

policy of the Government, although I promised to submit all their statements, as my duty was, to my colleagues; but I stated then that as regards cases of individual hardship, these might be dealt with by the Government under the existing laws, according to their respective merits.

The motion for adjournment was then carried, it being understood that the House would re-assemble at 9 p. m.

—:++:—

AFTER RECESS,

The SPEAKER took the chair at 9:15 p.m.

DUTY ON FISH.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said he had received a letter from a merchant in New Brunswick stating that it was reported in that Province that the United States Government had imposed a duty of 1½ cts. per lb. on fresh salmon imported from Canada. He wished to know from the First Minister if he was aware that any such change had been made in the tariff.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—I think there must be some mistake about it. It must be the duty of 1½ per cts. can on canned lobsters. I am not aware that any such change has been referred to has been made in the tariff of the United States.

THE INSOLVENCY BILL.

A message was received from the Senate notifying the House of Commons that they had passed the Act respecting Insolvency with certain amendments.

Hon. Mr. FOURNIER moved that the amendment to the 84th clause be not concurred in as being contrary to the spirit of the Act in its other parts.—Carried.

Hon. M. FOURNIER moved that the amendment to the 120th clause disqualifying assignees from acting when related by blood or marriage to a creditor, be not concurred in on the ground that the assignee has now no judicial authority and also that it would be exceedingly inconvenient to carry out such a provision.—Carried.

The other amendments to the Bill were concurred in.

TEA DUTIES.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL, referring to a reply given by the hon. Minister of Finance to an enquiry made at the afternoon session by the hon. member for Cumberland, asked the hon. Minister if he could

Hon. Mr. Cartwright.

state in what way the Government intended to deal with special cases as they arose in order that the parties interested would know how to make their application.

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT said the Government did not propose to invite parties to make such applications, but they had power under the existing law to deal with special cases of hardship. He could not answer the enquiry with sufficient definiteness to meet the object which the hon. member for Northumberland desired to attain.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL did not suppose that politics would enter into the consideration of such cases; but several parties had asked whether or not any remission of duties would be made, for, if so, there might be some particular points which required to be presented in order that a case might receive favorable consideration.

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he could not venture to lay down general rules for deciding the cases,

THE GASPE ELECTION.

Mr. TASCHEREAU asked why the report of the Gaspé Controverted Election Case had not yet been sent in. It was well known that the judgment was given early in January unseating the member for that constituency. He had appealed from the decision and his appeal had since then been withdrawn, but no report had been made to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER—I have not received any report.

Hon. Mr. FOURNIER said he had just been informed that the appeal taken by the late sitting member had been dismissed. That was the cause why no report had yet reached Mr. SPEAKER. After the member for Gaspé had been unseated he took an appeal. That might be considered a sham appeal because it was not followed up and no doubt the Judge would now send his final report without any delay.

THE MIRAMICHI BRIDGES.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL asked the First Minister if he could state what was the height of the Intercolonial Railway Bridges over the North and South West Branches of the Miramichi River, above the water. Fears were entertained by the owners of steamers plying on the river where these bridges were being constructed, that they would prevent this passage. He wished