

## CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

## SENATE.

May 15.—The Senate met, after their week's recess, at 9:30 p.m., and adjourned without transacting any business.

May 16.—Two bills from the Commons were read a first time, after which Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL stated, in answer to a question from Senator GIRARD whether it was intended to give a weights and measures law to Manitoba, that consideration of the question of a uniform system of weights and measures for the whole Dominion would be postponed until next session. He also stated that the Government intended as soon as possible completing the postal system and giving all necessary facilities to Manitoba. The House then went into committee on the bill regarding the public lands of the North-West. Senator GIRARD proposed some amendments in the details of the bill, which it was agreed should be left to be taken under consideration by the Government. Senator BUREAU moved an amendment to the educational endowment clauses, the effect of which would be to devote those lands to the support of separate schools among all denominations. Hon. Mr. ATKINS stated in reply that the bill did not dispose of lands, but simply set them apart as an endowment for the purpose of education. The committee went through the greater part of the bill and reported progress, and the House then adjourned.

May 17.—The House adjourned after several bills had been put through a stage.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

May 13.—The debate on the Washington Treaty was resumed by Mr. BODWELL, who moved in amendment to Hon. Mr. BLAKE's amendment, "that it is inexpedient at this time to proceed further upon the subject." Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said, in answer to an inquiry of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, respecting the nature of the amendment of the member for Durham, that it was not a motion of want of confidence. Sir JOHN replied that it was a censure on the Government, although not a direct want of confidence motion. Sir FRANCIS HINCKES followed. He said he proposed to discuss the question under three heads: 1st, Why were the parties responsible for the treaty? 2nd, The treaty on its merits; 3rd, How this House should deal with it. In the first place he said it was quite impossible in legislation that a colonial legislature should take part in a negotiation such as this, and quoted from speeches of members of the House of Lords, in which they held the Imperial Government responsible for the Treaty. With regard to the question of the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, he contended that as the opening of the river as far as Montreal to vessels of all nations had been of great advantage to the country, no loss could be incurred by throwing open our canals to our neighbours on an equal footing with ourselves. He then proceeded to contrast the remarks of members of the Opposition—remarks dictated by mere partisan spirit—with the statesmanlike utterances of the leaders of the Opposition in the House of Lords. He thought the treaty should be accepted, as it was looked upon as a fair one in England; and quoted from the speech of Earl Cairnarnon, (one of the warmest friends of colonial connection, and one as deeply opposed to the treaty as any present) who said that if he were Canadian, he should feel that Canada on her confederation had become a part of the Empire, and that he would be prepared to make sacrifices for the Empire. He next referred to Sir A. T. Galt's speech, and denied the assertion that England was asking us to prepare for independence. He contended that the correspondence did cover the Fenian claims. He also thought the British Government had admitted this. He complained of the manner in which the hon. member for West Durham had treated his argument in respect to the amount of guarantee, and he again repeated the argument used on a former occasion, showing that the guarantee would produce 1½ per cent, which, upon the whole amount, would amount to \$600,000, and if they only got the smaller amount it would amount to \$375,000; but he doubted not the large amount would be obtained from the Imperial Government if the intelligence was true that the clouds between Great Britain and the United States had passed away. Hon. J. H. CAMERON condemned the attack made, the previous Friday, by Hon. Mr. HOWE on the member for West Durham. He paid a high tribute to the talents and statesmanship of the Premier, and proceeded to defend him from the attacks of the Opposition. He then turned to the treaty. He argued that the Premier was an Imperial Commissioner, as otherwise there would have been two contracting powers on one side, to one on the other—an arrangement to which the United States would never have consented. He cited a French authority to show that it was Government who negotiated, and not their agents, through whom they simply acted. He argued that a negotiator could not withdraw from a commission without the consent of the appointing power or Government. In the case of the Premier, if he had resigned he would have been bound to retire from the Cabinet on his return from Washington. He traced the history of the various treaties relating to the fisheries, and argued that this treaty must be advantageous to Canada, inasmuch as Canadians were content with it, and the Americans were dissatisfied with it. He cited the instance of the Ashburton Treaty, by which Maine and Massachusetts were allowed a money compensation in return for cession of territory, to show that such cession of territorial rights was not looked upon as a humiliation. He then showed that the right of Great Britain to navigate the Alaska rivers ceased with the cession of that country to the States; and by this treaty it would be revived. After alluding to Lake Michigan, which he maintained was an inland sea and not a tributary of the St. Lawrence, he concluded with a glowing appeal to the House in favour of the ratification of the treaty, which was received with loud cheering. Messrs. CONNELL and MAGEE followed, opposing the treaty. Mr. POWER (Halifax) and Mr. WALLACE (British Columbia) supported the Treaty, the former contending that it would largely benefit the fishermen of Nova Scotia; and the latter specially commending the fishery clauses as calculated to be of the greatest advantage to the fishermen of the Pacific as well as of the Atlantic coast. Mr. OLIVER and Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N. S.) spoke against the Treaty, and the House, on the motion of Mr. O'CONNOR, adjourned at 11.30.

May 14.—After routine the debate on the Treaty was resumed by Mr. O'CONNOR. After expressing his satisfaction

with it as a whole, he proceeded to criticize the speeches of members of the Opposition; he doubted if the House would accept their statements in preference to the utterances of leading statesmen both in England and Canada. Mr. HARRISON (Toronto West) severely censured the Imperial policy, but entirely exonerated the Canadian Government from any blame in the matter. In a long speech he advocated the adoption of the Treaty, though he confessed there were some points with which he was not satisfied. Mr. MALCOLM CAMERON (Huron) followed in opposition to the Treaty. He made a severe attack on the High Commissioners for the loose way in which the Treaty had been drawn up, and concluded with retorting upon members to the right of the Speaker the charge of a leaning towards independence and annexation. Hon. Mr. TUPPER spoke in favour of the Treaty from a national standpoint, and was succeeded by Mr. JONES (Halifax). With regard to the statement that the American fishermen were disappointed with the Treaty, he said that was brought about by the speeches of Ben Butler, who urged that this was the time for procuring what they had long wished, the placing of a tonnage duty on American fish. It had been said that the trade of the Magdalen Islands had fallen off; but that was a natural result of the abolition of the American slavery and the consequent death of the trade. These fish were altogether bought to feed the slaves. He contended that the fishermen of Nova Scotia were so ill equipped, so inferior in skill, in capital and enterprise that the Americans gaining admission to their fishing grounds would usurp them all. He also contended that the Americans would thereby become possessed of the trade with the West Indies. He concluded with a flat denial of the statement that the majority of the people in Nova Scotia were in favour of the Treaty. Mr. KILLAM (Yarmouth, N. S.) was in favour of the Treaty. He considered that by adopting, and securing permanent peaceful relations with the United States, we would take a long step towards breaking down the tariffs between the two countries and thus securing free trade. Hon. Mr. HOLTON then moved the adjournment of the debate, which was agreed to, and the House rose at midnight.

May 15.—After routine Hon. Mr. HOLTON resumed the debate on the Treaty. He regarded the question as a purely Imperial one, and Canada, he thought, was more interested in the ratification of the Treaty than any other part of the Empire. He considered the fisheries arrangement as entirely fair, and one that would be beneficial for both nations. He thought the Government were to be censured for not insisting on larger privileges in return for the concession of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, but he held that the Americans had a just claim to the navigation of this river from so much of it lying in their territory. As to the status of the first Minister in the Joint High Commission, he maintained that he must be regarded as a Canadian Commissioner, and as such responsible to this Parliament. He denounced the course of the Government in agreeing to accept the Treaty they had first so strongly condemned, for the sake of the Pacific Railway guarantee. It would have been a much more manly and honourable course on the part of the Government frankly to avow that they were called upon to make sacrifices and were willing to make them, in view of what the Empire had done for us. He continued by saying that he would vote against the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, but he would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham, because, while censuring the course of the Government, it did not preclude the possibility of voting afterwards for the second reading of the bill, as he intended doing. Sir GEORGE CARTIER commenced by giving a brief résumé of the state of politics before Confederation. He then spoke of the great value of the fisheries, and denied that by opening them to the Americans any cession of territorial rights was involved. It was in fact only a tariff arrangement. It had been said that the Parliament of Canada having been accorded the right to deal with the fishery clauses, it should have been left free to deal with the navigation of the St. Lawrence. This, he pointed out, was absurd, for the high contracting parties to the Treaty of 1854, treated and determined upon the matters upon which they were authorized to treat irrespective of the legislation of any of the Provinces affected by that Treaty. It was only so far as that Treaty interfered with the customs duties of the British American Provinces, that its provisions were left to the disposal of the various Provincial Legislatures. After recess Sir GEORGE repeated his speech in French. Mr. CAMPBELL (Guysboro', N. S.) spoke strongly in favour of the Treaty, and pointed out as a significant fact that not a single petition or protest had been presented against it. Hon. Mr. DORION traced the history of the "Alabama" claims negotiations, and affirmed that England had only admitted those claims out of consideration for Canada. He denied that the opposition to the Treaty came from the Opposition press, and quoted articles from Ministerial papers to shew that the Government itself had first raised the cry against it. He made an attack on Sir John A. Macdonald for having gone to Washington as Premier of the Dominion, and then sacrificed the interests of his country. He (Mr. DORION) was not willing to barter his country for £2,500,000, nor support a Treaty which was made merely because Canada was a dependency of Great Britain. Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland, N. B.) expressed his determination to support the Treaty, because he thought that from Imperial causes it ought to be accepted. He criticized some of its provisions rather severely, and expressed the opinion that New Brunswick ought as a matter of justice to receive some remuneration for the duty taken off lumber. Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU, Mr. BAKER, (Missisquoi), and Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg, N. S.) supported the Treaty, the latter pointing out the great benefit the fishery clauses would confer on Nova Scotia. He also made an able refutation of some of the arguments used the previous evening by the member for Halifax. Mr. FORTIN would vote against both the amendment and the Treaty. Mr. STREET spoke in favour of, and Hon. Mr. ANGLIN against, the Treaty. The latter finally moved the adjournment of the debate, which was consented to, and the House rose at 3 a.m.

May 16.—After routine the debate on the Treaty was resumed. Hon. Messrs. ANGLIN and MACKENZIE denounced the Treaty in strong terms, and were replied to by Hon. Mr. TILLEY, who urged its adoption, as, should the House fail to ratify it, it would greatly interfere with the friendly relations existing between this country and the neighbouring republic. Several other members followed on both sides, until finally the patience of the House being utterly exhausted, about midnight members were called in for a division. The vote on Mr. BODWELL's amendment resulted as follows: yeas, 51;

nays, 125. The vote was then taken on Mr. BLAKE's amendment, which was also lost—yeas, 52; nays, 125. The motion for a second reading of the bill was carried on the following division—yeas, 121; nays, 55.

Yeas—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beatty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bolton, Bown, Brousseau, Burpee, Cameron, (Inverness) Cameron, (Peel) Campbell, Carling, Carmichael, Caron, Carter, Cartier, Cayley, Chauveau, Coffin, Colby, Crawford, (Brockville) Crawford, (Leeds), Cumberland, Currier, Daoust, DeCosmos, Delorme, (Provencher) Dobbie, Drew, Dugas, Ferguson, Ferris, Galt, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hagar, Harrison, Heath, Hincks, Holmes, Holton, Houghton, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Jones, Keeler, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Levisconte, Little, Macdonald, (Kingston) Macdonald, (Antigonish) Macdonald, (Lunenburg) Macdonald, (Middlesex) Masson, (Soulanges) Masson, (Terrebonne) McCallum, McDougall, (Lanark) McDougall, (Three Rivers) McGreevy, McKeagney, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison, (Niagara) Nathan, Nelson, O'Connor, Pearson, Perry, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Power, Ross, Champ-lain; Ross, Dundas; Ryan, Kings, N. B.; Ryan, Montreal West; Savary, Schultz, Sriver, Shanly, Simard, South Selkirk; Smith, Westmoreland; Sprout, Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Thompson, Cariboo; Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Wallace, Albert; Wallace, Vancouver Island; Walsh, Webb, Whitehead, Wilson, Workman, Wright, Ottawa County.

NAYS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bourassa, Bowell, Bowman, Brown, Cameron (Huron), Cheval, Connell, Coupal, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Geoffrion, Godin, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Kempf, Macdonald (Glengarry), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall (Renfrew), McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Munro, Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N.S.), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scat-cherd, Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Wells, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Wood, Wright (York), Young.

The House adjourned at 12:45 a.m.

May 17.—After some unimportant matters had been discussed, Mr. FOURNIER moved for correspondence relating to the necessity of appointing Judges for the Province of Quebec. Sir G. CARTIER expressed a doubt as to the existence of such correspondence, though, if there were any, he had no objection to submit it. A debate took place on the subject, in the course of which Mr. DORION pointed out the necessity of establishing a court of appeal in order to lessen the number of appeal cases taken before the Privy Council. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD thought it was the business of the Local Legislatures to ascertain the number of Judges required in each Province; until this was done, the duty of the Government and Dominion Legislature could not begin. He further said that the great difficulty that lay in the way of the establishment of an Appeal Court was the peculiarity of the law in Quebec. Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU said that, now that the Premier had decided the matter as to the initiative and powers of the Province, under the circumstances he (Mr. Chauveau) would gladly take proper steps to have the actual want supplied. After recess several private bills were read a third time. Mr. COLBY moved the third reading of the bill to repeal the Insolvency Laws. Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved an amendment exempting Nova Scotia and New Brunswick from the provisions of the bill. Mr. GIBBS moved the six months' hoist, which was lost on a division: Yeas, 72; Nays, 80. Mr. BELLEROSE moved a fortnight's postponement. Lost, 72 to 82. The third reading was then carried on a division. Mr. BODWELL then moved the House into Committee on his resolution respecting the change of the gauge of the Intercolonial Railway to 4 ft. 8½ in. After some discussion the debate was postponed, and the House rose at 11 o'clock.

May 18.—This was the first Saturday's sitting of the session. Several bills were advanced a stage, among them the Patent Laws Bill, which was amended so as to protect manufactures already established in the country. The House adjourned at 5:30.

## THE CLIPPER SHIP "GREAT REPUBLIC" OR "DENMARK."

This leviathan of wooden sailing ships has at last found a resting place at the bottom of the Atlantic after a very unfortunate career of nearly twenty years.

She was launched in 1853 from the shipyard of the celebrated Donald McKay, of Boston, who was her designer and builder. No expense was spared in her construction. Her extreme length was 320 feet. She was four-decked and four masted; and her speed was expected to have exceeded anything then afloat in the shape of a sailing vessel. After completion she was towed to New York, where she lay until a great fire broke out among the shipping on East River. The conflagration was not subdued until several valuable vessels were destroyed, and the "Great Republic" placed *hors de combat* with the loss of rigging, her spar deck, and many of her top timbers. She was then docked and reduced to a three-decker; she was afterwards chartered by the French Government to carry troops to the Crimea. After successfully carrying out her contract and proving herself one of the swiftest vessels in the world, she was again laid up and remained inactive for many years. Some speculators of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, at last bought her up for a mere song, ran her to St. John, New Brunswick, and took a wood freight to Liverpool. A Liverpool Company then purchased the old ship and converted her into a gigantic collier to carry "black diamonds" to Rio Janeiro, and to sail from thence to St. John for a return cargo of cereals.

The first trip she performed successfully; her load of coals consisted of about 3,000 tons. Her wood cargo was equal to 1,181 standard of deals, the freight of which amounted to £4,139 sterling, the largest parcel that ever left the port of St. John in one bottom. After discharging her coals on her second trip, she was lost on her way to St. John, off Bermuda, her crew landing safely in the ship's boats at that port. She was consigned at St. John to Geo. Thomas, Esq., to whom we are indebted for some of the above particulars.

The illustration is copied from a painting hanging in that gentleman's office, drawn when the ship was last in the port of St. John.

E. J. R.