It was not for us to dictate to them on the subject. As to the second point, he thought it would be very unfair because universal suffrage happened to prevail in Prince Edward Island that it should be forced upon the rest of the Dominion, because, if they followed the hon. gentleman's advice, he supposed the uniformity would be in favor of that principle. Many of those who had supported the hon. gentleman's view in favor of a uniform qualification were much opposed to universal suffrage (hear, hear), and yet if they would vote for uniformity with the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, they would be practically voting for universal suffrage. The hon. gentleman replied to various objections to the bill, arguing that it was not necessary to change the provisions as to the franchise to meet such a possibility as an election before the next meeting of the Island Legislature. It could decide in what sense the franchise should be settled. It seemed to him far more reasonable to leave the bill as it was, than for the accident of the Island having one House, elected by universal suffrage, to saddle the rest of the Dominion with that system. He thought it, therefore, far more reasonable to adopt the Ministerial propositions. Moreover, the six Island members of the other House of Parliament—a number greater than in the Upper House—had allowed the bill to go through its stages without any division upon it. Under all these circumstances, not only from the fact of the action of the other House, which was wholly concerned in this measure, he held the House should make no alterations. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said that there were two or three little things in the Bill which he did not entirely assent to, but generally he approved of it.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL had some objections to the ballot, but was in favor of its being tried. He did not approve of doing away with the property qualification.

The hon. gentleman was still speaking when six o'clock arrived, and the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL resumed the debate. He said that he did not see how a House which agreed to allowing candidates without property qualification to be elected, could refuse to adopt the principle of universal suffrage, and he thought that those who bore the burden of taxation should have the right of election of Parliamentary representatives. He thought that electors should be compelled to vote, or lose their franchise at the next election.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD expressed his intention of voting for the bill.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD, (British Columbia.) said that he thought this bill would not be in operation more than one election until the people would wish they had never heard of it. His experience of the ballot in British Columbia had been that it opened the door to all species of electoral corruption.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD considered the bill a good one. He approved of the principle of the ballot, but from his experience of that system of voting, he thought the chief advantage gained by adopting it was that it would secure more quiet elections than under the system of open voting. He had found that the ballot was not a panacea for open bribery.

Hon. Mr. WARK thought the bill a good one.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied to the various arguments hostile to the bill, which he extolled as consistent with the principles of a Liberal Government, and calculated to benefit the country.

After remarks from Messrs. Bellerose, and Trudell in reply to Mr. Letellier and in explanation of previous points, the bill was read a second time, and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Mr. EBLLEROSE, in Committee, moved his amendment to restore a property qualification for candidates.

Hon. Messrs. CAMPBELL and hon.

Mr. LETELLIER pressed the honorable gentleman to withdraw his amendment, which was ultimately lost on a division.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved an amendment, requiring the candidate for Parliament to be either a natural born subject of the Queen or a naturalized citizen of Canada.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND moved an amendment, designed to leave the franchise in P. E. Island the same for the Commons as for the Legislative Assembly.

After a lengthy discussion the Committee divided: Contents, 23; Non-Contents, 23. The chairman having cast his vote with the contents, the amendment was carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Scott, the committee then rose and reported progress.

SECOND READINGS.

A number of Bills were received from the House of Commons, and read a second time.

INSOLVENCY.

The House went again into Committee on the Bill to continue the Insolvency Act of 1869.

The remaining clauses were adopted without amendment, and the Committee rose and reported the Bill with amendments.

The amendments were concurred in, and the Bill read a third time and passed.

AUDITION.

The House again went into Committee on the Bill with reference to the adulteration of food, drink and drugs.

The remaining clauses were adopted, and the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH moved the recommittal of the Bill in order to alter the penalty proposed.—Lost.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL suggested that the Bill be read a second time now, and that the discussion upon it be taken tomorrow, on the motion to go into Committee

Hon. Mr. SCOTT agreed.

The motion was carried, and the Bill read a second time.

PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. WARK moved concurrence in the 6th report of the Joint Committee on Printing.

After some discussion, during which Hon. Mr. SKEAD complained of a departure from the principle adopted in regard to printing—namely, accepting the lowest tender—to the prejudice of Mr. Hope, whose tender for the supply of paper was below that of the successful parties, and advocated justice to this gentleman, the motion was carried.

PUBLIC WORKS.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. SCOTT,

The House again went into Committee on the Public Works (amendment) Bill.

The Bill was adopted without amendment.

The House adjourned at 11:45 p.m., till Saturday at noon.

SATURDAY, May 23.

The House met at three o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

After routine,

The following Bills were reported by the respective Committees, without amendment, read a third time, and passed:—

Bill to incorporate the St. John's Board of Trade, Province of Quebec.

Bill to authorize the incorporation of Boards of Trade in the Dominion.

Bill to incorporate the Commercial Travellers' Mutual Insurance Company.

Bill to incorporate the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.

Bill to incorporate the Royal Canadian Chemical Fire Engine Company.

The following Bills from the Commons were introduced, passed through the several stages, and adopted:—

Bill to authorize the purchase of a pier or breakwater at Cow Bay, Nova Scotia, and to provide for its maintenance.

Bill respecting the administration of justice in Algoma.

Bill respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

Bill to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Province of British Columbia for the construction of a graving dock at Esquimault, and for other purposes.

Bill to incorporate the Quebec Frontier Railway Company.

LAKE SUPERIOR AND MANITOBA RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON submitted a report of the Private Bills Committee, with

a Bill to incorporate the Lake Superior and Manitoba Railway Co, to which the Committee had made certain amendments. The object of the amendments was to put the terminus of the road at Nepigon Bay, and to provide that a majority of the Directors shall be British subjects.

The amendments were concurred in, and the Bill read a third time and passed.

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON submitted another report from the Committee on Private Bills, with a Bill to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway. The object of the amendments was to provide that the majority of the Directors shall be British subjects.

The amendments were concurred in, and the Bill read a third time and passed.

THE BAIE VERTE CANAL.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER, on rising to speak with regard to his motion on the above subject said he embraced this opportunity of expressing the uniform feeling of this chamber with respect to the Government's manner of conducting the public business of this Dominion. He would ask the hon. members of the Government in this Chamber whether they were of the opinion that a second Chamber of Legislation was indispensable and necessary, first, for the review of legislation; secondly, to stand as a safeguard to criticise all undue expenditure, and to prevent the large items of appropriations which might justly be termed maladministration; and thirdly, to protect the smaller Provinces against any injustice? He asked the members of the Government this question with all respect, and, with no desire whatever to embarass the Government, he would ask them whether they were of opinion that a second Chamber was necessary and indispensable.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON—I rise to a point of order. I don't think there is any question before the House.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER—It is on the order of the day.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, there is none on the orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER—I am speaking now to the motion of the the Baie Verte Canal.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I was not aware that this was the Baie Verte Canal.

It being ruled by the Speaker that the hon. gentleman was in order,

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said he wanted to ask the Government whether this Chamber, composed as it was, of the Presidents of the leading banks, of the leading commercial men and agriculturists of the country, who had served half a life-time in the Local Legislatures of their respective Provinces, should be here without viewing with care the whole public business and expenditures, and whether it was in the interests of the country to have the leading measures brought before this House so late in the day? He knew his hon. friends would say that there was no necessity for Parliament to be prorogued; that they could go on as long as they chose to discuss these measures, but when they saw that large numbers of the other branch of the Legislature had gone home, and some of this Chamber were about to leave that very evening, he would simply ask whether it was in the interest of the country, and whether it was right, to allow the leading measures of the country to be delayed almost within twelve hours of the prorogation of Parliament? He alluded more particularly to a measure of greater magnitude than any ever before that had been under public discussion - the Pacific Railway Bill—a measure affecting the whole territory in the North West, which ought to have days of discussion instead of hours, and yet they were called upon to decide upon the matter in one afternoon. As men of wealth, independence and experience, men above party spirit and partizanship, there were none more capable of reviewing the measures which came before them than the members of that Senate who were men of experience, of wealth and prudence, and above party spirit of partizanship, and there were none who considered both public and private bills in Committee with more care than the members of that House. He felt indignant, and justly indignant at the views which had been expressed by the other chamber and the press as to the propriety of remodelling a chamber of such experience. He concluded by saying that he had made these remarks not only in the interest of this House but in the interest of the country.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said he was quite at a loss to find that the honorable gentleman had been speaking with reference to the motion on the Baie Verte Canal; and, when the subject came up again, if he had no other arguments against the grant for that canal, he could scarcely expect to succeed. If legislation had been delayed in any way it was not the fault of the Government. If necessary in order to get through the business, the House could be

kept in session another week. He thought it a matter in which they might congratulate themselves that every measure which had been sent from this House to the Commons had been adopted by the latter without amendment, except in one instance in which a slight amendment was made.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said he was quite ready to sit a fortnight here if necessary. (A laugh.)

PROHIBITION.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL, on rising to speak to the order for the consideration of the report of the Select Committee on the petitions for the passing of a prohibitory liquor law, said it was his desire to have brought fully before the House the matters connected with this report, the subject of which was the liquor traffic; but he felt at this advanced stage of the session, in view of the pressing importance of the measures now awaiting their consideration, it would be unwise for him to encroach upon the time of the House with any remarks upon the question generally. It would be noted that the Committee had carefully avoided committing the House to any expression of opinion that would render debate necessary at this time. They had simply committed the House to this statement—that the time had arrived when the earnest attention of the Government and Legislature should be given to this important subject, with the view of discovering and applying the best remedy to the gigantic evils connected with the liquor traffic, which were afflicting the country, and that steps should be taken to obtain such official information as was necessary to the guidance of the House in dealing with this question. Those were the only two points brought out in the report. The remainder of the report was nothing more than a statement of facts, declaring to the House what the petitioners had asked for. They would find that certain very important statements were made there, and, what was also regarded as highly important, that the number of persons petitioning for the passage of a prohibitory liquor law was something enormous and unprecedented. Out of our limited population of about four millions petitions for such a law had been received from about half a million. He thought this indicated a very strong feeling with regard to the subject thoroughout the country, and some action on the part of the Legislature was demanded. He did not attach much weight to the objection to those petitions, that they were signed by women and children as well as by men, for he held that women and children were the greatest sufferers from intemperance. In addition to the petitions received up to the time of the adoption of this report by the Committee, others had been received since, from 147 municipalities. The hon. gentleman went on to analyse portions of the report. He said it was time the House should be in possession of full returns to prove the accuracy or inaccuracy of the statements made in the petitions and the report thereon. It was asserted, emphatically, that about three-fourths of the crimes of the country was connected with intemperance, and certainly there was abundant evidence in the statistics, more especially of Great Britain, to show this was actually the case there. Where the consumption of spirits had decreased, crime had decreased in an equal ratio. Those statements also showed that where population had increased at the rate of one and a fraction per cent, crime had increased four times that amount—an alarming fact, truly. When the House was asked to commit itself only to a demand for this information, he trusted his motion for the adoption of the report, and the address to His Excellency would encounter no opposition. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. FLINT, in seconding the motion, gave statistics with regard to the traffic on liquor in the Dominion. He estimated the quantity of liquor—including that made by adulteration—consumed in the country last year, at ten gallons for every man, woman, and child in it, and the loss to the country by the traffic, including the value of the grain used in the manufacture of liquor, at $57,000,000 and said that for this large sum we only received about $5,000,000 in return. He held that if the liquor traffic were done away with, we could in ten years pay off our national debt, and also carry on the government of the country, and that in twenty years we could make this country second to none other in the world for its net work of railways, canals and telegraphs.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that the report contained some recommendations which he could not object to, but one recommendation involved an expenditure of money, and that was something this House had nothing to do with. With reference to some remarks of the Hon. Mr. Flint, he said that scientific men had come to the conclusion that grain which had been used for distilling was much better for feeding cattle than the

coarse grain, and therefore, they should not consider all the grain used in the manufacture of alcohol lost. He would have no objection to the report passing if the mover of the resolution would strike out that portion of it which involved an expenditure.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL said that the object of the recommendation to which the hon. Minister of Agriculture took exception was to get all the information possible on this important subject for the use of the Senate, and he considered it very desirable that they should have such information However, if it were absolutely necessary that he should strike out that portion of the report, he would consent to do so.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL admitted the desirability, in deference to the expression of public opinion through the petitions which had been received, that the information should be obtained; but he thought that no prohibitory law would be passed for some years. He agreed with the leader of the Government, that the recommendation in view of an expenditure should not be adopted by the House.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that he sympathized with the object of the report, but he suggested that the clause involving an expenditure should be struck out of the report.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD cited cases in which the House of Lords had made just such recommendations as the one in this report, to which exception had been taken.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL said that he was willing to adopt the amendment to the report which had been suggested. He agreed to the striking out of certain words in the last clause, and the substitution for them of a requst that His Excellency might lay before this House at its next session, such information as he may be able to obtain on the subject of the liquor traffic before that time.

This amendment was agreed to, and the report was then adopted.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON then moved the adoption of the special report of the Banking Committee, dated May 23rd, recommending the amendment of the fifty-eighth standing order of the Senate. The report, which recommended the payment of $200 for private bills, instead of $100, as at present, was adopted.

On motion of Hon. Mr. DICKSON the 51st act of the House was amended so as to require parties interested in Private Bills to furnish proof of publication of the notice of application in the local newspapers.

BILLS.

A number of Bills, including the following, were passed, and some were read a second time and referred to the appropriate Committees.

To authorize the incorporation of Boards of Trade in the Dominion.

To incorporate the Commercial Travellers' Mutual Life Insurance Company.

To incorporate the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.

To incorporate the Royal Canadian Chemical Fire Engine Company.

To authorize the purchase of the pier or breakwater at Cow Bay, N. S., and to provide for its maintenance.

Respecting the administration of justice in Algoma.

Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

To authorize the advance of a certain sum of money to British Columbia for the construction of a graving dock at Esquimault, and for other purposes.

To incorporate the Quebec Frontier Railway Company; the Lake Superior and Manitoba Railway Company; and the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company. The latter bills were reported by Mr. Dickson, from the Private Bills Committee, amended so as to provide for a majority of British subjects on the Boards of Directors. The amendments being concurred in, the bill was passed.

The House adjourned at 2 10 p. m. and resumed at 3.30 p. m.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Kingston) brought up the report of the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways, on an act to amend the law relating to bills of exchange and promisory notes with various amendments and additions.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved, seconded by Hon. Dr. CARRALL, the concurrence of the House in the amendments.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT did not understand what the effect of the amendments would be. With regard to the notice to be given in reference to bills of exchange, it was entirely over-riding the principle that has existed ever since he remembered in Great Britain, France and all other places that he knew anything about it, that the holder of the note should give notice to the endorser at the place where it was

dated. In his opinion the party who held the note should look after the endorser, otherwise the enderser might get no notice at all. There were certain portions of the bill that he concurred in, but he could not agree with the alterations that would change the whole policy of commercial affairs, and do away with an established principle which had existed for all time.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU could see no use in sending a notice to the place from which the bill was dated, when in three days after the bill would be protested. The bill would be a dead letter, as the courts would decide there was no jurisdiction; the Constitutional act and articles of the Code would show that plainly. He had no objection to portions of the bill, and would consent to the abolition of stamps, which gave little revenue after all. Persons who omitted to affix stamps were exposed to loss.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL did not think there was anything in the hon. gentleman's objections to the bill. The Civil Code included very many subjects which were properly within the privileges of Parliament, as well as many not within them. With reference to the former it was quite open to Parliament to change the code; and among other subjects within the powers of Canada was that upon which they were legislating. The bill intended that the endorser should put his address on the back of the note, so that it might be sent to him.

After some further discussion, the amendments were agreed to, and the bill referred to Committee of the Whole, in which some further changes were made, the time for the commencement of the operation of the act being fixed for the 1st of August.—It was then read a third time.

THIRD READINGS.

The following bills were reported by the respective Committees, read a third time and passed.

Bill to incorporate the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Co, with certain amendments.

Bill to incorporate the Alliance Insurance Association of Canada, with an amendment.

Bill to incorporate the Huron and Trent Valley Co.

Bill with respect to Permanent Building Societies doing business in Ontario.

Bill to Incorporate the Rouge Boom Company.

Bill respecting the Militia, and to extend the present Act to Prince Edward Island.

Bill to incorporate the Montreal Credit Company, as amended by the Commons.

Bill to incorporate the Colonial Building and Investment Association.

THE SUPPLY BILL.

A message was received from the Commons, announcing the passing of the bill for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the years ending 30th June, 1874 and 1875.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER moved its second reading.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER rose to speak to the motion on the paper, respecting the Baie Verte Canal. He said as he had already made some remarks on the subject, he did not feel warranted in trespassing on the attention of the House It being now within a very few hours of the termination of the session, he felt that the House would scarcely listen to any lengthy speech explaining why he had placed the motion condemning the expenditure on the Baie Verte Canal on the paper.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER -Go on; we will listen.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER thought, perhaps, it might appear strange that in a discussion which related to works in the Maritime Provinces he again appeared to criticise an item for public improvement in that part of the Dominion; but he assured hon. gentlemen from those Provinces that he was looking at this as a financial question entirely. As to the principles which governed the legislation of the country in reference to public works, he had upon a former occasion ventured to express his views on that point, which, he believed, were assented to by all. He now, to illustrate what he meant, begged to refer to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway which had already cost $1,600,000. A number of gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces declared that the road was far from being properly placed as a commercial undertaking, and who thought that the road would not be of great commercial value to this country for a long period, while others doubted the wisdom of the construction of the road for a great highway. As to the Baie Verte Canal they had a report from the engineer of the country as to the difficulties of construction. It would cost, at least, $80,000,000. This gentleman also declared that there were great difficulties in regard to the making of that canal—difficulties of a grave character. He would ask what would be gained by passing through that canal? Where would be the saving in time and distance? He contended that

it was not practicable for ocean ships to pass through inland canals, as was proposed. He had heard the Government did not intend to carry out this enterprise. It was a most dangerous principle for the Legislature to grant money that was not meant to be spent; yet in this case he hoped the Government would give him the assurance that it was not their intention to spend any part of this $500,000 as proposed

Hon. Mr. WARK said those public works should not be judged by the amount spent on them, but they should be considered in the light of what they had done for the country. What would Montreal, the West and the Ocean steamers be without the western canals? The advantage of the Baie Verte Canal would be felt the more by the people of Quebec and Montreal in the course of time. No wonder Halifax was indifferent as to this canal, for if it had any effect, it would be to take away part of its trade. The canal would prove very useful in saving a long difficult journey round the coast and valuable time during unfavorable periods for navigation.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD characterised as most erroneous, some of the statements of the honorable mover (Mr. Alexander) including the assertion that the Baie Verte Canal was a Maratime Province work. He contended, in reply, that it was one of interest to the Dominion generally. As to the Intercolonial Railway, he protested against the line of his argument. That was also a Dominion work, as shown by the British North America Act. Since its contemplation as a Grand Trunk line, two competing roads have been undertaken—which were not forseen—so that the Intercolonial, the longer line, must fail, since it would become only a local line the moment the others were completed. The honorable gentleman went on to describe the earlier proceedings with respect to the Baie Verte Canal scheme, which had been under consideration for half a century. The N. B. Gov't had, moreover, spent a great deal of money on surveys, but had had in view only a boat canal. The Government had put a vote in the supplies for its commencement, but difficulties existed as to the route and its feasibility. Till thorough surveys were made, there was a doubt as to its practicability. But the report of the Chief Engineer of the Board of Works completely set that question at rest, as also that respecting the proper termini of this great work. Sir Howard Douglas, an artillery officer of great skill and ability, had years ago, pitched upon the two termini now recommended by Mr. Page, which were, no doubt, the best. He (Mr. B.) with a few others, had cut a canal, a few miles long, through this very soil, which some had imagined so difficult to pierce. It was 100 feet wide at the entrance, and for a considerable distance, and 13 feet deep, while for six miles it was 30 feet wide. Mr. Page was astonished at this work being done by private enterprise, or without public aid. They had cut through all those morasses spoken of, and he was quite sure that, with engineering skill and capital, there would be no difficulty in constructing the Baie Verte Canal through the Isthmus. He presumed that when the Government put an item for this work in the estimates, they were sincere and meant action. We had the opinion of both Governments as to the necessity of the canal. He read extracts from public and commercial documents all going to show the importance of the canal, through which, it was believed, over 800 vessels would pass each season, irrespective of the tonnage of P. E. Island and other countries, while three-fourths of the 1,400 American vessels fishing in British waters representing 150,000 tons would thereby be accommodated. Americans stated that if this Canal existed they would be able to make two catches a season instead of one. He pointed out the impetus it would give the trade between Western cities and the Atlantic seaboard, vessels taking from Duluth and other Lake ports flour and grain, and returning from the Lower Provinces with coal and fish. The Spring Hill Mines were only 20 miles from the Bay of Fundy terminus. When the canal was completed and the Welland and St. Lawrence enlarged, they would see vessels of 1,000 tons passing from the far West down to the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia seaboard and thence to the West Indies and other countries, from which they could bring back valuable cargoes for the cities of the St. Lawrence and the Lakes. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. READ admitted the importance of the Canal, and said there was no doubt it would be commenced. The Government could not fail to construct it, after their many assurances that they placed nothing in the estimates for sham. The Canal had, however, few friends in the other branch of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH assumed the Canal was to be constructed, as it would complete the inland navigation of the country. He argued it was more important to the Great West than to the

Maritime Provinces. The coast was a dangerous one, and if the Canal were practicable, it should be undertaken.

After a few words from Hon. Mr. McLELAN, and from Hon. Mr. LETELLIER, in support of the motion for a second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER replied to observations elicited by his remarks and said he did not think the answer of the Minister of Agriculture satisfactory. The Government ought not to put in the estimates any item they did not intend to use. Mr. Page had said that the receipts from the canal would not pay the interest on the cost of its construction, and that the interest would amount to $800,000 a year. He agreed to withdraw his motion.

The amendment was withdrawn, and the original motion was carried.

The Bill then went through the remaining stages and was passed.

The Bill amending the Militia Act, and extending it to Prince Edward Island was read a second and third time.

The House rose at six o'clock, to meet at eight.

AFTER RECESS.

The House went into Committee on the Election Bill.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL thought the bill defective in not providing a means of detecting personation.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said it was too late to make important changes. It was almost impossible to detect personation and preserve the principle of secresy. But offenders would be proceeded against.

The Bill was reported with the several amendments made, Mr. LETELLIER stating, in reply to Mr. CAMPBELL, he would consult his colleagues before taking the proceeding stages. He would not keep the House waiting many Minutes.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills from the Commons were read a first, second, and third times and passed:—

A Bill to extend to British Columbia certain commercial laws now in force in certain of the other sections of the Dominion.

Bill to amend the Act with reference to the North-west Police Force.

Bill to extend the powers of the Canada Permanent Building Society.

Bill to extend certain Acts therein mentioned to Prince Edward Island.

CONCURRENCE.

A number of Bills were received from the Commons, with amendments, which the Senate concurred in.

INDIANS.

A Bill was received from the Commons to amend certain laws relating to Indians, and to extend the operation of the same to Manitoba and British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said that he intended to move an amendment to it to provide against the selling of opium to Indians.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said that he saw in the Bill a clause which he thought an extraordinary one. It provided that a magistrate could on the oath of an Indian send certain offenders to prison for two years, and the person so convicted could not appeal.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL thought the clause was all right. There were persons engaged in selling poisonous liquors to the Indians in British Columbia, which was killing them off by hundreds, and no measures could be too stringent to put a stop to the traffic.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the hon. gentleman was mistaken with regard to the clause. He pointed out that Indians were excepted under the clause in question from giving evidence.

The Bill was read a second time.

ELECTION BILL.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST moved that the amendments made by the Committee of the Whole House to the Election Bill be concurred in. (Hear, hear.) At the same time he held that this Chamber should not have made any change in the Bill, as it was one which related entirely to the other House. Notwithstanding the slight amendment that had been made to the Bill, however, there was still enough in it to commend it to the favor of the country, and if the amendment would make the bill more acceptable to the people of Prince Edward Island he would the less regret that it had been made.

After a few remarks from Hon. Messrs. WILMOT and HAVILAND,

The motion was carried.

The bill was then read a third time and passed.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SCOTT,

The House went into Committee.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL asked the mover of the resolution if he did not intend to make any remarks on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the Bill had been pretty well discussed already, and he did not intend to make any remarks on it at the present stage.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he thought that, in a matter involving so much money, and such serious consequences, the House might reasonably have expected some explanations on the measure. He felt it was due to the House to have made some remarks on this subject. The Bill itself, he did not propose to offer any opposition to, but he desired to make some observations upon the differences between it and the bill of last year in certain repects. The subsidy in money was the same as was also that in land, but, in addition thereto, a guarantee of four per cent. was granted by the present bill, on a certain sum not named, for, he thought, a limited period. Now, that was an obligation of an indefinite character, and which might be very onerous in the future. He looked upon it with great distrust. He was quite satisfied that if the late Government had proposed to add to the burdens of the people, such a guarantee upon a vague sum for a period like 25 years, the whole country would have been aroused with appeals against that course. As it was, the scheme devised by the late Government was considered as imposing extraordinary, unheard of obligations upon the community, which could never be sustained. Then he found it was proposed to make the road either the subject of a contract with private individuals, who should take in different sections, or that it might be constructed by the Government in sections; and if constructed by individuals, it was to be worked by them, or might be assumed by the country at any time. Well, he quite admitted, there might be very great difference of opinion as to the relative advantages of constructing this gigantic work in one block, or dividing it into sections, and constructing it piece by piece. It might be advantageous to put it into the hands of a number of different companies, or that the late Government were right in leaving it to one grand company to undertake the whole enterprise. That might have been the most economical way. There were many advantages on both sides. He admitted the Government might be right in granting the work to some large wealthy Company with extensive connections on both continents and powerful means of bringing out emigrants from Europe. It might be too much for one company, and be divided into six sections, although he did not see it very clearly; for rival companies constructing each a certain section would not have the same opportunity or perhaps the same need to use great exertions for collecting emigrants and accumulating supplies of various kinds, and thus might a serious argument against the section system be built up. Then there might not be harmony between the progress made on the different sections, and there was nothing in the bill to show whether the section at the beginning of the road, that opened on the navigable waters, was to proceed first or sections in the interior. He inferred from what had been said in another place that, although the Government were passing a bill for a trans-continental railway, they were not only not committing themselves, but had refused to commit themselves to the construction of the Pacific Railway. (Hear, hear.) What they did commit themselves to was simply the construction of a road from Fort Garry to Pembina. They also spoke of a section from a point on Lake Nipissing to the shores of Lake Huron or the Georgian Bay. Then he found a bill was introduced a few days ago by the Secretary of State to incorporate a company to build a railway between those points; and he presumed the company was composed of gentlemen whom the Government desired to favor, and that they would receive for the work the advantages the Government were enabled to give, and that, when completed, it would be handed over to them to work. He thought it was likely, also, the branch from Pembina to Fort Garry would be dealt with in the same way.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My connection with the bill is purely accidental.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—This projected railway of the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company was, apparently, to run over the line the bill under discussion contemplated for the eastern section; and from the part taken with regard to it, by the hon. gentleman, he ventured to assume what he had expressed. There was no doubt the Fort Garry and Pembina section ought to be the first entered upon, but there was no American railway to within a considerable distance of Pembina. That, however, might be the case for only a short period. Probably next year there would be an extension to the frontier. What the advantage of constructing the branch to Georgian Bay would be, unless the Government carried out in good faith the agreement entered into with British Columbia, he could not see. It seemed to him that it would be a piece of road without any connection, and that it would

be of no use to anybody. The other features of the Bill which he contemplated with considerable distrust, were those which related to the working of the road when it shall have been completed, and the option which was given to the Government to construct any section, or to give it out to contractors. He held that by this bill the Government had taken a great deal more power into their own hands than was taken by the late Government. Under the scheme of the late Government it was known to what extent the Government was committed, but by this, the country did not know that, for under this scheme the Government might give to contractors the sections of the road which were easy to construct, but when the sections were difficult of construction they might not get contractors to take them, and have to do the work themselves; and when the road came to be worked the Government would find that they would have to work the difficult sections themselves. The whole subject was left in extreme vagueness, while the bill provided for an accumulation of important powers in the hands of the Government which they said they did not contemplate at present using.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Not till after Parliament has sanctioned it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—They did not say they would not use those powers till Parliament had sanctioned it, but any charters they made were to be revised by Parliament. The bill made a merit of declaring, in so many words, they should always be submitted to Parliament. He looked upon that as a sort of Pecksniffian virtue displayed, because everybody knew that Parliament was constantly at the bellows; and you could not get such matters outside the purview of Parliament whether the Bill said so or not.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—It would not have interfered with your scheme.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It would have interfered if the occasion had required. Parliament could interfere with a contract in the middle of the work on compensating the parties interested. Then what could Parliament know about a contract beforehand? He would have been much more pleased to believe that the Government intended to prosecute this enterprise in good faith, (Hear, hear,)—and as rapidly as their means permitted. It might be that the late Government were blameable in agreeing to carry on so great an enterprise in ten years, but everybody knew we were making that bargain with a colony coming into the Union, and that it would be as much interested in the affairs of the Confederation as any other portion. Our bargain with British Columbia was like entering into a similar arrangement with a person who was going to become a partner the next day; and no doubt, if fair progress had been made with the road in ten years, and it had been seen that an attempt had been made to carry out the scheme in good faith, the people of British Columbia would be perfectly content though the road was not completed in the time stipulated. He believed that under the arrangement proposed by the late Government, the construction of a road from the shores of Lake Superior to the Pacific would have been undertaken in good faith with British Columbia; that the work would have been in the hands of large contractors, and that it would have progressed as rapidly as a fair application of capital would have permitted. Under this Bill no one knew what degree of rapidity or slowness, in the construction of the road, the Ministry of the day contemplated. He could not but think that this House should have had the fullest explanations from the hon. introducer of the Bill with regard to what they intended to do under this scheme. (Hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that his hon. friend had endeavoured to leave the impression that it was out of some want of respect to the House that he refrained from going into a discussion of the provisions of the Bill. The reason why he had not done so was that he believed this House and the whole country were so fully aware of the Government policy with regard to the road that it seemed quite unnecessary to make any remarks on the Bill until some objections were raised to it. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to refer to the fact that when the present Government came into power they found that a treaty had been entered into by the late Government to build a railway within ten years, although they had no knowledge as to whether it would be possible for them to fulfil that promise; that the scheme proposed was one which it was utterly impossible to carry out in the time agreed upon, and that when it was taken upon the money market capitalists would scarcely look at it. He pointed out that when the present Government found that the scheme which the late Government had adopted was impracticable, they decided that they would do the next best thing, and avail themselves of the stretches of water communication that were to be met with in crossing the continent, and by building portions of the road over the

intervening distances, secure communication with British Columbia as early as possible. The Government desired to open the great North West to settlement, but at the same time they wished the people of British Columbia to understand that they were anxious to carry out the terms of union with them as soon as possible (Laughter by Hon. Mr. Carrall.) He saw the hon. gentleman smiled, but a confidential agent had been sent to British Columbia by the Government, and when the papers came down the liberality of the terms proposed to that Province by the Government would perhaps be a matter of surprise. When less liberal terms were proposed in the other House the other day, only five gentlemen voted for them, and thus it was seen what the feeling of the country was with regard to the carrying out of the terms of union with British Columbia. After entering into an explanation with regard to the four per cent guarantee, he said that a subsidy was to be given to railways connecting the Canadian system of railways with the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This would give a direct connection with Lake Huron, and from the eastern point of Lake Huron, to the western end of Lake Superior. From that point they intended to construct the road to Fort Garry, and also the branch from Pembina to Fort Garry. He thought that from the experience which the country had had in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, they would be inclined to adopt the motto of *festina lente*, especially seeing the different character of the two roads. The Government would construct the road throughout British territory as soon as they could do so.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL said it would be his duty to detain the House for some time, and to criticise the conduct of the Government. He regretted that it was so, for he would have preferred at this late period and almost the close of the session to have spoken rather words of endearment—(laughter), than otherwise with regard to the policy they had pursued. That policy would call forth some words from him that he hoped would not be taken in a political sense. He shared in the feeling of amazement and astonishment expressed by the hon. member from Kingston, that this Government or any other Government in Canada should think it was discharging its duty sufficiently by laying this bill on the table with sublime indifference, without a remark. It was a measure of the greatest importance, and one that had cost the existence of one Government, and might result in the writing of the epitaph of the present on their tombstone.—(Laughter) He had heard utterances from time to time in which it was propounded that it was in consequence of the admission of British Columbia into the Confederation that the country was called upon to build the Pacific Railway. It seemed that the Government had brought this measure down at the last hour and carried it through the Lower House, and then it was sent to this Chamber as if it was the intention to smuggle it through at the end of the session. This he did not think was fair or just, because it was a matter that required the fullest and freest consideration, and the members of the Government should have come to the Senate with such a statement as would have enabled the Chamber to discuss the matter at length, but instead of that it had been left to the last moment, and was then laid on the table without a word. There was one thing that he felt a deep interest in, and that was in reference to the terms of the agreement made with British Columbia, and he felt it his duty to stand up in defence of those terms. It had been heralded to the world that British Columbian gentlemen were most expensive and luxurious, and to gratify them the nation was bound to build a railway from one end of the continent to the other. He desired to give that a flat contradiction, and he might say for the representatives of British Columbia, without taking upon themselves to boast, that they were actuated, in putting the conditions for building the railway into the agreement, by a desire to unificate and build up the whole Dominion. He looked upon the building of the Pacific Railway as the great agent in the work of European emigration, and a work that would enable them to make the Dominion a competitive nation with our neighbors in the south of this continent, in trading with the rest of the world. Still further, it would be the means of settling the country with an industrious population, and the railway system would offer such great advantages that in no long time Canada would have the lion's share of the carrying trade between the East and West. He would not go into the comparative merits of what would be the advantages that would accrue to the Dominion; but he would say that his motive in advocating the speedy construction of the road was not influenced by any narrow parish, or colonial, or provincial ideas. He held that if the Government carried

out the line of policy in good faith that had been adopted, they would build up a great future for Canada. As far as personal convenience was concerned, he looked upon that as of no moment whatever. It was not a matter of personal convenience at all for the nine gentlemen who had to come from his province to Parliament, because they experienced little difficulty at present from the want of railway accommodation to reach the capital. It was not a mere desire for pelf, or that there should be so much money expended in the province. The people of British Columbia looked upon the line as a great competing line with the United States. Such would be the result in his judgment, and in the opinions of those who had carefully looked into the matter—such would be the result which would follow the construction of the railway now under consideration. He was glad to see from the Bill that was before the House, and from the remarks of the members of the Government, non-committal as they were, as he had read them in the papers, that a change had come o'er the spirit of their dream in regard to the necessity for this railroad. In Opposition, they held that it would be ruin to the country, but now they admitted its necessity, and he believed they, as a Government, would sign their death warrant if they did not follow that policy. He did not think they should forget the stories that beguiled their infantile years. They all remembered the story of Simbad the Sailor, who, when he landed on foreign shores, saw the King mounted on an elephant, and before him went a herald who proclaimed—"This is the mighty Prince; long live the King!" And after the procession, came another who said "Great as that King is he shall die." That was applicable to the Government, It might be proclaimed: "Great is Mackenzie, great is the hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just, great is the House of Commons, but the people in solemn procession would say of them all "Great as thou art thou shalt periah if you fail to carry out in good faith the solemn liabilities entered into by Canada." (Applause and a laugh.) He would now make a few remarks from a British Columbia point of view, for what he had already said was intended in a national sense. Any one who had the misfortune to know him knew that he was as sincere about this matter as the Hon. Mr. Vidal was about prohibition. (Laughter.) He had no sympathy with the statement of the Secretary of State, who proclaimed from the hustings that the road could not be built in forty years. If that turned out to be true, he could assure the honorable gentleman that it would not be built during the time that he occupied the side of the House on which he at present sat. But he wished to give the Government every fair play, and he thought it was most unjust for any person to come to Ottawa, and press them to locate the line in any particular place. The road would have to be built to some point on the Pacific coast, but the Government should not be tied down to do anything until they were sure that they had secured the best line of communication. He maintained that they should not be harrassed by people coming here and asking them to do certain things that might be of personal interest to the parties who took upon themselves to offer suggestions or make requests. He fully sympathized with the Government in matters of that kind, for he was above sectional, provincial, political or party considerations in this great undertaking. He believed the Government was right in not committing themselves at present to say what terminal point was best, and there were things that he was not prepared to force on any Government to have done until they were fully informed regarding them He wished this to be made known, as his opinion to the country through the Fourth Estate. While he did not wish to hamper the Government in any way, he had a right to ask whether what they proposed was no sham, and whether they really meant business and were going to build the road? The spirit of the negotiations that were first entered into was what ought to be carried out and the Government should do their best to inform themselves as speedily as possible on all matters that would place them in a position to carry out those terms at as early a date as possible. He had as much right to interpret the future as any one, and he could not see that the country would not be able to bear the cost of this road. He did not think that the elasticity of the resources of the Dominion of Canada would be strained or overtaxed in carrying out the work in the course of years. If Mr. Fleming's report could be believed, the road could be constructed in a less time than had been spent in building the Union Pacific, so that he believed it was within the ability of the Dominion to construct the road. He looked upon it as a national necessity, and he was persuaded that it was a commercial absurdity to make the patch work scheme proposed

by the Government in making the water connections. To his mind it was simply absurd to make a little stretch of railway through British Columbia. It would cost a good deal of money, but the other parts of the line would be left untouched for years to come. By this scheme it would leave the road a drug on the Dominion, but if the road was put through it would build up the country and be what the Grand Trunk had been to Canada.

Hon Mr. LETELLIER—Is the Grand Trunk paying now?

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—It was the making of the country.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—There were some people in that portion of the country through which it passed.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL went on to criticise the policy of the Government in relation to the scheme, stating that it had been their boast they were going to save thirty millions of dollars to the country, but he did not see in what way that saving was going to be effected. He expressed his satisfaction with the bill as a whole without going into details; yet he had no confidence in the present Government, or in their intention to build the road. He doubted the sincerity of the Government because of their conduct while in opposition, and their determined hostility to the road. Even since they have held the seals of office he doubted their intention and their ability to build this railroad. Indeed, he did not think they intended to build it. He believed the present Bill was so constructed as to prove the intention of the Government to make it only what would prove to be a fraud and a snare to the public; and unless the treaty with British Columbia was followed out, he had no hesitation in saying that the Government would be turned out of office, and others put in their place that would act with good faith in carrying out the obligations of the Dominion. (Cheers and laughter).

Hon. Mr. READ moved the adjournment of the debate, but as there was a general feeling expressed that it should be proceeded with, he went on to say that at the opening of the session he had stated that he would support the Government in any reasonable scheme for the construction of the Pacific Railway, because he was thoroughly convinced that if Canada was ever to be a great country the road must be built. When it was remembered that the descendants of old France had come to the country, men of sterling worth who cut their way through the woods and settled down to make a living in the forests, and when they came down to a later date and found the hardy emigrants from England, Ireland and old Scotia, and when they came to combine these elements to make up a nationality, he believed there was nothing that a community composed of men of that sort could not carry out. Still, it was doubted by some whether it was the intention of the Government to build the road; but if they were not going to utilise the country that had been given to them—a country nearly as large as the whole of Europe, for which they only had to pay $300,000—it would have to be given up to others who would make use of it. He held that if the people of this country were not educated up to the standard of constructing the Pacific Railroad, they must be educated to that point. He would give the Government his support in any honest measure for building the road, and would not cavil much about their plan, but give them every latitude necessary to carry out this great undertaking. But he did see some things in the proposed scheme which he did not understand. [Laughter]. If it was intended to construct the road proper, then there was no necessity for some of the provisions in the measure now under consideration. He did not get much information as to the intention of the Government when the bill was thrown on the table, and although he gave strict attention to the proceedings he had to ask what bill they were in Committee upon. It was a bill most intimately affecting the future of this great country, yet it was thrown on the table without a word of explanation. When it was allowed to be read a second time it was on the distinct understanding that a discussion should take place in Committee. It had been said by the Hon. Secretary of State, that the House was thoroughly versed in the Government policy, but that he much doubted, and further, he doubted whether the Government knew themselves what their policy was. (Laughter.) At least the bill now under consideration did not show it, and therefore he could not see why the Senate should be expected to be thoroughly versed in that policy. He looked upon the using of water and railway communication as an abortion of a scheme. It was proposed to go to French River, but he could not see the object of going to French River if they were not going to build the main line. Since this project had been up he had been trying to study the maps, and he did not find any reason for going to French River if they were going to make the terminus at Lake Nipissing. French

River is about half a degree southwest of Lake Nipissing, so that there would be 200 miles of road to be built at a cost of $3,000,000 in order to get to Georgian Bay. They all knew that Montreal must be the starting point, and for half a million of dollars a communication could be effected with Georgian Bay in less than two years. He did not see that the plan proposed would be of much use, and he was most anxious to have the road constructed at the earliest possible date. He did not think that they could construct the road all the way through without increasing the taxation, but for all that was wanted for last year and all that would be wanted for the next year the tariff would be sufficient.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria) said: I certainly thought that I could congratulate the Government on the abandonment of a mixed land and water communication as a part of the great trans-continental highway—however useful such a work might be, and no doubt will be at some future day for local and colonization purposes, yet as a competing line it will be useless. From all the information which I can gather on the navigation of the Saskatchawan, it could only be used for about three months in the year after a large outlay, first in removing obstructions. The Bill now before us gives no indication of a route similar to that alluded to by the Secretary of State—the Bill is purely a Railway Bill—and does not give the Government power to spend money in improving rivers, canals or navigation of any kind—the proposed mixed communication would be a great commercial failure. The present Government have been accused by many of having no intention of building this railway. But I cannot imagine a man, in the position of the the Premier of Canada, stand before Parliament and the country, and say that he was going to do certain things that he had no intention of doing. I have heard him in the other branch of the Legislature repeat offers made to British Columbia, and saying that he would not make a sham commencement, that he hated shams. I for one believe that the Government is in earnest. Two years ago when the former Government brought in their Pacific Railway Bill I gave it my support, believing it to be a good measure, which, with fair treatment, would have brought a large amount of foreign capital into the country, and would have formed a wealthy corporation into an active immigration society, whose interests it would have been to colonize the enormous tracts of land over which it would have had control. Our business, now, however, is not with the former bill, or the company, or aught in connection with it; for reasons too well known to be repeated, it failed in its object. To the bill now before us I intend giving my support also, although I would like it had been more definite on many points. Yet I have no doubt but it has been carefully prepared, and the money and land grants proposed to be made under it carefully weighed, and I do hope that it will meet the object in view. Our large tracts of lands whether in the hands of Government or in the hands of Companies are valuless until placed in communication with the outside world, and disposed of to actual settlers—then, and not until then will the great North West be of value. It is much to be regretted that the Minister of Finance, in his Budget Speech, should have taken such a gloomy view of the state of the country. Surely it could never have occurred to that hon. gentleman that his words would operate against himself and the country as soon as we became borrowers in the money market of the world. In all the arguments adduced in favor of increased taxation and a high tariff, in order to meet the large contemplated expenditure for railways and canals, calculations have been based on the present revenue, and no allowance made for increase, while we have ample proof that the revenue has grown steadily year by year. The Government is about to borrow $40,000,000. Now it is not likely that it will be necessary to borrow in any one year more than $8,000,000, the interest on which for one year would be, at 4½ per cent, $360,000 and sinking fund at 1 per cent $80,000; but as this sinking may be invested in good security, a portion of this amount would be saved; but taking the whole amount, the interest and sinking would be $440,000 for the first year. Now for the sake of illustration, I will take the first two years in which we would borrow say $16,000,000, the interest on which would be $1,580,000 and sinking fund $240,000, making a total outlay for two years $1,320,000. The point which I wish to place before the House is this, that allowing for a reasonable addition to the revenue for the next two years—say at the rate of $750,000 per annum, or $1,500,000 for the first two years—the interest on our loan would not cost the country one dollar of fresh taxation; and with the progress of these great works, the large expenditure of money, the stimulus given to trade, and the in-

crease of population, is it not a reasonable expectation that the revenue will largely increase, and the burden on the country be very light? With regard to satisfying my own province, which is supposed to have a direct interest in the Pacific Railway, although I cannot speak with authority for all parts of that country, yet I will undertake to say that a reasonable prosecution of the work will be accepted; and although the people are opposed to opening our terms of union, yet when the ten years in which the work was to have been completed have expired, there will be little difficulty in extending the time, provided always that in the meantime good progress has been made. A great deal of valuable time has already been lost, which is a very strong reason for making good use of that now before us. Although I hold my own opinions as to route and terminus, I shall not urge or press them in this House or on the Government; but, while I am willing to leave this question in the hands of the Government and competent engineers, feeling that they will exercise wisdom and discretion in the matter, yet I must say that in the interests of commerce, and in order to compete successfully with the American routes, the terminius should be in the harbor most accessible to the Pacific ocean, as well for the reasons mentioned as to fulfill the treaty obligations.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said his principal objection to the Bill was that the Government had taken power to construct the road themselves, rather than by giving bonuses and such encouragement as to induce companies to underate it. He did not believe from his own experience in regard to public works, that the Government could construct this railway as cheaply themselves as they might have got it done by companies properly aided and encouraged. He would also suggest that the Government do not commit themselves to any guage for the road, but merely provide that the guage should not exceed four feet eight and a half inches. The hon. gentleman went on to describe the Festiniog railway, in Wales, as under two feet guage, while accommodating a traffic greater than the Grand Trunk, yet worked at two-fifths of the cost. Judging from this experiment, and information collected from all parts of the world, the ablest engineers had decided that the guage might be limited to three feet. Sweden, Norway and other countries had adopted this guage, and why was it necessary for us in a thinly settled country to do otherwise, when we had such a long line as 2,500 miles to construct? It was an admitted fact that they could complete a narrow guage railroad, sufficient to carry traffic for a century, at three fifths the cost of a four feet eight and a half. The broad guage had been one of the reasons of the failure of the Intercolonial. He hoped the same failure would not be the result under similar circumstances, of the Pacific.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER urged the adjournment of the debate.

After some remarks,

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST moved that the Chairman report progress. —Carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST moved that when the House adjourn, it stand adjourned till Monday at 12 o'clock. —Carried.

BILLS FROM THE COMMONS.

Sundry disagreements by the Commons to amendments in bills were announced to the House, and the amendments were not insisted on.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 11.50 p. m.

MONDAY, MAY 25th.

The House met at twelve o'clock.

MINISTERS IN THE SENATE.

Hon. Mr. READ enquired if it was the intention of the Government to have an additional number of Ministers in this House at the next meeting of Parliament?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that it was not.

Hon. Mr. READ said that he regretted that it was not. He held that it was not fair to this House, and not consistent with its dignity, that now, when new Provinces had been added to the Confederation, and the number of the Cabinet had been increased, there were only two Ministers sitting in this Chamber. In England a third of the Cabinet had seats in the House of Lords, and he believed that if there were more Ministers in this House business would be got through much better than at present. He moved that in the opinion of this House a fair proportion of Ministers have not seats here.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND regretted that his hon. friend had not brought his motion forward at a period of the session when

there was less press of business than now, at the eleventh hour. He thought that if the Government were satisfied with having only two Ministers representing them in this House it was nothing for this House to grieve over. In England the number of members of the Cabinet in the House of Lords varied with the different Ministries. He hoped his hon friend would withdraw his motion.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said that his views were fully in accord with those of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He had seconded the motion, but only out of politeness to the mover, and he hoped the latter would now withdraw it, as it was too late in the session to bring the matter before the House. There were enough Ministers to bring Government measures fairly before the House. This was, at any rate, a matter for the Government themselves. (Hear, hear)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST remarked on the lateness of the period at which the motion had been brought forward, and said if the mover did not withdraw it he would be obliged to move the previous question. He went on to say that at the time of Confederation there were four members of the Cabinet in this House, but that number was subsequently reduced gradually to two, and it would be more difficult to return to that state of things than it would have been to maintain it. Two new Colonies had been added to the Confederation, one of which had received representation in the Cabinet, at the expense of the other Provinces. That was a further reason why they could not have a larger number of Ministers in the Senate.

HARBOR MASTER.

The House went into Committee on the bill for the appointment of Harbor Masters in certain cases, which was explained by Hon. Mr. Scott. Their salaries would range from $300 to $600 a year, according to the importance of the harbor.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—By whom to be appointed?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—By the Government in Council.

The bill was reported without amendment and passed.

THE MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION.

The House went into Committee on the bill respecting the Montreal Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners. Hon. Mr. Kaulbach in the chair.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT explained the measure, one of the chief objects of which was to give the Government the control of the Board, which would be composed of nine gentlemen, five appointed by Government. A large amount of public money was spent on that harbor for which the goods distributed all over the Dominion had paid duties. Therefore, though the harbor was, in a sense, a local work, in other senses it concerned the whole Dominion, a very large amount of public money being annually spent upon its improvement. It was necessary, then, that Government should be responsible for its due expenditure. Of the remainder of the Board, one gentleman was to represent the shipping interests, one the Board of Trade, another the Corn Exchange, and the fourth would be the Mayor of the city. Heretofore each of those bodies elected its representative at the Harbour Board, but it was proposed, for hereafter, to take the already elected head or president. The President of the Commission would receive an annual indemnity not exceeding $2,000 a year, from the revenues.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL could not say he approved of the changes described by the Secretary of State. He did not think it was fair to legislate in the direction contemplated by the first clause. The present Commissioners had been elected under an existing Act of Parliament, those representing the Board of Trade, Corn Exchange and City Corporation for five years, subject to a removal any year by a ballot. They might remain in for five years, or be changed by one going out yearly. This bill then, said in the most arbitrary way, they should cease to form a portion of the Board after the first of August next.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—How did you treat the Legislative Council of Quebec and Ontario when you passed Confederation? You did the same thing.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL denied it.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Yes, you did. There was the case of Mr. Philip Moore.

Hon. Mr. CAMPELL said there was an easy explanation; there were not seats enough for all the members of the Council representing Quebec under the old system. They Legislated nobody out of his seat, nor did they say that Philip Moore should not hold a seat. But in this case Government desired to act in a way extremely arbitrary, and contrary to the ordinary spirit of Legislation. He did not see any reason in the world why they should assent to a change of that kind, to the prejudice of those three gentlemen who had been elected by proper authority, under an Act of Parliament for five years.

The Ministers, who called themselves Liberals, proposed to take from the Corporation, the Board of Trade and Commercial Exchange the right hitherto enjoyed, of electing their several representatives, and to say, absolutely, the Mayor and the two Presidents of those bodies should be their representatives. The Mayor, for example, might or might not be the sort of man desirable for a seat at the Board. Then why should he be thrust upon it? Why should not the Corporation of Montreal be allowed to choose its representative? Was this the change one would have expected from a Liberal Government? Certainly it was not. The Board of Trade and the Corn Exchange were very much interested, too, in the duties performed by these Commissioners, and it might not be desirable at all times that the President of the former should let that body judge whether he was the right man to send there or not. He believed that the aim of the Government in thus limiting the power of these several corporations and arbitrarily saying who should represent them was directed against certain individuals, because the shipping interest was allowed to elect its own members. He did not know these gentlemen, who had made themselves obnoxious to the Government, neither did he know the extent of their sins, nor even whether they had sinned at all. He did not speak as a citizen of Montreal, but as a citizen of the Dominion, and he contended that, even if these gentlemen had made themselves obnoxious to the Government, this was not the way to get rid of them. He condemned the proposed change as a limitation of the election principle which had obtained hitherto, as a retrograde movement, and as a diminution of the liberties enjoyed by those bodies who should be allowed to choose whomsoever they pleased to represent them. He also considered that clause in the bill unfair, which diminished by two years the length of tenure of office by the gentleman in the shipping interest. He said nothing as yet about the Government commanding the majority in the Board. This had been explained by the Secretary of State on the ground of its being a public work, and therefore that the Government ought to command a majority. Well, it was, and it was not, a public work. The funds, for the most part, all came from Montreal, from the tax on shipping, and he really did not see why the Government should desire to have that majority. Four would be representation enough. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST was surprised that the hon. gentleman had made it a question of vested right existing in this corporation which the Government were about to take away. He would again call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the Legislative Council of Quebec, some of whose members had certainly been deprived of their seats though elected for a term of eight years. Their tenure was guaranteed by the constitution. Not only did the Government declare they might follow a principle contrary to the rights of those gentlemen under the constitution, but the subsequent appointments should be filled by the Crown. If he remembered well, a gentleman on the then opposition side was deprived of his seat. The opponents of this bill could not argue, therefore, that Government had no right to interfere with the seats of the Harbour Commissioners, because they had been elected for five years. That would be equivalent to saying that there should be no legislation on this important subject till that period expired. He believed that since the country had such an extensive stake in that harbour it should, to a certain extent, control the revenues and expenditure. Some of the charges brought against members of the Board were true, which constituted an additional argument for the bill. If Montreal shall not be able to select her best men for the position, she would not be worthy of her opportunities. The different corporations, when electing their presidents, would, of course, be influenced by their knowledge of the positions they would have to occupy at the Board. The hon. gentleman [Mr. Campbell] opposing this measure, would show that he had lost some of his Conservative principles since he crossed the House. [Hear, hear, and a laugh.]

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that as he read the statute, the present Commissioners were not in for five years, nor could five new members take their seats till next August.

Hon. Mr. READ argued that, as regards the constitution of the Senate, at Confederation, it was the act of the Legislative Council, of the whole body of this House, if any hon. gentleman was left out. It was not by the act of other people.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL argued there was no analogy between the members of the Legislative Council, years ago, legislating in a way to exclude themselves from Parliament, and an outside body ruling them out, and also, that not one single reason had been given for the change proposed by the bill, except

that the Government desired to have control of the Board. He held that the qualifications required for heads of corporations were often very different from those required in representatives of those bodies elsewhere. He presumed, neither the Corn Exchange nor the Board of Trade had been consulted, nor notified in regard to this measure. He took a very decided objection then to the principle of the bill, whose preamble was not proved. He thought it should be thrown out.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he was very much surprised at some of the objections to this bill. As to legislating out of office, the same was done as regards Trinity House, by the bill of last year, which legislated out of existence the Harbor of Montreal the lights on the river, and such other matters, concerning the navigation. He went on to argue in reply to other objections that this was a public bill to all intents and purposes since Montreal harbor derived its revenue from the whole country. Every bale of goods sent to Upper Canada was taxed for the improvement of that harbor. At first, the Board consisted of men nominated by the Government, and it never gave more satisfaction. (Hear, hear.) They converted Lake St. Peter from a three hundred ton to a one thousand-ton channel, but were all dismissed in one day by a notice in the *Gazette*. This was the way the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches dealt with vested rights. When the change took place, moreover, this very principle of *ex-officio* representation on the Board was the one adopted. Up to last August the members of the Board were *ex-officio* members. It was the Mayor of the city and the Presidents of other corporations who represented them; so this elective principle was quite a new thing. For his own part he was rather in favour of it, and if he had drawn the bill, would have introduced the principle. His hon. friend (Mr. Vidal) had stated there was no complaint of the present Board, but the facts in connection with the giving out of the contracts for the dredges, should convince him of his error. Tenderers had come down materially in their second offers, while the Board had given out contracts at prices considerably higher than they could have got the work done for by other parties. All this proved the interest the country generally had in the proper administration of the affairs of the Harbor.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL said he did not affirm there had been no complaints, but that in the proceedings taken here, none were stated.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he referred to this matter, not to find fault with what the Commissioners did, but to show what the Dominion had to gain or lose by an improper or proper constitution of the Board. Though himself in favor of the elective system, he would be willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, who, he contended should possess the control, as they were responsible for the public expenditure. He argued that some of the members had no inherent rights to affect, and that the Board was to some extent a consultative body which the bill designed should give the Government advice. The measure took away nobody's rights.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—We are just going back to the system previously and long in force. The hon. gentleman in opposition made the change.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Of course we made the change in the interest of the advancement of the elective principle; we introduced it last year.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Under the old act, also, Government had the control.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Not under the elective principle.

Hon. Mr. RYAN expressed regret at the reference to the charges against the Commissioners, which had been much discussed and very well cleared up by the Montreal papers. He denied some of the charges brought against them, including that of imposing duties to the amount of 60 per cent on the inhabitants of Ontario, and asserted, as regards the action they had taken, that in the end they had reached a better result than could have been come to in any other way. Without going back to the accusations against the Commissioners, whether elective or nominative, he held that the business of the past had been most admirably conducted. (Hear, hear.) Its management had reflected credit not only on Montreal, but on the trade of the country in general; and he knew that the Harbour bonds were at a considerable premium, showing that the administration of the affairs of the harbour must have been very good and satisfactory indeed. He did not believe the trade of the country, that passed through Montreal, would be benefitted by the change proposed by the Government, which was a retrograde change. The merchants who had most interest in the conservation of this harbour, having obtained the privilege of electing their representatives—a step in advance—were now to be put back, the Government pro-

posing, because some of the Commissioners were not acceptable to them, to change the elective system, and replace these gentlemen by *ex officio* members the residents of the Corporations. The practical effect upon the Board of Trade and Corn Exchange would be to make them a little political arena, bodies which should devote themselves exclusively to the interests of trade, apart from politics. If the Government particularly wished for a favourite on the Harbour Commission, they would, of course, set about canvassing to secure his election as President of either Corporation. He did not think the Government would gain much in the opinion of the intelligent and independent people of Montreal, by this measure, for he had received many remonstrances from merchants, on the subject. He did not care what Government was in power, local works were best managed by the people on the spot, if upright and sensible. While determined to vote against the first three clauses of the bill, and the seventh, which was connected with them, he was quite willing to let the fourth stand, which enabled the Commissioners to pay their Chairman, although the first merchants in Montreal had worked on that Board as long as it had been a Board, which was nearly 40 years, without any pay whatever. This was a new feature undoubtedly. He did not mean to say it was not proper, but it opened another way of dispensing a little patronage. (Hear, hear, and oh, oh!) The other clauses of the bill were very good. But instead of restricting the elective principle, there were other classes, entitled to votes for the Commissioners, to whom it should be extended. He was sorry to say no provision had been made for them in the bill—he meant the rate payers, who belonged neither to the Corn Exchange nor Board of Trade, and their numbers were very considerable.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They are represented by the Mayor.

Hon. Mr. RYAN concluded by suggesting, with the other amendments the addition of a clause, giving Montreal importers and exporters, and all who contributed directly to any considerable extent to the revenue of the Commission, the right of electing representatives at the Board.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT, after a few words of reply, moved the adoption of the first clause,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL repeated that he was opposed to it, and would ask for the question.

A division then took place: contents 15; non-contents, 14.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said Mr. Lacoste had not voted, when Mr. SCOTT argued the matter should be considered decided.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL insisted upon the hon. gentleman's vote being taken.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT protested against a second division.

At length, the Clerk obtained from Mr. Lacoste the reply that he would vote against the first clause. There was then a tie, but the Chairman, Mr. Kaulbach, also cast his vote with the non-contents, defeating it.

The Committee then rose and reported progress, Ministers stating they would consult their colleagues with regard to the amendments.

ALBION MINES SAVINGS BANK.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON reported from the Banking Committee a bill respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank, and moved that it be not proceeded with.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT moved that the bill be read a third time. He explained the character of the bill, which was to enable the miners, who were mostly Scotch, to deposit their small savings in this bank.

After some remarks from Mr. Campbell, who opposed the bill,

Hon. Mr. PENNY explained the difference between the savings banks here and in the old country, the latter being managed by the Government, and therefore being perfectly secure, while the former were limited liability companies; and the Scotch miners would invest their savings in this bank under the mistaken notion of its security.

The House adjourned for an hour at 2 o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair at 3 p.m.

The following, among other bills, from the Commons were also reported from the Banking Committee, read a third time and passed:

To enable the Montreal and Ottawa Colonization Company to build a bridge over the Ottawa River.

The Colonial Building Investment Association bill.

The Lumber Exchange of St. John, New Brunswick bill.

The International Express Company's bill with amendments.

BILLS NOT DISTRIBUTED.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT objected to all these bills that they had passed through Committee without copies of them being distributed to the members. He had nothing

to say, however, against the bills themselves.

FREE POSTAL DELIVERY.

Hon. Mr. READ enquired whether the returns as to the localities where letters were delivered free, which he had asked for in the early part of the session, had been brought down.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that the Post Office Department had not been able to prepare the returns in time, but he believed Halifax was the only place where this occurred.

Hon. Mr. DEVER considered it very unfair that this boon should be extended to Halifax and not to St. John.

The matter then dropped.

PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. READ the eighth report of the Joint Committee on Printing was adopted.

INSPECTION OF STAPLE ARTICLES.

The House then went into Commttee on the Inspection of Staples Law Amendment Bill, from the Commons, and reported the same amended on the third reading.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACK moved that the bill provide for the compulsory inspection of butter, lard, corn and flour. He argued that no exception should be made in the case of fish, which would be an injustice to a deserving class, who contribute largely to the revenue. Why not inspect other articles as well as fish?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said these were optional, because inspection was an impossibility.

The amendment was lost, and the bill read a third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED.

The Port Wardens' Appointment Bill; the Windsor branches of Nova Scotia Railway Transfer Bill, and the Indian Laws Extension to Manitoba Bill were put through Committee of the Whole, reported with amendments, read a third time and passed.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Pacific Railway Construction Bill.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said he would not take up much time, but he looked upon the question of constructing this railway as a matter of Imperial interest, and one which he believed the resources of the country were quite equal to. He had no inclination for fettering the country beyond the power possessed by her for building the railway. The late Government had a definite scheme and a definite time in which to do the work. He had no doubt but they, in the course of time, would have built the road in the way most advantageous to the country; but in this Bill it was otherwise, for there was no definite amount named, nor any definite time fixed in which the work was to be completed. There was no doubt that the whole country was in favor of the line. No section of the people nor of the public press opposed it, and the country was obliged to build it if the plighted faith given to British Columbia was to be observed. As he had said, if the Government had been a little more definite as regards the cost of the work more reliance could have been placed on their intentions; but there was no statement as to what the cost would be. In the late scheme it was proposed to give a grant of $30,000 000 in money, and 50,000,000 acres of land, but by the present plan nothing so definite was proposed. He held that before they went to work they should sit down and count the cost, but the Government not having done this, and not having came before Parliament with anything definite or that could be relied on as to the amount that it would cost, or when it would be finished, it appeared to him that the Government was not very desirous to complete the scheme. He thought they were rather governed by the public sentiment than by their own scheme, and in this he was the more convinced by some remarks he had heard. Objections had been made as to the difficulties that the Rocky Mountains would present, but there were natural openings through the mountains that could be used for the railway route. He did not think that there were any insuperable barriers until they got across the Frazer River, and therefore they should not look upon the building of the road as one of those undertakings that was hardly practicable. He was sure the late Government was in real earnest about the matter, and if it had not been for certain occurrences this railway would have been commenced long ago. If it had not been for McMullan's scheme and other hon. gentlemen's political schemes—(hear, hear, and laughter)—it would not have proved abortive. It was to be regretted that it had turned out as it did, and that the country was now in the position of not knowing what the railway would cost. They

had no assurance from the Government that it would be within the means of the resources of the country to build the road, but his own opinion was that it is perfectly within the power of the country to bear the taxation to put the railway through. He hoped the Government would show that they were in real earnest, and that they would put the matter through as speedily as possible.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER regretted that there was not sufficient time remaining to discuss the question, as he would have liked to occupy the attention of the House for a considerable time; but the feeling of the House was that the session should terminate in a few minutes.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER—We will give you five hours for your speech if you like.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER went on to offer some objections to the scheme on the ground that the Government was taking too much power by providing that they should construct any portion of the line He looked upon that as the most dangerous clause of the bill no matter from what point they looked upon it. With the evidence before them of past experience he looked upon it as strange that the Government should think of constructing any portion of the railway. In the United States, the plan adopted was to give private companies bonuses of land and money and he thought we should act on the same principle. If $10,000 per mile was not enough to build the road, they should increase it, but let the Government not dream of building any portion of the road as a public work. He did not agree with the late Administration that it could be carried through in ten years, and even if it could, he believed it would be a calamity to the country to construct it throughout, unless there were about six millions of population. There was a large portion of the road that should be built soon, but the feeling of the country was that they should proceed cautiously with the construction of the road. They should have early railway communication with Fort Garry, and he asked why, with half a million of money expended, there was no survey yet to Fort Garry? There should be no time lost in completing that survey, and what he maintained now was the sentiments of every commercial man. They ought to build the line from Thunder Bay to Fort Garry, and from thence to Pembina. They were bound to make a certain connection there as soon as they could ascertain from the survey what was practicable. He proceeded to give a calculation of the distances between various places, and the probable cost he put down at $35,000 per mile, which he proposed to provide by a money bonus, and a grant of 20,000 acres of land per mile, which would be value for a dollar an acre. He felt persuaded that the money could be raised in England to carry out the work, because, when the road was built, the land would become valuable, as in the case of Illinois, where it had been sold at from ten to fifteen dollars an acre. He maintained that the road could be built without increasing the burdens of the country, because the money could be had under an Imperial guarantee at four and a half per cent, and there was a steady annual increase going on in the revenue of the country, which would produce $250,000 as the work proceeded. Then as to how the residue was to be raised, he thought $250,000 could be saved from local grants, such as had been given to local municipalities. Then again with regard to the working of public institutions, there could be a saving effected, as for instance the sum $139,000, which would not be again required, and which expenditure was occasioned by two extra sessions in the last year. No doubt it would be said that money was wisely spent. True, men who had served the country for half a century, had been hurled from office, and a large number of votes were recorded against them, but he thought the time would come when the verdict of the country would be reversed, and whatever else might be said it could not be alleged that the members of the late Administration had put one dollar into their pockets. They had become poor in the public service, and if they had made a mistake with regard to the Pacific Railway, it could not be denied that a certain party in the country had done everything they could to destroy the chances of raising the required capital in England. However, he was inclined to forget the past, and he only hoped their successors would show their ability to deal with this great national matter successfully. He regretted that there was no mind at the head of affairs, like that of Sir Francis Hincks, to make proper calculations as to the probable increase of the country's resources.

Hon. Mr. FLINT would have been perfectly willing to allow the bill to pass without saying a word, because there were certain portions of it which he approved, and others that he regarded as injurious and which, in his opinion, should not be passed. In looking carefully over the bill, he

did not find anything to guard against letting out this contract wholly to Americans, and as they were aware from past experience, at the last session very much was said about the Northern Pacific; the promoters of which were very anxious to get hold of the Canadian road in order to stave it off, so as to help their own road. There should be a clause in the bill to say that the road should be built by British subjects. The absence of such a clause was one great fault of the bill. Then there was another fault of which he complained. There was no time specified in which the work shall be completed. He thought when British Columbia was taken into Confederation on certain terms they should endeavor to carry out those obligations. He did not say that they could build the road in the time that was first mentioned, but if the Government had come down with a measure asking for five years more, he believed the time would have been granted, and British Columbia would have been satisfied. But they brought forward a measure for a land and water communication which he thought would not be of very great advantage to the country. It struck him that they wanted a line of communication that could be kept open all winter—all the year round in fact. It would not do to have people who intended to get to the North West spending six months waiting until the water communication could be open, and before they could get to the place that they intended to make their homes. These were the two principal points to which he took exception, but there were many other points in the bill of which he approved.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD did not hesitate to say that he approved to a certain point with the principle of the bill. The scheme he considered a good one, and if put in execution the effect will be to put Canada in a superior position before the world. He did not desire to ask from the Government extraordinary things, and he understood the work could not have been done in the time that was specified at the first, but it must be done and he had no doubt would be done. In undertaking such a giant enterprise which must have the effect of doubling the population of the Dominion, it would be necessary to increase the taxation. He approved of the plan of using the natural advantages which the country possesses in her great lakes and streams. He thought it was possible to complete that part of the line between Fort Garry and Lake Superior by 1876. He thought when the work was commenced the population of the country would rapidly increase, and that was very important because the population at present is not large enough for the expenses of such an undertaking. It might be said that they should wait for a larger population, but he wanted the door opened so that provision could be made for others coming to the country. It could not be expected that people would go and settle in a country where they had no means of getting out of it if they desired to do so for any object. If a man went there with his family he could not suffer the idea of being shut in, and that he could not get out in case of emergency. The branch from Fort Garry to Pembina was a great necessity, and the country could not be advanced without it. Without this they would be always depending upon the American railways. There were stage lines, communication by river, and the Pacific railway. All these lines would not subsist for a single day if the people of Winnipeg were not here to give them the traffic. He had tried to show that it would not be an extraordinary expense to complete the line from Thunder Bay to Fort Garry, and he thought it would be very easy to get farther and profit by the water of the rivers. The Assiniboine was not a navigable river for any extent, but at the same time he thought it would be very easy to make a canal that would draw the water of Manitoba Lake into the Assiniboine River so as to render it for miles and miles perfectly navigable for all vessels. Then there would have to be a cut of five miles made to arrive at the Saskatchewan, which would afford easy navigation to the foot of the Rocky Mountains.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—How many months in the year would it be navigable, and for what kind of boats?

Hon. Mr. GIRARD—It would be navigable to all kinds of boats, and it will be navigable for 800 miles. You must commence at the heart of the Province.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—How many months will it be open, taking into account the ice and the low water season?

Hon. Mr. GIRARD said the low water season was very short. He looked upon the scheme as affording two ways of improving the country. If they improved the water communication it would not cost the Government so much more money. He hoped the Government would proceed with the work, and he would do anything in his power to advance it.

Hon. Mr. READ mentioned that he had got a botanical report put into his hands

from which it appeared that flowers and plants were to be found a thousand miles West of Fort Garry of a similar character to those growing naturally about Belleville, so that the climate might be assumed to be much the same.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said he had only a few observations to make, and first that from the adverse remarks of hon. gentlemen from whom he was often obliged for information, he must say that he was led to think very unfavorably of this bill; but since that time he had come to look upon it as a very wise and cautious measure. He held that there was very little prospect that a work of this kind should be commenced and not carried out. He spoke with some earnestness on this matter, because the people of the Lower Provinces would look on this railway as a national one, which would be built out of the revenue, especially in view of the fact that the people were heavily taxed, so much so that they were about as far as they could arrive at. They could not afford any more taxation until the population was increased. It would be necessary to go on cautiously. Taking this view, he was disposed to support any measure involving but little expenditure, and tending to public welfare, no matter what Government was in power. He might also say in reference to the Baie Verte Canal, it would be highly in the interest of his Province that the loop should be completed. It was a national matter, one that should be recognized as a Dominion work. It had also been pointed out that the Intercolonial road to New Brunswick was a national work, and it was one of those works that Canada must have in order to carry out the great union. In the great work of constructing the Pacific Railway, it was essential to keep in view that there was no intention to go to any gigantic expenditure, but only as the revenue of the country increased the work should progress. He hoped the Government would act with energy as well as with due caution in the undertaking.

The Committee then rose, and the bill was reported without amendment, read a third time on the motion of the Hon. Mr. SCOTT and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

The House again went into Committee of the Whole on the Montreal Harbor Bill, which, after some slight additional amendments, was reported, read a third time, and passed.

[The House of Commons concurred in most af the amendments made, and, as it now stands, the present elective principle is restored to the Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange and the Corporation, but the former body are to return only one member, thus giving the Government the majority.]

Hon. Mr. WILMOT then moved the third reading of the Albion Mines Savings Bank Bill, which was carried unanimously.

The House, after eight, having disposed of its business, adjourned during pleasure and, finally, to meet at two on Tuesday, for prorogation.

TUESDAY, 26th May.

This day, at THREE o'clock, P. M., His EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL proceeded in state to the Chamber of the Senate, in the Parliament Buildings and took His Seat upon the Throne. The Members of the Senate being assembled, His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and that House being present the following Bills were assented to in Her Majesty's name by His Excellency the Governor General, viz:—

"An Act to amend the Act respecting the construction of the Intercolonial Railway."

"An Act to amend the Act respecting the prompt and summary administration of Criminal Justice in certain cases as respects the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick."

"An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Canadian and Great Northen Telegraph Company."

"An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Caughnawaga Ship Canal Company."

"An Act to Consolidate the Mortgages and other Preferential Charges of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for raising further capital and for establishing a superannuation and provident fund association, and for other purposes."

"An Act to incorporate the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company."

"An Act to amend the Act to incorporate 'La Banque d'Hochelaga."

"An Act to continue for a limited time certain temporary provisions in the Act respecting the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Dominion."

"An Act to amend the Pilotage Act, 1873."

"An Act to exempt Transports from Port and Harbour Dues."

"An Act to incorporate the Lochiel, Hawkesbury and L'Orignal Junction Railway Company."

"An Act to incorporate Lamb's Waterproof Gum Manufacturing Company."

"An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Maritime Warehousing and Dock Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Bank of Ottawa"

"An Act to amend an Act for the organization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada."

"An Act respecting the extension and application of the Fisheries Act to and in the Provinces of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba."

"An Act further to amend the Act to provide for the appointment of a Port Warden for the Harbour of Montreal."

"An Act to authorize the raising of a loan for the construction of certain public works, with the benefit of the Imperial Guarantee for a portion thereof."

"An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Confederation Life Association."

"An Act to incorporate the Collins Bay Rafting and Forwarding Company."

"An Act to incorporate the London and Canada Bank."

"An Act to incorporate the International Transportation Association."

"An Act to incorporate the Maritime Insurance Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Board of Trade of the Town of Ingersoll."

"An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Royal Canadian Insurance Company."

"An Act to amend the Act incorporating the St. Lawrence Tow Boat Company."

"An Act to amalgamate the Canadian Telegraph Supply Manufacturing Company (Limited) and the Toronto Manufacturing Company (Limited) under the name of the Electric and Hardware Manufacturing Company (Limited.)"

"An Act to incorporate the Saint Croix Printing and Publishing Company."

"An Act respecting the Federal Bank of Canada."

"An Act to indemnify Stanislaus Francis Perry for having sat and voted as a member of the House of Commons, under the circumstances therein mentioned"

"An Act to change the name of the Victoria Bank of Canada to that of the Manufacturers Bank of Canada."

"An Act to amend the Act passed in the thirty-fourth year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled 'An Act to amend and explain the Act to amend the charter of the Ontario Bank.'"

"An Act to incorporate the Provincial Steamship Company."

"An Act further to amend the Act respecting the inspection of steamboats."

"An Act to amend the Act 31 Vict., ch. 44, and other Acts amending the same and the Tariff of duties of Customs imposed by the said Acts, and to alter certain duties of Excise."

"An Act respecting the Bank of Nova Scotia."

"An Act to establish a Military College in one of the Garrison Towns of Canada."

"An Act to declare the intention of the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter thirty, as regards the subsidy to be allowed to Nova Scotia."

"An Act to amend the Act to incorporate a Company by the name of 'Le Credit Foncier du Bas Canada."

"An Act respecting the Crime of Libel."

"An Act to incorporate the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company."

"An Act to extend the time limited for paying in of Subscription of Stock in the Canada and New York Bridge and Tunnel Company."

"An Act to amend the Act incorporating the British America Assurance Company, and other Acts affecting the same, and to extend the Powers of the said Company."

"An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Bank."

"An Act to authorize the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company to issue Preferential Mortgage Debentures, and for other purposes."

"An Act for the removal of obstructions by wreck and like causes in navigable waters of Canada, and other purposes relative to wrecks."

"An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Canada Mutual Marine Insurance Company."

"An Act for granting certain powers to the Richelieu Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Consolidated Silver Mining Company."

"An Act to further amend the Act 31 Vict., ch. 48, intituled 'An Act respecting Insurance Companies."

"An Act to amend the Act 36 Vict., ch. 31, for the re-adjustment of the salaries of Judges, and other purposes."

"An Act to amend 'An Act respecting the Administration of Justice, and for the establishment of a Police Force in the North West Territories.'"

"An Act to amend an Act respecting Vagrants."

"An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial Oaths."

"An Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act.".

"An Act to authorize Joseph Meunier to build a Toll Bridge over the River L'Assomption, in the Province of Quebec."

"An Act to make better provision for the Trial of Controverted Elections of the Members of the House of Commons, and respecting matters connected therewith."

"An Act to give certain powers to the Port Whitby Harbour Company."

An Act to incorporate the "Neutral Link Railway Company."

"An Act respecting Carriers by water."

"An Act to extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Company."

"An Act respecting the issue of bonds by the St. Francis and Megantic International Railway Company."

"An Act to enable the Great Western Railway Company to further extend and improve its connections, and to authorize and confirm the issue of certain debentures of stock."

"An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Bank of Manitoba."

"An Act to attach the Village of Richmond Hill to the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of York."

"An Act to incorporate the St. John's Board of Trade, Province of Quebec."

"An Act to authorize the incorporation of Boards of Trade in the Dominion"

"An Act to incorporate the Commercial Travellers' Mutual Life Insurance Company of Canada."

"An Act to incorporate the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada."

"An Act to incorporate the Royal Canadian Chemical Fire Engine Company."

"An Act to impose License duties on compounders of spirits, amend the Act respecting Inland Revenue, and to prevent the adulteration of food, drink and drugs."

"An Act to authorize the purchase of the Pier or Breakwater at Cow Bay, N.S., and to provide for its maintenance."

"An Act to make further provision for the management of Permanent Building Societies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario."

"An Act for avoiding doubts as to the application of the Act 32, 35 Vict., ch. 35, to the District of Algoma."

"An Act to extend certain Acts relating to the prompt Administration of Justice in Criminal Matters to the Province of Manitoba."

"An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company."

"An Act to authorize the Advance of a certain sum to the Province of British Columbia, for the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and for other purposes."

"An Act to incorporate the Rouge Boom Company."

"An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Quebec Frontier Railway Company."

"An Act to enlarge and extend the powers of the Montreal Credit Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Merchants' Marine Insurance Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Neepigon and Manitoba Railway Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Mortgage and Investment Company (Limited.)"

"An Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion Lands in Manitoba."

"An Act further to amend the Patent Act of 1872."

"An Act to authorize corporations and institutions incorporated without the limits of Canada to lend and invest moneys therein."

"An Act to authorize the shareholders of the Western Canada permanent Building and Savings Society, to change the name of the said Society."

"An Act further to continue for a limited time the 'Insolvent Act of 1869,' and the Act amending the same, and for other purposes."

"An Act to amend the Act, 27 Victoria, Chapter 49, incorporating 'The Lower Canada Investment and Agency Company' (Limited.)

"An Act to incorporate the Great North West Railway Company."

"An Act to incorporate the Huron and Trent Valley Canal Company."

"An Act to extend certain Acts therein mentioned to the Province of Prince Edward Island."

"An Act to authorize the Shareholders of the Canada Permanent Building and Savings Society, to change the name of the said Society."

"An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada, and to extend the same to the Province of Prince Edward Island."

"An Act to amend an Act to make further provisions as to duties of customs in Manitoba and the North West Territories, and further to restrain the importation or manufacture of intoxicating liquors into or in the North West Territories."

"An Act to extend to the Province of British Columbia certain of the criminal

laws now in force in other Provinces of the Dominion."

"An Act to incorporate the Alliance Assurance Association of Canada."

"An Act to amend an Act respecting the Public Works of Canada."

"An Act to incorporate the Ottawa Agriculture Insurance Company."

"An Act to amend the law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes."

"An Act respecting the Elections of Members of the House of Commons."

"An Act to provide for the Appointment of Harbour Masters for certain Ports in the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island."

"An Act to amend the Acts of Incorporation of the Farmers' and Mechanics' Loan and Savings Society."

"An Act to provide for the appointment of Port Warden at certain Ports of the Dominion."

"An Act to authorize the transfer of the Windsor Branch of the Nova Scotia Railway to the Western Counties Railway Company."

"An Act to enable the Montreal Northern Colonization Railway Company to build a bridge over the Ottawa River."

"An Act to incorporate the Colonial Building and Investment Association."

"An Act to incorporate the Lumber Exchange of St. John, New Brunswick."

"An Act to provide for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

"An Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank."

"An Act to amend certain Laws respecting Indians, and to extend certain Laws relating to matters connected with Indians to the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia."

"An Act to amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal."

"An Act to incorporate the Central Canada Telegraph Company."

"An Act to incorporate the International Express Company."

"An Act to make better provision, extending to the whole Dominion of Canada, respecting the Inspection of certain Staple Articles of Canadian Produce."

"An Act to incorporate the Ottawa Loan and Investment Company."

His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to reserve the following Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon:

"An Act to regulate the construction and maintenance of Marine Electric Telegraphs."

"An Act to amend the Extradition Act, 1873."

"Then the Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

"In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a Bill intituled:—

"An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June 1874 and the 30th June 1875, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service,' to which I humbly request Your Excellency's assent."

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

"In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill"

After which His Excellency the Governor General, was pleased to close the FIRST SESSION of the THIRD PARLIAMENT of the DOMINION with the following

SPEECH:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I am glad that at a comparatively early period of the season I am able to relieve you from further attendance in Parliament.

I thank you for the devotion you have shown to the public interests in the earnest prosecution of the work of the Session.

I congratulate you on having passed an Election Law adapted to the requirements of the respective Provinces, and I trust that this law, with the amended Act for the trial of controverted elections, will result in securing for the future pure and peaceable election.

The measure you have passed providing for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway will enable my Government to proceed as soon as practicable, with such portions of the work as are necessary to secure communication with the Interior, and with British Columbia.

I hope that the law for the establishment of a Military College will be found to fulfil its design in securing a class of thoroughly educated officers for the Militia service.

I trust that the other measures you have adopted with so much unanimity will likewise prove beneficial to the country.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the readiness with which you have made provision for an anticipated deficiency and granted the supplies for the Public Service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate, Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I trust that the measures I have caused to be taken for the preservation of the peace in the North West Territories will be effectual in preventing the spirit of lawlessness, so much to be feared in these vast unsettled regions, and in maintaining friendly relations with the Indian tribes.

The negotiations in progress relative to the compensation due to Canada under the Treaty of Washington will I hope, realize our just expectations.

We have reason to rejoice that within our borders are peace and prosperity, and I pray that the country may continuously enjoy these invaluable blessings.

The SPEAKER then said—It is the will and pleasure of His Excellency that this Parliament be prorogued until Monday the 6th day of July next, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until that date.