

**MR. ARCHIBALD McKELLER**

Upon the order for the question by Mr. Stephenson, whether it is the intention of Government to appoint the Hon. Archibald McKeller to the office of Commissioner or Superintendent of the Welland Canal, or to any other position on that public work.

**Mr. STEPHENSON** requested that it be dropped. (*Hear, hear, and laughter.*)

\* \* \*

**THE GUN BOAT PRINCE ALFRED**

**Mr. STEPHENSON** enquired whether it is the intention of the Government to place the gun boat *Prince Alfred* in a condition for actual service in the way of rendering aid to vessels in distress, and otherwise performing functions similar to those pertaining to the revenue cutters belonging to the United States on the western lakes.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE:** The Government have had a survey of the vessel made recently, with a view to deciding what service she may be fit for. It has not yet been decided what would be done with her, but I may say to my hon. friend that I am afraid she will not be fit for the services he refers to.

\* \* \*

**PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW**

**Mr. BODWELL** moved for a Special Committee on petitions for the passage of a prohibitory liquor law, with power to send for persons and papers and the Committee to be composed of the following gentlemen:—Messrs. Appleby, Béchard, Bowell, Burpee (Sunbury), Blake, Cameron (Ontario South), Chisholm, Cunningham (New Westminster), Davies, Forbes, Killam, Ryan, Ross (Middlesex West), Smith (Selkirk) and Bodwell.

After a few words from Hon. Mr. Cauchon,

**Mr. KILLAM** requested that his name be struck off, and that of Mr. Carmichael substituted.

**Mr. BODWELL** said the hon. member had been on the Committee for a similar purpose last year, where he had proved himself very energetic and useful. Not knowing that he had any objection to serving in the same capacity upon this occasion, he (Mr. Bodwell) had put his name down, but as there were no doubt good reasons for the hon. member declining he had no objection to the substitution of the name of Mr. Carmichael.

The motion was altered accordingly, and carried.

\* \* \*

**BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**Mr. BUNSTER** moved for a Select Committee of ten members to enquire into the present tariff in the interest of agriculture and commerce in British Columbia. In doing so he remarked that the farmers in that Province were suffering greatly from excessive competition by Americans; and the want of protection, coupled with the fact that the Pacific Railway had not yet been commenced, was acting as a great drawback to settlement, and was sending many agriculturists out of the country.

If the committee were granted, he hoped to be able to show that protection of some kind was necessary, at least until the completion of the railway, which he hoped would be soon. He contended that every acre of land cleared in that Province was worth \$50 to the Dominion, and in conclusion moved that the following gentlemen compose the committee, viz.:—Messrs. McQuade, McCallum, Brouse, Dewdney, Cunningham (New Westminster), De Cosmos, Roscoe, Schultz, Paterson and Bunster.

The motion was carried.

\* \* \*

**DEMANDS AGAINST VESSELS**

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK** moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on a resolution making further provision for the collection of demands against vessels navigating certain lakes and inland waters of Canada. He did not propose to discuss the principle involved in this resolution at any length at the present time. He was certain that those persons who were interested in the maritime trade of the country looked with great concern to the action that might be taken by the House in this matter.

It was rather unfortunate that the great maritime trade of the inland waters of this country was an exception to that of all other countries having such a trade, in having no law providing speedy, safe and certain means for the collection of demands against vessels. In France, in England, in our own Maritime Provinces, and in the United States they had such a law, but for our inland waters where the trade was yearly increasing, and millions of dollars were involved, there was none. He held that we should have an Admiralty Court for our inland waters.

The object of his motion was to secure the passage of a law, similar to that now in force on the American side of the lake, for Canadian inland waters, so that vessels might be held for the supplies furnished them on credit. Such a measure would be a benefit to the owners of vessels, as well as to ship chandlers, mariners, and ship companies. If, for instance, ship chandlers ran great risk of not being paid for their goods, they must charge an extra profit to compensate themselves. If the means of collecting their claims were made speedy and certain, their prices would be materially reduced, and the honest ship-owner would get his stores cheaper than he now does. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) hoped that there would be no objection to the passage of that resolution through Committee, and that any discussion on it would be postponed till another stage of the proceedings.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON** said that his hon. friend must move the reference of his resolution to a Committee on another day. Being opposed, root and branch, to this motion, and having, during the last twenty years, assisted in preventing its passage at least a dozen times, he (Hon. Mr. Holton) was not willing to waive this rule of the House.

**The SPEAKER** ruled the motion out of order.

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK** then gave notice that he would move tomorrow that the House go into Committee on the motion.