

friend's attention to that. If he will turn to the Treaty of Washington, he will find that the bonding privileges do not extend to goods arriving by sea, and, therefore, the treaty does not provide for bonding goods from San Francisco, Seattle or Tacoma to Victoria.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing to prevent them doing it if they choose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be very glad to be informed how that could be reached.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not claim that we can force or compel the United States to change the course they are taking. On the contrary, I said that we could not even complain of their action. But I said also that if that was so and they choose that course, there is only one thing for us to do, and that is not to allow them to take everything. We certainly could prevent American ships carrying between our ports Victoria and Glenora.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should think that there would be no room for difference of opinion except for the point I have raised, which, however, is of the utmost importance. There should be no difficulty about the proper construction of our Act as there ought to be no difficulty about the construction of the American Act. But an important case in which a difficulty might arise would be in the case of goods from Victoria to Glenora to be transhipped, under treaty rights, at Fort Wrangel. We have the right to carry from Victoria to Glenora and an American ship has not. Without expressing a definite opinion upon a matter which has not come before me, I take it that there can be no reasonable doubt about that point.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what the Bill means, but at present, the practice is different.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The goods when shipped from one point in British territory to another cannot be carried in American ships. We are at one in the matter, I fancy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But what is necessary is to get the construction formally put on the present Act and instructions sent out in accordance with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have been considering the matter. Of course, our object is to give our own transportation companies fair-play and to secure for them as large a share of this trade as possible.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I followed the hon. gentleman his statement was, that a certain ruling of the department had been given and action taken upon it;

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

but the statute was not strong enough to bear it, and legislation has been introduced in the form of a declaratory Act to give the necessary power?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the United States.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Exactly, and now he proposes to make our law stronger?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it requires amendment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And he is adding the same words that they are adding—"part of a voyage"?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I followed the hon. gentleman right, while the Treasury Department made that ruling in the California case, they had not the statutory authority for what they did?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then the hon. gentleman does not blame the Customs Department of Canada, under the wording of our statute which is similar in its language?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been arguing that the decision in the California case was not sound and that that was the view practically taken by the Washington authorities. They have, in fact, ignored it. So far as that is concerned, I said that construction had stood only until this excitement, as we may call it, arose on the Pacific, and then in the close competition, the authorities at Washington looked into the matter and ignored the construction put upon the statute in the California case, and gave their law what I do not think should be called an extreme construction. They are following that by a declaratory Act, and all I want is that we shall see if our Act will bear that construction, and, if not, follow it with a declaratory Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DINING CARS ON THE I. C. R.

Mr. McMULLEN asked,

How many dining cars are on the Intercolonial Railway? How many are kept in operation? What was the gross expenditure, including wages, supplies, &c., during the last year, and what were the gross receipts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There were no dining cars on the Intercolonial Railway previous to the opening of the Montreal Extension on