DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

SECOND SESSION—FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, April 14.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 p.m.

THE TEA DUTIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked the following questions:—1st, whether it is the intention of the Government to levy a differential duty on teas imported from the place of growth when ordered under letters of credit, part by overland, part by Suez canal, and the balance, with dust of the whole, *via* United States by sailing vessels round the Cape of Good Hope; 2nd, in the case of teas bought at the same time, and imported by two or three routes as above, and their arriving at different dates, will the Government consider such division as breaking bulk; 3rd, will the whole purchase be held by the Customs until completed by the arrival of the dust; 4th, in the event of part of the said teas being unsalable in Canada, will importers be allowed to dispose of such teas at New York without prejudice to rates of duty levied on the balance?

Mr. BOWELL replied—1st, it is not the intention of the Government to levy any such duty. The question of route is not considered other than that the teas shall be a direct importation from the countries of growth. 2nd, the Government does not recognize an importation of teas as direct when bulk has been broken in a foreign port, but in the case of a consignment of tea to Canada from the place of growth, the Government does not insist upon the whole consignment being brought to Canada in one vessel, or by any particular route, but the Customs does require that all the teas, or dust referred to in the original invoice, be entered for duty. If part of such consignments only had arrived, the balance might be entered to arrive, or the tea which had arrived might remain on sufferance in warehouse until the whole consignment shall have been received. 3rd. The third question is covered by the answer to the second question. 4th. After teas, whether of a direct or indirect importation into Canada, have had the duties required by law paid thereon, the owners thereof is at liberty to dispose of the same in whatever market he pleases, without interference on the part of the Government. The teas may, however, be entered for warehouse, and afterwards entered ex-warehouse for duty or export at the option of the owner.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Mr. GIROUARD moved the consideration of the bill to legalize marriage with the sister of a deceased wife, as amended by Committee of Whole House. The bill, as it at present stood with the amendments made in Committee, was read as follows:—

Marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, or the wife of a deceased brother, shall be legal. All such marriages heretofore contracted by parties who are living as husband and wife at the time of the passing of this Act shall be held to be lawfully contracted.

He observed that now that the clause relating to dispensations had been omitted, one or two Quebec journals, Judge Loranger, of Sorel, and the Bishop of Three Rivers had opposed the bill. His Lordship the Bishop protested against it on the ground that a man could marry his deceased wife's sister without first receiving a dispensation from the Pope. But the omission of this clause would not affect the case. As every one knew, Catholics must be married before the priests or the curate of the parish. No priest or curate was obliged to solemnize a marriage against his conscience, and if the marriage of a man with his sister-in-law could not be solemnized according to the law of the Church without a dispensation, the priest would not solemnize it without such, and the bill would, therefore, not open the door to the marriage of Catholics being solemnized without dispensations. The bill had been endorsed by the Bishop of Montreal, the Archbishop of Quebec, and other Church dignitaries of Quebec Province. Moreover, it had also received the support of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ontario. The Archbishop of Toronto wrote respecting the clause for dispensation:—"I think in a Parliament like that at Ottawa, the Catholic members might overlook that, as Catholic members would always obtain such dispensation when necessary through his Bishop from the Pope." It had been alleged that the bill was being hurried through the House in individual interests. He, however, had no interest in the bill, and if the admission would quiet opposition, he would frankly say he had no sister-in-law. An opportunity had been afforded to arouse an agitation against the bill, but the result was in a contrary direction. Hardly a newspaper could be cited which opposed the bill, and not a single editorial could be found in an English or French paper, outside of ecclesiastical journals, against the proposed measure. No petition had been received from the Province of Quebec, and all the petitions that had been sent in were in the same form, and not always headed by the clergyman of the parish. They were still awaiting a petition from Gananoque, the residence of the hon. member for Leeds, the chief opponent of the bill. Who opposed the bill? The bishops of the Church of England. Against them were arrayed the Presbytery of London, the Methodist clergy of Toronto, and all the clergy of Montreal, except those of the Church of England. It was a remarkable fact that while some Christians interpreted the Scriptures to be opposed to such marriages, the Jews interpreted them differently, and acted in a manner entirely opposite to the Christian contention; but it was a question whether the Mosaic law was a safe guide to Christians entirely. Why, in the Mosaic law, polygamy was permitted, and Solomon had no less than seven hundred or eight hundred concubines. (Cheers.) He had, no doubt, however, that notwithstanding that, there was no danger of polygamy being introduced into a Christian community. The restrictions which the opponents of the present bill advocated were not founded on either moral or natural laws. If the bill was to make the marriage obligatory, one might account for the opposition of the Church of England to the measure. But the bill did not propose to interfere with the liberty of the subject, and the members of the Church of England, whose consciences forbade them to marry a deceased wife's sister, would not be prevented from abstaining from contracting such marriages. It had been objected that the bill introduced civil marriages into this country. Such was not the case, as it did not touch at all the mode of solemnization. It was said that the bill proposed would upset all social relations and destroy the relations existing between brother and sister-in-law. Public opinion was admittedly in its favour. In regard to the alleged change that it would cause in the feelings towards the sister-in-law, the London *Telegraph* had pointed out that it was impossible to control domestic affections by action of Parliament. An effort had been made to bring the influence of the fair sex against the bill. But what a failure had resulted. One or two women on the desolate coast of Cape Breton under the pressure and restraint of unmerciful husbands, had petitioned against it. On the other side a lady in an Ottawa journal rushed into the melee, and in the course of a newspaper correspondence, compelled Bishop Lewis to withdraw from the field. (Applause.) He moved concurrence in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) said the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had got up a brief, but he (Mr. Jones) was not ready with any such prepared argument. The hon. gentleman had said that numerous petitions had been presented in favour of the bill. How were these petitions got up? They were got up and written for by the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman said he had no interest in the bill himself. If so, who were the friends in whose interests he was pushing it? The hon. gentleman said that only the Church of England opposed it. Well, if the only opponents to the bill were members of the Church of England, they, at all events, formed a large portion of the community, and the delay that was asked for by them should, at all events, be granted. He (Mr. Jones), as a member of the Church of England, looked upon the bill as contrary to the law of God, and likely to produce troubles in many now peaceful and happy families. The proposal in the bill was not the law in Old England, and he hoped this country would not try to set an example in this matter. He, in view of the delay asked for, which in his opinion it was desirable to grant, would move that the bill be concurred in this day six months.

Mr. GAULT said he could not change his opinion. He suggested the bill. He had nothing to gain by it, because he had married an only daughter. There was no reason why the bill should not pass.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) said that as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones) had ventured to speak on behalf of the Church of England, and declare that it was opposed to the present bill, he, as a member of that Church, having as good a right to speak on behalf of that community as the hon. gentleman, totally repelled any such position. He altogether denied that the Church of England was opposed to the bill. It was perfectly true that the Bishops of that Church who had presented their views to the House had opposed the bill, and he believed the majority of the Bishops of the Church of England in England were also opposed to the bill. Some few of the Bishops had on one or two occasions voted in favour of the bill. But on the occasion of the second reading of the English Act, the Bishops of the Church of England had expressly admitted there was nothing in the Scriptures against the principle involved in the measure, and that their opposition rested not upon the Scriptures, but on the Prayer Book. He did not coincide with that party of the Church of England who considered the Prayer Book superior to the Bible. The Prayer Book was a very good book, but its expressions were not equally binding with those contained in the Bible. That was the whole secret of the opposition arising from a certain section of the Church to the bill, the High Church party. Reference had also been made to a protest emanating from a small section of the Presbyterian Church. That Church, as a whole, was not opposed to the principle of the bill. When they found that for upwards of twenty years the question had been annually brought forward in England, that on seven or eight different occasions when brought before the House of Commons it had uniformly been carried by large majorities, one hundred votes or upwards, and was only defeated by the High Church feeling which pervaded the House of Lords, that the public opinion in Great Britain was in favour of it, these facts afforded additional reasons for passing the bill. When, moreover, it was shown that no religious principle was involved, when the hon. member for Leeds, although he declared the law of God was against it, failed to adduce any proof in support of the assertion, when the only passage that gave colour to such assertion was one in Leviticus, which the highest authorities had stated was not against the bill, but in its favour, when they found leading members of the community, including members of Parliament, making such marriages, he ventured to say that the third reading of the bill should be carried.

Mr. CHARLTON urged postponement of the measure, holding that the House should concur in the request of the Presbyterian Church to postpone the question for a year. It was desirable that the calm opinion of the large religious bodies should be obtained, and Parliament did not now possess that opinion.

Mr. PLUMB declared himself in favour of the six months' hoist.

Mr. WELDON deprecated the haste with which the supporters of the bill were endeavouring to get it through. The bill differed from all English bills on the subject but one, inasmuch as that proposed to legalize marriage with the widow of a deceased brother. No one had asked for such a provision as this, and, indeed, until long after the bill had been introduced no person had asked for the other and main provision of the bill. In England, this latter provision had been rejected time and again, and it was not until 1550 that any Pope gave a dispensation permitting such marriages as those proposed in the bill. He asked that the bill should be delayed, and would, consequently, vote for the six months' hoist.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) urged the introducer of the bill to withdraw it for this session, in order that the subject might be more fully discussed.

Mr. HOUDE moved in amendment to the amendment that all the words after the words "that" be struck out, and that the following words be inserted instead:—"That the bill be not concurred in, but that the bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to replace the first section with the following:—The laws prohibiting marriage between a man and the sister of a deceased wife, or the widow of a deceased brother, are hereby repealed. This Act shall also apply as if the laws repealed had not existed prior to such marriages heretofore contracted, the parties whereto are living as husband and wife at the time of the passing of this Act."

Mr. MACKENZIE—What laws do you propose to repeal? If it is the common law of England, we cannot repeal that.

Mr. HOUDE said the law of England had become the common law of Canada, and the carrying out of the principle in the form he proposed would leave it to the Churches to object to such marriages, or give dispensations permitting them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY said he would like to mention the reason why he was going to vote for the six months' hoist. He had never seen any objection to the principles contained in the bill, and from the arguments addressed to the House he was confirmed in the opinion he had always held on the subject. At the same time this was an important matter, and he thought the country would not suffer by the bill being delayed for twelve months in order that the country might have an opportunity of discussing and considering the matter. He merely stated this, because he intended to vote for the postponement on this occasion, and because next year he would vote for the bill if he saw nothing to change his opinion in the meantime.

Mr. CASEY rose to a question of order. The amendment of the hon. member for Maskinonge proposed to repeal laws which were the laws of England and not of Canada, and should, therefore, be ruled out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER—I am not called upon to say whether there is a law or no law. That is a question for the House to decide.

Mr. BLAKE—Hear, hear.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was rejected—ayes, 10; nays, 130.

The House divided on the amendment that the bill be read this day six months—ayes, 34; nays, 108.

YEAS—Messrs. Bourbeau, Bowell, Brooks, Charlton, Coughlin, Desaulniers, Doull, Farrow, Fleming, Geoffrion, Houde, Jones, Kirkpatrick, Langevin, McCuaig, McIsaac, McKay, McLeod, McQuade, Montplaiser, O'Connor, Ogden, Olivier, Patterson (Essex), Plumb, Pope (Compton), Rouleau, Schultz, Smith (Selkirk), Stephenson, Thompson (Haldimand), Tilley, Vanasse, Weldon, White (Renfrew), Williams, Yeo—40.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Allison, Angers, Anglin, Arkell, Baby, Beauchesne, Bechard, Benoit, Burgeron, Bill, Boldue, Bourassa, Bowell, Brown, Bunster, Burnham, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Casey, Cimon, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Coursol, Currier, Daoust, Desjardins, Doull, Duess, Dumont, Elliott, Fiset, Fitzsimmons, Fortin, Fulton, Gigault, Girouard (Jacques Cartier), Grandbois, Hackett, Haggart, Hay, Hesson, Hilliard, Hooper, Hurteau, Ives, Jackson, Kilbam, King, Kranz, Landry, Lane, Larue, Longley, McDonald (Pictou), Macdonell (Lanark), Mackenzie, Macmillan, McCallum, McDougall, McGreevy, McInnes, McLennan, McRory, Malouin, Massue, Merner, Methot, Rykert, Scriver, Shaw, Skinner, Strange, Tellier, Thompson (Cariboo) Vallee, Wallace (Norfolk), White (Carlwell), White (Hastings), Wright—102.

The bill was read a third time and passed on a division.

OTTAWA, April 15.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir Charles Tupper had intended to bring in some resolutions concerning the Pacific Railway, but did not do so this afternoon at the opening, leaving that to a later stage so as to enable Mr. Blake to move his proposed resolutions. But at the same time he addressed the House on the general subject of the railway. In doing so his tone was, as on the occasion of bringing in his resolutions last year, moderate, dignified and convincing in its earnestness. The proposition that the country would have gained greatly if the Pacific Railway had been constructed on the terms of the original compact of 1873, was fairly stated to the House. The next proposition was that when Mr. Mackenzie came into power the circumstances were such as to have enabled him to abandon the whole scheme had he so chosen, or had he so felt compelled to choose. But Mr. Mackenzie did not so choose; on the contrary he very emphatically committed himself to the building of the whole line. But he made a change. He chose to build the road as a Government work in order, as he himself said, that the people might get the profit of it. He struck out of his Act all reference to private enterprise, and boldly committed Canada to the building of the Pacific railway as a purely national endeavour. It was true that some provisions were made for subsidizing companies by means of lands and money, if the Government was pleased to make that choice, the price of the lands to be fixed between the Governor-in-Council and the contractors. In fact in this way at least 20,000,000 acres of land and $27,000,000 of money were pledged to the work in that alternative way, and the expense of surveys, &c., was to be borne by the Government. In short the late Government had committed the people of Canada to engagements far more onerous than the Government of 1873 had proposed. It was also proposed by the late Government to build the Georgian Bay branch at a cost of $2,560,000 and to give a subsidy of $1,440,000 to the extension of the Canada Central; in all about $4,00,000 that Mr. Mackenzie proposed to pay out in addition to the whole cost of the railway actually before reaching the eastern terminus at Lake Nipissing. As to the promise not to increase the rate of taxation, that clause of the Act had been made waste paper of by an actual loan raised for the purpose of aiding the construction of the Pacific railway. In fact the moment the Reform party got into power, they forget all their gloomy anticipations and tried to outdo their predecessors in expenditure and promise. Having added to the eastern end a sum of four millions of money, Mr. Mackenzie proceeded to add other millions at the other end by the well-known Carnarvon terms. These terms were as follows:—

(1.) The building of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway.

(2.) The pushing on of the surveys with vigour.

(3.) The construction of a waggon road and telegraph line.

(4.) That two millions per annum be spent in British Columbia on railway works.

(5.) That the railway be completed by December, 1890.

As to these same Carnarvon terms Sir Charles Tupper caused a ripple of amusement by referring to that spirit of independent criticism which marked Mr. Blake when he was not in the Cabinet. Mr. Blake had indeed opposed the Carnarvon terms, but Mr. Mackenzie had asked for the "cheerful support" of his party in passing these terms which had added at least eight millions of dollars to the expenditure more than Sir John Macdonald's Government had proposed to expend. Yet Mr. Blake had actually entered that Government and had thus assumed the full responsibility for all that policy of Mr. Mackenzie.

After five years of power, the old party came back to power. They found the Pembina branch incomplete, the waterstretches unutilized, and a vast expenditure incurred in sections of lines beginning nowhere and ending nowhere, and the surveys for which had notoriously been disgracefully incomplete. These facts are fully come out by the evidence on the Section 15 Committee and by the letter of Mr. Fleming referred to in a late issue of *The Mail*. Sir Charles Tupper had given Mr. Mackenzie last session credit for calling for tenders for the railway in 1878, but he now withdrew his credit, since Mr. Mackenzie himself had admitted that he did not intend to build the sections for which he asked tenders and had only called for the tenders to get at the cost. If this was the case, it was clear that Mr. Mackenzie was not entitled to the credit which last session had been given him in mistake. As to Mr. Mackenzie's responsibility for the increase of the quantities on section 15, Sir Charles stated that the change from trestle work to embankment had been approved of by Mr. Mackenzie before Mr. Fleming left for England. The present Government had effected great savings in most of the contracts by shortening the line and decreasing the cost of the works. In one case alone a saving of $319,000 had been made and similar savings were being made on other contracts. The statement of Mr. Mackenzie that his call for tenders was, in fact, a fraud on British Columbia contracts, and that there was no intention of building the railway, was dealt with by the Minister with great force. One point new and striking was made in this respect. Sir Charles asked Mr. Mackenzie to explain why it was, if he had not intended to build the Yale-Kamloops section, that he had concluded a contract with persons in British Columbia—to carry rails from Victoria to Yale, involving a cost of $32,400.

The great main plank of the present Government's policy was the building of the railway out of these lands. The present Opposition seemed disposed to prove to the world that the lands were of no value. They had declared that we had not a million of acres to utilize. Mr. Mackenzie had done his best to disparage the land and declared last session that we should have to pay people for going into our North-West. Mr. Mackenzie displayed a good deal of restiveness, and protested at this point, but the quotation was driven home with new force by the Minister who was cheered by the House. The Minister then referred to the mission of Ministers to England, and said that they had left England after many consultations with the late Ministers, in the full confidence that the Imperial authorities had been enlisted with earnestness in the present Government's plans for developing the North-West and building the Pacific railway. The times were not propitious, of course, for making public all the hopes that had been entertained, but the successful party in England would be just as careful of Canadian interests as the Conservatives had been. Sir Charles Tupper read from a recent speech of Mr. Forster to show that that gentleman had recently declared that it would be wise for England to be liberal in this matter. He deepened his earnestness and vigour as he rebuked the Opposition for their evident attempt to weaken the confidence of the people of Canada in the Liberal Administration in England.

Changes would necessarily have to be made in the policy propounded in the resolutions of last session. As to the route, Sir Charles dealt with the history of the Government's policy in that matter. He gave to Port Simpson the credit of being a fine port, but the land was not good on that route; it was far out of the current of population, and it would involve a great labour in construction. The merits of the Burrard Inlet route were set forth in striking language. The wisdom of building the Yale-Kamloops section was also set out, Sir Charles giving some account of the region from various authorities. The contracts had been let for maximum quantities. Power had been taken to lessen the work and expenditure at any time on these works. The maximum estimates would probably be reduced very largely in the course of construction.

An unhappy interjection of Mr. Blake caused Sir Charles to repudiate the notion of tarnishing the public faith of Canada and stultifying two Governments by breaking faith with British Columbia and refusing to build this line. All the surveys have been closed in the estimates, and after the 1st July there will be no further surveys except for proper purposes of location. The result of the year's operations as to the route was that in spite of the change to the south of Lake Manitoba, the Burrard Inlet route would not be lengthened more than ten miles. The 200 miles west of Winnipeg would be built for an average of $10,000 per mile. An interjection from Mr. Mackenzie brought forth the *Globe's* article on the Pacific railway, in which that paper committed itself to a more enthusiastic forecast of the future of the North-West than Sir John Macdonald himself. Sir Charles said that when he read the article in the *Globe* he fogave the paper for all the falsehoods and vituperation it had cast on himself.

He then gave an outline of the expenditure on the road up to date, of which the following affords a sufficiently accurate table:—

Red River line	$ 4,666,891
Telegraph	505,009
Pembina Branch	511,914
Rails, bolts, spikes	2,978,682
Canada Central	2,563,716
Georgian Bay	52,000
Engineering, &c	995,000
Payments not under extract	247,806
Total	$10,729,527
Exploitation, &c	3,119,618
Total	$13,818,875
Dawson route	22,995
Fort Frances locks	287,795
Total	$14,129,165

A figure here and there will doubtless be wrong in transmission or taking down, but the total will be found right.

Sir Charles pointed out that Mr. Mackenzie had spent in British Columbia alone the sum of $1,611,997 for surveys, and on the main line $1,507,621, or a total of $3,119,618 for surveys alone. The total cost of the line he estimated at $63,119,618, to which must be added the cost of the Pembina branch of $1,750,000, and add $22,000,000 for the 600 miles from Fort William to Nipissing, making a total of about $83,000,000 for the total cost of the line.

Sir Charles dealt also with the land policy and the probable receipts from them. That we could build the road with the lands and have a surplus of lands left, was a point which, quoting from Sir John Macdonald, he pressed home on the House. He quoted also the *Globe's* article recommending portions, great portions of the line as commercial enterprises certain of success. As to the British Columbia section, the Minister quoted the *Globe's* assertion that if 100,000 people should settle in British Columbia during the progress of the work, that would solve the difficulty as to cost, and the *Globe* did not see why that should not be the case. As to the question of the cost of operating the road after it is built, the Minister stated the possible objections to that point. He gave the returns of the Pembina branch, showing that for the month of March the receipts from all sources had been $24,771. Sir Charles said that he had no doubt that in 1882, when we would have a large number of miles in operation, all that would pay its own cost without fail.

With regard to the cancellation of the contract for the Georgian Bay branch, Sir Charles made an explanation. The road would have cost $1,900,000, and a large part of the money would have been flung away. To-day the energies of the business men are all directed towards the Sault Ste. Marie railway as a far more promising enterprise. Sir Charles concluded in a peroration which was greeted with repeated rounds of applause from the Ministerial benches.

OTTAWA, April 16.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. Blake at the outset discussed the results of the elections in Great Britain in their relation to the future of Ireland, a sufficiently irrevelant topic one ventures to think. After this we got from him some reflections on the reduction of the national debt of the United States and the increase of population, as a happy suggestion perhaps to immigrants that our debt is increasing. He abandons Texas to Mr. Mackenzie, but takes up Kansas, to show that even in that favoured State the progress of population was not such as would justify us in thinking that the North-Western population would in ten years grow up "from nothing to 550,000." What Mr. Blake means by "nothing" in this case, perhaps he or some one can explain. It does not describe the present population of the North-West, and as for the 550,000. it is evident that Mr. Blake is still doing what he began to do last night, viz., answering the *Globe*, which admits not 550,000, but 750,000 people as a probable population in ten years. Mr. Blake declined to believe in any such estimates. It was "not demonstrable." After this the hon. gentleman made a most elaborate statistical calculation as to land sales and population in the United States, with the intention of showing us how futile were the hopes entertained in Canada of rapid North-Western progress. Mr. Blake's whole argument on this point is undermined by this consideration. He is talking of emigration to the United States at times when emigration consisted chiefly of the labouring classes, and when no hope was entertained that a better class of emigrants could be induced to leave the old country, where farming was prosperous. At present, however, the condition is changed. At present the farming lands of the old country no longer possess their old value, and the farmers who have capital are coming in with more cheerfulness than labourers did formerly. This materially changes the conditions of land sales and land settlement in Canada, and makes the calculations of Sir John Macdonald more likely to be fulfilled.

After Mr. Blake had proved "conclusively" that we could not hope to get the population that Sir John Macdonald and the *Globe* estimate of 550,000 or 750,000 in ten years, Mr. Blake proceeded to prove with equal "conclusiveness" that those who enter the North-West would not pay for their lands, certainly not in the time estimated, ten years. In the course of his speech, Mr. Blake was amusingly frank, and in the first place asserting that Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper had indulged in "visionary" guess-work, Mr. Blake went on with equally "visionary" guess-work to refute them. Logic is not an Opposition science. In the second place, he proves that the Opposition assault on the Government had been carefully concerted. He tells the House that Mr. Mackenzie will take charge of one part of the debate. Then later, he tells the House that Mr. Charlton will take charge of another part. The whole affair has, therefore, been carefully concerted; and this consideration renders Mr. Blake's manifest failure more striking. Unless Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Charlton take charge with more force and accuracy, the debate on the Opposition side will not have been worth maintaining.

Mr. Blake does not believe that we shall receive even half of thirty-eight millions for the lands, a point on which he is quite at variance with the *Globe*. As he approaches the close of his speech, Mr. Blake tries to apply some balsam to the wounds which he imagines he has inflicted. He does not oppose the development of the North-West. He does not oppose the Pacific railway. He does not wish to discourage immigration. He, in fact, does not wish to do anything disagreeable, but anyone who reads his speech, the chief points of which are here noted, will not agree with him in his own appreciation of his good will towards the development of the country. Closer still to the finances Mr. Blake proceeds to build up an alarming scarecrow of "public indebtedness," at which he has tried his hand in two recess speeches and once before this session. The condition of the country does not justify the building of the Yale-Kamloops line. That is the sum and substance of Mr. Blake's argument. One does not see much force in this as coming from the Opposition as a party, and but little force as coming from Mr. Blake himself. The finances of the country now are certainly not more precarious than than they were when Mr. Mackenzie with "a light heart," after the fashion of Mr. Olivier, prepared to build the Yale-Kamloops line in 1878, and when he engaged himself in a contract of $30,000 for carrying the rails for the road to Yale. Mr. Blake can only maintain that position by standing on the body of Mr. Mackenzie. Perhaps Mr. Mackenzie is ready to "give him a back."

Last night Mr. Blake made an appeal to the Province of Quebec against building the British Columbia section. To-day he makes an appeal to Ontario against it on the ground that Ontario will have to pay all, or nearly all, the taxes. He proves with a remarkable degree of wit and timeliness that the smaller Provinces, like Nova Scotia, which get more from the Dominion than they give to it, will not have to bear any show of the taxation for the railway. This is an interesting fact in view of the contention of the Reform press in those Provinces, that the bulk of the taxation would come out of them. When the question gets settled among them, no doubt an average will be struck, which will not be so alarming to Ontario, nor so felicitous to the smaller provinces. After this, there followed the most remarkable collection of miscellaneous statistics that was ever used in the Commons of this country, statistics to prove provincial payments, statistics to prove the indebtedness of the Provinces, statistics to prove European indebtedness, statistics to prove American reduction of indebtedness, statistics to prove everything, which, nevertheless, proved nothing but Mr. Blake's consummate industry, complete grasp of statistical discussion, and great command of the English language. There never was so voluble a statiscal declaration before for so vague and mysterious a purpose. At fifteen minutes to six, Mr. Blake had in all been speaking nearly six hours, and yet he has not replied to one quarter of the points of political interest raised by Sir Charles Tupper, although he has traversed a greater field of desultory discussion than ever was traversed by any speaker in the House of Canada. Mr. Blake closed at the time specified in an eloquent peroration.

There was a certain fitness in Mr. Langevin's rising to speak on this great question. It is now eight years since his valuable report was published, giving all the information that was then available concerning British Columbia. There was, too, a great fitness in his opening remarks that the question had, in the hands of Mr. Blake, become a question as to the propriety of maintaining the Confederation, and respecting the national honour. This was an inclusive remark, since Mr. Blake's provincial appeals against the smaller Provinces were certainly calculated to raise discontent with the Confederation, which entails such very serious engagements. Mr. Langevin made a splendidly effective point by quoting to the House a speech made by Mr. Mackenzie to the electors of Ottawa, in which Mr. Mackenzie actually detailed to his audience his contract for carrying the steel rails to Yale, where "next spring" he intended, he said, to begin construction. This rivets home on Mr. Mackenzie the former point made by Sir Charles Tupper, concerning the contract for carrying these rails. It will be interesting to hear how Mr. Mackenzie will deal with this subject. Mr. Blake, it will be remembered, refuses responsibility for this matter, and declares he was out of the Government and out of the country. He washes his hands of the business. Mr. Langevin dealt in a very masterly way with Mr. Blake's relations to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, and his subsequent support of Mr. Mackenzie, even after he had advertised for the tenders for the work against which Mr. Blake now so strongly protests. Mr. Blake protested at this point that he was out of the country. But this would not do. A man who had been a Minister, and who was even then a politician and a member of Parliament, was strangely negligent if in the course of a short visit to England he allowed all the concerns of his country to drop out of his life, and all interest in the plans of his colleagues to depart from him. Mr. Langevin drove home this idea with great vigour, amid the cheers of the House.

Mr. Blake's idea that statesmen could not look ten years ahead was dealt with as it deserved, as a most unstatesmanlike statement. Mr. Blake's idea that Irishmen would not come to Canada with any degree of cheerfulness after leaving the British Islands with a certain prejudice against British rule, was also refuted by Mr. Langevin in a very practical, masterly manner. Mr. Langevin dealt with the land question, the immigration question, and kindred topics, and closed with an eloquent appeal to the House to sustain the ideas as well as the structure of the Confederation, which was being attacked under cover of Mr. Blake's resolution.

After Mr. Langevin had concluded, there were loud cries of "question." It was not eleven o'clock, and, therefore, quite early. The Speaker rose to ask if the House was ready for the "question." Mr. Mackenzie sat still. Sir Richard Cartwright sat still. Mr. Charlton was not in his place. The Opposition were not prepared to continue the debate. At length, Mr. Casgrain, leader of the Liberals from Quebec, *vice* Laurier, resigned or effaced, after some consultation with Mr. Mackenzie took the floor, evidently to fill up the time till midnight, when an adjournment will, no doubt, be demanded. Mr. Casgrain made a noble point at beginning by declaring that every winter the thermometer congealed. Some wag asked if it didn't melt every summer, but Mr. Casgrain was not able to give the desired information. His object in saying that the thermometer "congealed" every winter was no doubt to attract emigration to that quarter. Mr. Mackenzie had previously told the world that there were long dreary winters in Manitoba. Mr. Blake had declared all the agonies of a settler on the prairie lands, and Mr. Casgrain, with wonderful aptness, comes in to declare that the thermometer congealed every winter. This remarkable coincidence of opinion will probably strike the public mind of Canada, if not of Europe.

The House was perfectly still with suppressed excitement in view of the fact that Mr. Casgrain might "declare himself" on the question of independence, and so startle the weak minds of British statesmen and disrupt the British Empire. But he did not declare himself; he contented himself with pooh-poohing the idea of our being a great people. "Why," he said, "the people of New York have more revenue than we have." It was some comfort, indeed, that Mr. Casgrain believed that "some day" the road would be built, his "some day" meaning some day perhaps when Mr. Casgrain was in power. After Mr. Casgrain had concluded, there were more cries of "question." Mr. Charlton had arrived, but was not ready apparently. Neither was anybody else on that side. Dr. McInnes took the floor, therefore, to criticize Mr. Blake's speech from the British Columbia point of view.

After Mr. McInnes, there were more cries of "question, question." Mr. Charlton moved the adjournment. The House refused. Mr. Mackenzie pressed for an adjournment. Sir John Macdonald pointed out that there had been one adjournment already to oblige Mr. Blake, but there was no need for an adjournment now. There were many members who wanted to speak. The case for the Opposition had been ably and fully put by Mr. Blake. Mr. DeCosmos pressed for an adjournment also. After a speech from Mr. Brecken, Mr. Charlton again pressed the adjournment. The Government refused. Mr. DeCosmos professed his intention to speak till 8 o'clock in the morning, and took out his watch to begin on time at midnight.

At 2 40 a.m. the House adjourned on motion of Mr. DeCosmos.

(Continued on Fifth Page.)

UNFORTUNATE EMIGRANTS

Fatal Accident to a Train en Route to Manitoba.

A Family Burned in Grain:

WINNIPEG, Man., April 13.—Mr. Taylor's fourth Grand Trunk party arrived last night at seven o'clock. They were detained at Chicago, where one of the stock cars took fire, destroying all the stock, among which were a number of valuable horses. They were also detained at West Union, between St. Paul and Crookston, where four freight cars ran off the track, one becoming a total wreck. A man named J. H. Gould, from Stratford, in the car, was killed, and his nephew slightly injured. One stallion, valued at $1,000, was lost. Mr. Gould's body was taken to Sank Centre to be returned to Toronto. His nephew and two of his children will be well cared for by the railway authorities until their relations are heard from. Deceased had taken up one thousand acres of land at High Bluff, Manitoba.

A family named Forest emigrated from Renfrew, Ont., last autumn, and resided with Redden and Dickson, formerly of Pakenham, pending the erection of their own house near Nelsonville, Manitoba. Mr. and Mrs. Forest, their three children and sister-in-law, slept down-stairs, and the owners upstairs, where 150 bushels of wheat were stored. On the night of the 6th of April, the beams gave way, precipitating the grain and Mr. Dickson above down on those below. Mr. Dickson awoke instantly and with considerable presence of mind struck a light and set to work to rescue those buried in the wheat. He succeeded in getting the head of the husband and one child above the grain, but ere reaching the wife and one little girl, death from suffocation had ended their sufferings. The melancholy accident has cast a gloom in the Mountain country where the survivors live. Sincere sympathy is felt for the afflicted husband, who lies in a precarious condition, the fruits of partial suffocation.

NOT FIRED FROM THE OUTSIDE.

Verdict of the Jury at the Inquiry Regarding the Burning of Michael O'Connor's House.

LONDON, April 16.—The inquest to enquire into the O'Connor fire, was resumed to-day by Coroner Hossack, M. D. No evidence implicating any person was elicited. Several witnesses were sworn, but their testimony all went to show that the house of O'Connor had been frequented of late by parties of questionable character, and that Kate Johnson, a young woman from Park Hill, of disreputable character, was there the night of the fire in company with Robert Donnolly, who is a son of James and Judith Connelly, who were murdered. After consulting four and a half hours the jury returned the following verdict:—"That Michael O'Connor's house was burned on the 13th inst, and that the fire originated in the interior of the kitchen, but we are not able to determine whether accidently or wilfully, but the jury do not believe that the fire was started from the outside of the building."

THE CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY.

Arraignment in Congress of the U. S. Secretary of State of 1850.

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 16.—A report accompanying a resolution in the House to-day by Cox, severely arraigns the policy of Secretary of State Clayton in 1850 in inviting Great Britain to share with the United States the duty and privilege of peculiarly our own of protecting inter-oceanic communication of infinite interest and concern to this country. The report claims the fundamental provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty were violated by Britain, and the Treaty was long since suffered to lapse into oblivion, from which it has but recently been evoked. The Treaty has led to great misunderstanding and controversies. It has always been equally inoperative, either to guarantee the independence of the Central American States, or to advance the general interests of commerce. So long as it has even a formal shadow of existence, it cannot but tend to cloud and obscure the perfectly simple, just equitable policy of the United States in regard to inter-ocean transit. The circumstances in which the Treaty was originally negotiated have been profoundly modified by the lapse of thirty years. It should now be formally abrogated.

Severe Snow Storm Along the Central Pacific.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., April 16.—The storm which has prevailed throughout this State for several days, has been the severest ever known on the line of the Central Pacific. The through express got only as far as Alta, Vinzinia, the lightning express stopping at the same point. A snow plough train, with eight engines, which left Summit this morning to effect connection with the plough from Emigrant Gap, when half a mile west from Summit, jumped the track and dashed through the snow sheds for one hundred feet. The west-bound emigrant and freight due at Sacramento last night, was stopped by a slide two miles from any station, where it still remains. Every effort has been made to clear the track.

Foreign paupers who turn up in Holland are regularly every month "sent over the border." This was last year the fate of 400 Germans, and the Germans are taking retaliatory measures. Genuine Dutch paupers are put to reclaiming waste lands; yet the other Hollanders don't howl about it, as the hatters and others do here when our prisoners are made paying.

EPPS' COCOA.—GRATEFUL AND COMFORTING.—"By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected cocoa, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast tables with a delicately flavoured beverage which may save us many heavy doctors' bills. It is by the judicious use of such articles of diet that a constitution may be gradually built up until strong enough to resist every tendency to disease. Hundreds of subtle maladies are floating around us ready to attack wherever there is a weak point. We may escape many a fatal shaft by keeping ourselves well fortified with pure blood and a properly nourished frame."—*Civil Service Gazette.* Sold only in packets labelled—"JAMES EPPS & Co., Homœopathic Chemists, London, Eng."

Many people are not aware that it is the wrapper of tobacco which gives the colour to the plug, and are, therefore, often deceived by a handsome outside appearance. The wrapper is a single film of leaf wrapped round the plug, and is never good smoking tobacco. It is costly only because of its fine colour. In the "Myrtle Navy" brand the chief attention is paid to the "filler," that is, the inside of the plug. It is this which determines the smoking quality of any tobacco. A tobacco can be made to look as well as the "Myrtle Navy," without much trouble or expense, but it may at the same time be a very inferior article.

CANADIAN ITEMS.

Clearwater is the name of a new town about to be started three miles west of Crystal City, Manitoba.

Mr. Thomas Bawden, of Blyth, formerly of Exeter, has been left a legacy of several thousand dollars by a lately deceased relative in England.

Mr. Geo. Johnston, of lot 6, concession 13, Stephen, is the fortunate possessor of a very prolific ewe. On St. Patrick's day she gave birth to five lambs.

J. E. Tetu, Dominion Immigration Agent here, has received instructions to put the immigrant buildings at the railway, Emerson, Man., into good shape.

The second annual ploughing match in Vaughan township will take place on Wednesday, April 28th, on Mr. A. McQuarrie's farm, lot 22, 4th con. Vaughan, near Maple. Over $400 in prizes will be awarded.

It is estimated $25,000 a week will be put in circulation by the Chaudiere mill owners throughout the entire season. The sooner operations begin the better. The prospects of a brisk summer at the Capital are remarkably good.