

amount of duties from the goods which had been destroyed. As to the other proposition, which was practically that it would have been proper for the Government to have returned the amount of duties on goods destroyed, if they could have ascertained it, there would have been very great difficulty in carrying out such a proposition practically. The parties who would have been entitled to receive the refund of duties would have been the insurance companies, which had lost the money, not the merchants, who had received their insurance money. In the next place, although it might be true that a large portion of those goods were owned by merchants in St. John, it must be remembered that all those duties were duties practically collected by the merchants on account of goods distributed all over New Brunswick and a considerable portion of Nova Scotia; and a very large portion of those goods were in bond, and on those the Government collected no duty, but remitted the duty. Very considerable claims had come up since the St. John catastrophe for the remission of the duties which would otherwise have been collected, and those in all cases had been granted by the Government. If three million dollars' worth of goods had been held in stock, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Palmer) had remarked, a very large proportion would have been in bond. If it were desired to make a return of the money lost, the greater part must go, not into the pockets of the sufferers at St. John, but, of necessity, into the pockets of the insurance companies, who were really losers to an enormous extent by that calamity.

Mr. DOMVILLE said he took issue with the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, that the money would have to pass into the hands of the insurance companies. The people of St. John lost by that fire goods to the value of from \$25,000,000 to \$35,000,000.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: That is four times the total annual importations of the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. DOMVILLE said that, while he mentioned goods he was about to add property, when he was inter-

raptured. From twenty-five to thirty-five million dollars worth of property had been destroyed, a large portion of which, such as furniture, clothing and knick-knacks, would have to be replaced. The hon. the Minister of Finance had argued that not much was doing at St. John when the fire occurred, while the hon. the Minister of Customs mentioned that an extensive business was being prosecuted, and both hon. gentlemen could not be correct in their statements. The people of St. John should have some consideration shown them, and it was not too late to manifest it. If they had paid duties which they should not have paid, the Government should take measures to remit them, and should also endeavour to ascertain who had goods in bond, and return duties which had been twice paid.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF RAILWAY STORES.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES moved for a statement showing:—the average price paid each year since 1867, for locomotives, cars, iron and steel rails, fish-plates, bolts and iron in general, wood and all furnishings purchased by the Government;—also the quantity bought each year since 1867.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS SINCE 1867.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES moved for a statement, showing all contracts given since 1867, including those of the Intercolonial Railway, those awarded to the lowest tender, and those given to others; the difference between the price given and that stated in the tender, and the reasons why the contract was not awarded to the lowest tender; and all Orders in Council relating to the same.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIMS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for copies of correspondence between Mrs. Edward Murphy, of Barnaby River,