

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 panny 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