

portion as the reporters, about one-third, the reporters advance being one third. The question as to the time when it should go into effect was also discussed, and it was decided that it would take effect, as in the case of the *Hansard* reporters, next Session. I think it would be entirely unfair to take the advance retroactive in one case and not in the other. I think that the Committee arrived at a decision which the House should sanction. I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not, and the salaries they receive are so much to the good. The case is very different with the *Hansard* reporters. They have no other employment. Although they are nominally employed here during only three or four months, they are practically unable to obtain other employment during the recess. I repeat that the proposal to make the advance retroactive in the case of the translators and not in that of the reporters is unfair.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if the motion in amendment, as proposed, by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is adopted, Mr. Poirier, whose name appears in the fifth clause of the report, will receive this year a salary of \$1,000 without doing any work at all.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) His appointment only takes effect next year.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) By virtue of the fourth clause, his appointment only takes effect next year, and in the fifth clause it is stated that these gentlemen will only begin next year to receive the salary stated opposite their names, but the amendment which has just been moved asks that this salary be paid to them this year. Now, a word in answer to the hon. Secretary of State, who says he does not know the reasons which may have induced me to make a motion in amendment—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that; I said the hon. gentleman had given no reasons.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) In that case, I think it is better not to make them known.

Amendment (Mr. Amyot) negatived, and report concurred in.

THE LATE PRINCE LEOPOLD.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that a Message had been received from the Senate with an Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty of condolence on the death of His Royal Highness, Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany, to which the concurrence of this House was desired; and the said Address is as follows:—

"To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty,

"MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

"We Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty with the renewed assurance of our attachment to Your Majesty's Person and Government.

"The intelligence of the further affliction which has befallen You, in the early and sudden death of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Albany, has deeply touched the hearts of Your Majesty's subjects in this part of Your Empire; We speak in their name, as well as in our own, when we humbly tender You the expression of our respectful and earnest sympathy.

"Your Illustrious Son had spent some time in Canada, during the residence here of the Marquis of Lorne and Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise.

"Our attention was thus naturally drawn to the high position he had, so early in life, attained in the world of Literature and Science, and we had looked forward with confidence and hope to the increasing usefulness of his already distinguished career.

"Your Majesty's bereavements have indeed been many and grievous, and the interest which You have so often and graciously shown in the afflictions of Your subjects, of low as well as of high degree, has inten-

sified our sympathy with Your own: Your Majesty's sorrows, we say it with respect of dutiful subjects, have been ours.

"We pray that the God of consolation may comfort Your Majesty, and long preserve You to Your people."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said Address be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT ST. CLOTILDE.

Mr. HOLTON enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a post office at St. Clotilde, in the parish of St. Jean Chrysostome, county of Chateauguay? If so, when, and who will be named postmaster?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. DESJARDINS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring down during this Session some measure to compel railway companies to do away with level crossings on roads or streets leading to and in the vicinity, or within the limits of large centres of population?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to provide for that matter, as it is already provided for by 46 Vic., chap. 24, an Act further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act which provides as follows:—

"In case where any portion of a railway is constructed, or authorized or proposed to be constructed upon, or along, or across any turnpike road, street, or other public highway on the level, the railway company before constructing or using the same, or in the case of railways already constructed within such time as the Railway Committee shall direct, shall submit a plan and profile of such portion of railway for the approval of the Railway Committee, and the Railway Committee, if it appears to them necessary for the public safety, may, from time to time, with the sanction of the Governor in Council authorize and require the company to whom such railway belongs within such time as the said Act directs to carry such road street or highway either over or under the said railway by means of a bridge or arch instead of crossing the same on the level."

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of saying whether or not there is any truth in the rumours which have been heard within the last day or two, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have represented that the arrangements recently made with them are inadequate, and that they have asked for a modification of those arrangements.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No such communication has been made, so far as I am aware, to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE FISHERY AWARD.

Mr. DAVIES. The proposition to which the House is asked to accede, in the resolutions which I intend to move, is that Prince Edward Island is entitled to a portion of the amount awarded to Great Britain, as against the United States, at the Halifax Fishery Commission. This proposition has been discussed once or twice in the House, but not at any great length, and it has never been submitted to the House in a form in which the sense of the House could be taken upon it. Hon. members will better understand the few remarks which I shall make on the subject, if I read the resolutions to the House:

That by the terms of the Treaty of Washington, 1871, the privilege of using the territorial waters of the Dominion of Canada and the then Provinces of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland for a certain term for fishing purposes, in common with British subjects, was granted to American citizens, on and after such times as the necessary laws to