

Revised Statutes of the United States, which read as follows:—Vessels which are not of the United States shall not be admitted to unload at ports of entry established by law, and no such vessel shall be admitted to make entry in any other district than in that one in which she shall be admitted to unload."

Once a vessel going from Canada to the United States passes the line, she can go on to the extent of the first collectorial district, but if she goes further she is liable to be seized. On the other hand, American barges, which are now carrying all the lumber from Canada to the United States, can enter any Canadian port they like. A Canadian vessel can only go a certain distance, and she must unload there, while an American barge can go from port to port in Canada to gather her load, and then go back to the United States again; this is a gross injustice to the trade of this country. I think about 400 barges and between thirty and forty tugs have been allowed to lie idle at the docks. Some years ago, to test the law on this question, a tow of ten barges was loaded at Ottawa and sent to New York. It went to New York and returned as far as Rondout to load up with coal. While the tow was there, this same Collector of Customs at Plattsburg, after receiving instructions from Washington, telegraphed to the officer at Rouse's Point to seize these barges because they had passed beyond the first collectorial district. Fortunately for the barges, before the telegraph arrived, they had just got across the line and were safe, but the experiment has never been repeated. Not satisfied with the letter he received from the Collector of Customs at Plattsburg, the forwarder wrote to Washington, and received the following reply:—

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, D. C., 18th June, 1875.

"I have received your letter of the 4th instant, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Ottawa and Rideau Forwarding Company, stating that he had forwarded a number of his British barges from Ottawa to New York, via Lake Champlain, Champlain Canal and the Hudson River, and that he intended continuing that trade if it be not illegal.

"I will thank you to inform the gentlemen that the laws, as construed by this Department, prohibit the trade in question, so far as British vessels are concerned. The fact that the vessels mentioned as having gone to New York were British, was overlooked at that port, and they were treated as American. Section 5,771 of the Revised Statutes requires that the vessels in question shall unload at your ports.

"Very respectfully,
(Signed) "B. H. BRISTOW,
"Secretary."

I think it is a great hardship that our shippers are denied equal rights with American shippers. The Federal Government have on previous occasions tried to throw the blame on the State Governments; but I can produce documents from the State Governments to show that they have no objection to reciprocity with Canada with regard to the passage of boats through their canals, for they say that the more boats that pass through their canals, the more money they can make. I hope the Government will endeavor to obtain justice for our own people in this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I wish to make one or two remarks in reference to the charge made by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). It does not come well from my hon. friend, because there happens to be a vessel at Kingston with some damaged grain on board, to urge that the whole specific duty should be set aside. If the specific duty means anything, it means that it should not be set aside, even for damaged wheat.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It does not mean a specific duty on damaged wheat, but on sound wheat.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kirkpatrick) being a lawyer, which I am not, may be better able than I am to give an interpretation to the law upon what it should contain, rather than what it does contain. I will not discuss the principles upon which specific duties are based; they may be best for the revenue

or any other purpose—a point I will not now discuss. But, supposing a bushel of wheat in Chicago cost \$2.00, the duty in Canada would be 15 cents, and if it cost 50 cents, does he mean to tell us he would only levy the duty in proportion to the value of the wheat? If wheat becomes damaged it is none the less wheat, and if it be entered for consumption in Canada, any lawyer or anybody else must say it is subject to the duty of 15 cents, and that duty no person administering the Customs Department has any right to change. The hon. gentleman says that irksome regulations were issued by the Customs Department in this matter. There have been none at all. The law is on the Statute-book, and it provides for 15 cents duty as a protection to our farmers. He voted for that, and for the seven cents per bushel on corn for protection, and now, because the Minister of Customs will not violate the law and allow that wheat to be entered at a lower than the legal rate, in order that his constituents or others may obtain this grain for food, although it competes with the coarse grains of our farmers, for whose benefit he voted for protective duties, he seems dissatisfied. That may be good law, but if so, I do not understand the law. If I understand specific duties, they must be levied on the article no matter what its price in the foreign market, the moment it goes into consumption, the duty has to be collected. But an *ad valorem* duty is quite a different thing, being in proportion to the value of the article; and the law provides that should the article be damaged, the *ad valorem* duty must be lowered in proportion. But I know of no principle upon which, with a specific duty, you can adopt the principle laid down by my hon. friend. Apart from protection altogether, if he can suggest a mode by which the Government can set aside any law in order to meet these particular cases, I shall be very glad to carry it out, and I am sure the Government will be equally glad. In all those cases of damaged grain the duty must be collected until the law is changed. The Government has no option in the matter. There have been no regulations issued in reference to this matter, irksome or otherwise.

Motion agreed to.

DEATH OF MR. THOMPSON, OF CARIBOO.

Mr. BUNSTER. It is my painful duty to announce to the House the melancholy intelligence which has just reached me, of the death of one of our members. I know the House will sympathize with me in expressing the severe loss we experience in the death of Mr. Thompson, of Cariboo—a gentleman who occupied a prominent position in this House ever since Confederation, and who always commanded its respect, as well as the respect of his constituents and the country. I will, therefore, out of respect for his memory, ask the House now to adjourn as a small tribute to his worth. He was remarkable for his adhesion to his party and to his leader, whom I would have been glad to see here to-night to do justice to our departed friend, for he could better perform that duty than myself. He was always earnest and sound in the great work of Confederation, and in the effort to make Canada a nation. I think the hon. member for Niagara, who was a very particular friend of Mr. Thompson's, will endorse my sentiments by seconding the motion.

Mr. PLUMB. I am certain that the announcement which has been made by my hon. friend, the member for Vancouver, in such feeling language, will meet with a response from every hon. member in this House. The untimely death of our fellow-member, Mr. Thompson, will be felt by every one on both sides of the House who was acquainted with him during the time he sat in Parliament. That gentleman's courteous manner, his intelligent handling of such questions as came under his observation and purview, his uniform gentlemanly and courteous demeanor, won him friends on both sides of the House. I venture to say that he never had an