

it only referred to goods coming to Quebec from abroad.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said in the first place it struck him as being an unreasonable proposition that all goods entering the city, whether by harbor or otherwise, should be subject to those dues. In fact the effect of the bill would be to put octroi duties on everything that entered the city. It seemed to be a provision to enable the citizens of Quebec to tax themselves in a way one would think would interfere with their business very much. If they desired it, however, and it was necessary that an additional sum should be raised to meet the interest on their debt, he would not oppose the bill, but he would require strong proof to believe that they desired such legislation.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER could not see why the goods landed by the North Shore Railway, or by the Grand Trunk, should pay harbor dues. In one case the railway did not touch the harbor at all, and in the other the wharves were private property of the company, and not of the city.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL said he had received several letters from parties in Quebec, which tended to show that while there was some opposition to this measure at one time, that opposition had been withdrawn since, as they had recognized the necessity that existed for increasing the revenue of the harbor to meet the interest on the debt, and make some further improvements. When improvements were to be made in that city, there was always opposition from a special class—gentlemen who, though being wealthy, and occupying a position in business, had no fixed interest in Quebec but merely resided there for a time to make money in the lumber trade with a view afterwards to leaving the city. Their opposition was founded on the belief that an increase in taxation would advance the price of labor.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said it might be convenient for the people of Quebec to raise a revenue in this way, but the question the Senate had to consider, was how it would effect the interests of the public generally. The 4th section, for instance, obliged masters of vessels within twenty-four hours after their arrival to report their cargo and pay dues on pain of fine and imprisonment; and the commissioners were also empowered to impose penalties on persons infringing their by-laws. This was a very extensive power to give to such a body.

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER explained the dues referred to were not on the cargo, but on the vessel.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said after the explanations he had heard, it was right to

assume that the people of Quebec were willing to have this taxation imposed upon them, and inasmuch as they were the only parties who would suffer by it, he was not disposed to oppose the measure. He contended, however, that this bill would impose a tax on lumber and timber from Ontario, while it relieved the lumber and timber of Quebec from the same dues. For instance, timber cut on the north shore of the Ottawa River would not be subject to any dues, while timber and lumber cut on the south shore of the same river would have to pay them. Surely, it could not be contemplated to discriminate so unfairly against the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said the bill was contrary to every principle of reason and justice. It was imposing a tax on goods carried by land, to maintain a harbor through which they did not come and from which they received no benefit. He considered it was also unwise to give such unlimited powers to the Harbor Commissioners to enforce their by-laws. The 8th clause contained a very vicious principle. It enabled the Commissioners to fine a pilot who was guilty of negligence \$100, instead of suspending his license or taking it away from him. It was a vicious principle, because it offered a premium for negligence. The pilot might run a vessel aground, and by paying a fine of \$100 he would be at liberty to run another vessel aground the following day. He considered it was a move in the wrong direction.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL asked if it was the intention of the Government to impose differential dues on the timber and lumber produced in Ontario. Certainly, the bill as it stood would have that effect.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said this bill was altogether in the interests of Quebec as a commercial city. If fifty per cent. of the goods arrived by the St. Lawrence, and fifty per cent. by New York, it was quite clear that imposing the harbor dues only on the former would be discriminating against the trade of the St. Lawrence. The necessary consequence would be to divert trade from the river to Portland and New York, and the greater the proportion that would be brought by land the more rapidly would the trade of the St. Lawrence diminish. It was, therefore, deemed wise to impose dues on all goods brought into the city. It was not contemplated to impose dues on timber and lumber from Ontario.

Hon. Mr. BAILLARGEON was surprised at the opposition made to this bill. Quebec was a large harbor, but still the increased number of vessels arriving every year made