measure. It was evidently introduced to meet the wishes of the hon. member for Annapolis, who seemed to be such a great protectionist, that he thought the quality of the herrings in the Digby Basin would be greatly improved if they were taxed a little. In no other part of the country, had there been a demand for the inspection of smoked herrings, and in no other section was an inspection considered necessary. If the Government would confine the operation of this Bill to fish caught in the Digby Basin and sold for exportation at Halifax, then those who represented other constituencies would have no reason to object. But they had objected last year, and they objected again, to any attempt to impose a tax on this small industry, which the people engaged in it did not find over profitable. They would feel the tax as an oppressive and onerous one, and they would avoid the inspection as of no value whatever, and they would come to regard this Parliament, not as interested in their welfare, but as choosing to meddle in their business without justification. The present Bill was to reduce the tax, and therefore he would support it, because he was opposed to any imposition at all, and he preferred the smaller charge to the larger. The Government would only render their administration obnoxious by interfering in this petty way with this small industry, as it would not in any way improve the character of the fish or promote the welfare of those engaged in it. He would have no objection to such a measure, provided its operation was confined to those districts, the representatives of which chose to say the inspection would be of advantage to the trade.

Mr. RICHEY said the Halifax Chamber of Commerce concurred in the expediency of such a measure as this, as they had some years ago addressed a memorial to the Government in favor of it, in the interests of the port of Halifax and of the fishery business. If the inspection of fish at all was necessary, it appeared proper to extend the inspection to smoked herrings as well as other fish.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD could not agree with the doctrine laid down by the hon. member for Gloucester, that a provision for the inspection of any article of commerce should be subject to the opinion of the representatives of those districts which might be more particularly interested in that article. He thought this was a question of public policy, which must be settled of the wishes of some constituencies. It was very hard to get any class of persons engaged in any industry to put a limit to their power of sale. They had an instance in Canadian butter. There was no reason why Canadian butter should not command the highest possible price, because we had all the facilities for making good butter as were found anywhere else, yet the producers objected to having their butter inspected. They were like the old ladies interested in the butter trade, who would like very much to have their poorest sample put in the market as well as their best. At one time Irish butter was very poor in quality, but through a rigid system of inspection it became the finest butter in the world. The whole of the navy and the army were supplied exclusively from Ireland with butter during the long Peninsular war, its standard had become so improved; yet the inspection measure was most tremendously opposed when introduced. The hon member for Halifax said the Board of Trade there were in favor of this measure. It was easily understood that fishermen, or any other persons immediately employed in any particular industry, could not be expected to look far distant, and make up their minds to a little sacrifice by taking more care in their work and excluding an inferior article

Mr. MILLS said the case of butter cited by the hon. to an improper use of arms. He was member was not to the point. A certain amount of artistic Government saw any reason to apprehensially was required in the manufacture of butter, which was requiring exceptional legislation of this kind.

Mr. Anglin.

not regulated in the curing of fish. They were taken from the sea, and whether they were superior or inferior in quality was wholly independent of the fishermen. If the inspection of butter imposed a tax of ten per cent, on the butter trade, however much the butter might be benefitted, it would be impossible that inspection would be had. The inspection of fish, according to the hon, member for Charlotte, imposed the enormous tax of ten per cent, on the value of fish. This was a sufficient reason for opposing the measure.

Mr. ANGLIN said the law for the inspection of butter did not require its inspection for the home market, and he did not know of any law to prevent the exportation of butter not inspected. It was to determine the quality of the butter, the standard of which was then branded on the tubs.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. MOUSSEAU introduced a Bill (No. 49) to amend the General Inspection Act of 1874, and the Act amending it. Bill read the first time.

PREVENTION OF CRIME.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 30) further to continue in force for a limited time the better prevention of Crime Act 1878.

Mr. ANGLIN asked what reasons the Government had for continuing this Act. Many entertained the opinion that the Act had not worked as well as was expected by the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had not considered really whether or not the Bill was as perfect as any one that could be framed. It had done no harm and could remain on the Statutes.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE said his hon. friend the Minister of Justice observed that the Bill did no harm, and, therefore, there was no reason why it should not remain on the Statutebook. His own opinion was that it was designed to meet an exceptional state of things, and ought to be continued only on the responsibility of the Administration, which was responsible, of course, for the prevention of crime. It still appeared that there was some reason for its continuance, and perhaps it should be allowed to remain on the Statutebook for another year. It was, when introduced, not only justifiable but desirable, owing to the excited state of feeling that prevailed in certain parts of the country. But as that excited feeling thad fortunately passed away, there would be very good reasons for its removal from the Statute-book after a limited time.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said he did intend to let the Bill drop, but certain circumstances transpiring elsewhere made it desirable for the present to retain it for at least another year, beyond which it would probably not be wanted.

Mr. ANGLIN said he was sorry to hear the reasons alleged by the hon. Minister for the renewal of this law. His own feeling was that very great restrictions should be placed on the practice of carrying arms, which created a temptation for their improper use. He must object to the reasons given by the Minister for his course as reflecting upon a large portion of our people. He did not think there was any reason for passing any exceptional measures in Canada. There was no reason to expect that any portion of our people would with any object resort to an improper use of arms. He was sorry that the Government saw any reason to apprehend any hanger requiring exceptional legislation of this kind.