

stituency—Niagara—with only 4,470 of a population, and another—Essex—with no less than 25,211. In adding up the population of the ten smallest constituencies, he found that they contained a population of 82,258; while the ten largest constituencies contained over 231,000. By adding the population of the twenty smallest constituencies together it appeared that they contained only 214,000. Thus we had two hundred and fourteen thousand people having twice as many members as two hundred and thirty-one thousand. Then taking the representation east of Kingston he found seventeen members whose constituencies had an average population of 14,000, while the seventeen western constituencies contained an average population of 18,000. He thought a better plan would be to have given a second member to the largest constituencies than to have made new ones.

Mr. McKENZIE said that three principles should have been regarded in distributing: the representation, population, area, and probable value of the land. On these three heads, he proceeded to show that gross injustice had been done to Lambton, and moved an amendment that another member be given to that county.

Mr. HANKIN was very grateful to the member for South Oxford for taking such particular interest in his (Mr. R.'s) constituency. But he (Mr. R.) had refrained from asking for two members for Essex, because it had been found very difficult to get even one member returned for that constituency. (Laughter.) The hon. member for South Oxford had devoted a good deal of time to prove that one of his chief objects for going into the coalition had not been gained. One of his principal justifications for having gone into the coalition was that he had obtained representation by population for Upper Canada, and now he had done his best to prove that representation by population had not been gained.

Mr. JONES (North Leeds) was exceedingly glad that the principle of representation by population had not been carried out in the distribution of the new seats, but that the prospective development of the country had also been considered.

Mr. McKELLAR supported Mr. McKenzie's amendment.

In reply to Mr. McKellar, Attorney-General MACDONALD explained that the new counties were formed purely for electoral purposes, and would not interfere in any way with the existing municipal or judicial boundaries.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD said the Government were very much gratified to find that the scheme had been so generally received. The Government had endeavored to do substantial justice in the premises without regarding political influence, past, present or future. They had seventeen new members to distribute, and their duty had been to find out seats for them. One of the principles which the Government had laid down, was that they should not disfranchise a single constituency. There were some of the old constituencies with a very small population, but the Government did not feel that they should interfere with their existing privileges.

The amendment was declared lost on division.

The several paragraphs in the schedule were then agreed to.

The new county formed out of Kent and Lambton was called "Bothwell."

The village of Mount Forest was included among the municipalities embraced in the North Riding of Wellington.

The new county formed out of the counties of Haldimand, Lincoln and Welland was called "Monck," out of compliment to His Excellency. The new county formed out of the counties of Peel and Simcoe was called "Cardwell," out of compliment to the late Colonial Secretary.

Loughborough and Bedford were taken from Frontenac and added to Addington.

The schedule as amended was passed.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD moved that Messrs. Howland, McDougall and the mover do draft an humble address to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to cause to be embodied the Local Constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada in the Imperial Act for the Confederation of the British American Provinces.—Carried.

The address was then reported.

On the motion for adoption of the address, Hon. Mr. DORION moved an amendment to the effect that the new Constitution shall not be put in force until it shall first be submitted to a vote of the people.

Lost. Yeas, 13; Nays, 62.

Hon. Mr. DORION then moved an amendment to provide, that if the General or Local Constitutions, as passed by the Imperial Parliament, shall differ in any particular from the resolution adopted by this House, they shall not be put in force until first submitted for approval to the Canadian Parliament.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON said he had voted for the Quebec Resolutions upon the distinct pledge of the Government, that they would accept the Confederate Constitution, on the basis of these resolutions, without alteration or change in any particular.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD said the Government would adhere in every particular to the Quebec Resolutions. But they could not assert jurisdiction over the paramount authority of the Crown. No doubt the Imperial Parliament would respect the wishes of this House, and he had every confidence that no changes would be sought to be made.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON would accept the declaration of the Government, that no departure from the Quebec resolutions would be agreed to. He could not now consent to vote for want of confidence in the Government; after their assurance that the scheme would be adhered to.

Hon. Mr. BROWN said the hon. member for Hochelaga had opposed Confederation from the first, and now he had moved an amendment to declare that we should set ourselves above the Imperial Parliament. We have asked them to do a certain thing, and now he wishes us to tell them, "If you do not do it in the right way, we shall not take it at all." He hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his motion, because if put it would be voted down, and every man who voted against it would be made to appear as if he was willing to admit the possibility of changes being made. This House had no right to presume that any changes would be introduced.

The amendment was lost.

YEAS.—Biggar, Dufresne, (Iberville,) Laframboise, Geoffroy, Dorion, Holton, Scatcherd, and J. S. Macdonald.—8.

NAYS, 65.

The address was then passed.

The Supply Bill was read a second time, on motion of Hon. Attorney-General Macdonald.

The House adjourned at 5 o'clock.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

MONDAY, Aug. 13, 1856.

First Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 11 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON moved the House into Committee on certain resolutions respecting the Common Law Procedure Act of Upper Canada, with reference to Sheriffs' fees.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON explained the object of the bill to be founded upon these resolutions, which was to restore to the Sheriffs their right of poundage in certain cases where the judgment is satisfied, otherwise than by sale, which they enjoyed previous to the consolidation of the statutes.

After some discussion, Mr. SCATCHERD, who contended that under the existing state of the law, the Sheriffs were well remunerated, moved the three months' hoist.

Mr. MAGILL strongly opposed the bill, saying it would be a most unpopular measure in Upper Canada. He also charged that it provided for legalising what had already been illegally done by the Sheriffs.

Mr. McKELLAR approved of the bill, which he said would be a real protection to the poor debtor by guaranteeing the Sheriff's poundage, and thereby permitting to exercise a discretion which he could not otherwise do unless to his own loss. He bore down heavily on Mr. Scatcherd for having twice introduced a bill to reduce the fees of the legal profession, and for always withdrawing the bill when he saw any prospect of its passing.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD pointed out that it was most unjust that Sheriffs should pocket such enormous fees as in the case of the city of Hamilton, which had to pay Sheriff Thomas nearly \$3,000 in cases where there was really no risk. If the bill before the House should pass, and if the Attorney-General West placed an execution in the hands of the Sheriff of London for the arrears of the municipal loan fund, he would pocket the poundage on the whole of it.

Atty-Gen. MACDONALD.—These are exceptional cases.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD.—They are too common in Upper Canada. He had an amendment which he intended to move, but since the hon. mover of the bill would have his own way, he intended to take his. Referring to the remarks of the member for Kent regarding the bill of the member for Middlesex to reduce the fees, he said that he (J. S. McD.) and the Attorney-General West had defeated that bill by getting it referred on both occasions to the consideration of a Committee adverse to its adoption.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD supported the bill of the member for Peel because he believed it was a good measure and ought to be passed. The hon. member for Cornwall himself

had approved of the bill, and he was now only talking for the sake of humbug in opposing it. As for his friend the member for Hamilton, who talked for posterity, he had a little difficulty with the Sheriff of Wentworth.

Col. HAULTAIN having heard no case of injustice made out of the operation of the law, would vote against the amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE was at first opposed to the resolutions, but since the assessment law had been amended, very improperly, as he thought, in a way that largely reduced the Sheriff's fees, he was willing to do anything to keep the income of the Sheriffs at a reasonable amount. He would vote for the bill of the member for Peel.

Hon. A. A. DORION opposed the bill on the ground that it would injure the interests of the Lower Canada creditors. He referred to the member for Kent's remarks upon Mr. Scatcherd, affecting great indignation that that hon. member had not carried through his bill to reduce the fees, but it he (Mr. McKellar) were in earnest he would not now support the member for Peel's bill which proposed to increase the fees.

Hon. Mr. BROWN said that the bill did not affect Lower Canada in the slightest degree, (Oh! oh!) except in the matter of collecting their debts. (Laughter.) After having listened to the argument on both sides, he came to the conclusion that the measure was a good one, in the interest of the poor debtor. He quite agreed with those gentlemen who said that this bill and the Municipal bill and the Assessment bill should be in the hands of the Government. It was highly improper that measures of the kind were left in the hands of private members, and we should never enjoy the full benefit of Parliamentary action until the Government really assumed all its functions and shouldered the full responsibility for all the legislation of the country.

Hon. JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the member for South Oxford had not always held these views. If he (J. A. McD.) remembered rightly, when that hon. gentleman was a member of the Government, he had taken a somewhat different course. There had been, if he was not mistaken, a committee struck on the Assessment bill of which the hon. member for South Oxford, then President of the Council, was chairman; and a committee was also struck on the Municipal bill of which the same hon. gentleman was also chairman. Yet he did not remember that that hon. gentleman had suggested that these bills should be taken out of the hands of the members for Kent and Lambton. He also referred to the bill introduced by the hon. gentleman some years ago—the bill to repeal the Usury Laws, which was a very important public measure.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON replied to the argument of the members for Hamilton, Hochelaga and Cornwall, saying the last named gentleman had agreed to it before. The proposition to compel the Sheriffs to appeal to the Judges in many cases that might arise for settling amount of fees, which the member for Cornwall desired, was not one which he thought ought to be agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER had listened for an argument in favor of the bill which would justify him in supporting it, but he had heard none that appeared sound to his view. It had been said, by the members for Kent and Lambton that because the Sheriffs had been deprived of certain fees by the Assessment act, this bill ought to pass to make up their salary, but he held it particularly unjust that the poor debtor should be made to pay for a deficiency in the income of the Sheriff, which he had no responsibility in creating. The member for South Oxford had said it would prevent the Sheriff from immediately levying upon the poor debtor, because his fees would be secured, but he (Mr. O.) believed that equally sound, as if there was to be any restraint upon the levying under execution, it ought to be provided for by Parliament. He would vote against the bill.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAND said the feeling of the House was against the bill, and it ought not to be passed. The reasons urged in its favor did not seem to have any weight. It had been said that the passage of this bill would prevent the Sheriff from being under the necessity of pushing the execution to secure his fees; but the pushing of the execution was not ought not to be, at the option of the Sheriff. (Hear, hear.) There were no better paid officers in the country than Sheriffs; and as he did not believe in the necessity of this bill, he should consider it his duty to vote against it.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD explained what had taken place regarding his agreement to accept the bill if confined to personal property. The member for Peel had shown him (J. S.) the amendment he proposed, which he (J. S.) did not approve. He then drew up the amendment, which he (J. S.) desired to make, and

showed it to the member for Peel, but that hon. gentleman refused to accept it. He continued his remarks until the clock was called, when the House rose.

Second Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock. Mr. McKENZIE moved that 250 copies of the Municipal and Assessments Acts, in one volume, be printed, the cost not to exceed \$100. He explained that it was intended to distribute three copies to each Municipality.—Carried.

Attorney-General MACDONALD moved the third reading of the bill to enable compensation to be made to the heirs of Mrs. Elizabeth McKay, for the erroneous issue by the Crown of letters patent for lands to which she was entitled.

Hon. Mr. BROWN objected to the consideration of this bill; it was a private one, and ought not to be proceeded with at this time.

The point of order was decided adversely to Mr. Brown's views.

The merits of the bill were then discussed by Hon. Messrs. Cameron, J. H. Cameron, Brown, and others. The opposition urged the impropriety of opening a door to such claims, as hundreds of cases existed throughout the country of a similar character.

Hon. Mr. BROWN moved, in amendment, that the bill be not read a third time but that an humble address be presented to the Governor-General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause an investigation as to the grounds of the claim of the heirs of the said Elizabeth McKay, and the amount of compensation to be paid—if any.

Lost. Yeas, 16; Nays, 35.

The bill was then read a third time.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON moved that the bill be amended by providing that the amount of compensation shall not exceed \$20 per acre for the whole of the lands for which the patents were erroneously issued.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON raised a point of order. He moved that the bill be re-committed to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of incorporating the said amendment.—Carried.

House in Committee. Bill amended and reported accordingly.

On the motion for the second reading.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON raised a point of order, that stage could not be taken at this sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER decided against him.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON then spoke against the second reading of the amendment. He disapproved of forcing through the bill at this late period of this session, when the House had only discovered its nature to-day. He would have offered no further opposition to it had it been fully discussed by the House. He then discussed the point, quoting an authority to show that when the bill was amended in committee after a third reading, the concurrence in the amendments could not be taken until a subsequent sitting of the House.

The bill was then allowed to stand.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER moved the second reading of the bill to postpone, for a limited time, the issuing of writs for the next election of Members of the Legislative Council. He said that the preamble of the bill explained the reasons for its passage—the prospect of the early accomplishment of Confederation; the bill provided that the writs which should be issued in September next, are to be delayed until the 17th of July of next year, the day on which the present Parliament will expire. It was not intended to destroy the elective principle, but merely to suspend its action for a few months. There was no question of the power of the Legislature to pass such an act, though it must be reserved for the Royal assent. As the present law continued existing members in their seats until the return of the writs of the new election, so this act continued the present members until an election should be held under it. The act provided that in case the constitution of the Council is not changed by act of the Imperial Parliament before the election under this act shall have taken place, then the members elected under it will serve only for the unexpired portion of the term, which they would have had to serve had they been elected in October next. Then in case of accidental vacancy, the existing law provided that if that vacancy occurred within three months of the expiring of the term, it should not be filled up until the usual time; now this act proposed to extend that principle, so that if any accidental vacancy occurred in the Council, it should not be filled up until the time appointed for the election by this act. These were the provisions of the bill, and he would move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary, that it be now read a second time.

Hon. A. A. DORION opposed the bill. These gentlemen proposed the suspension of an important part of the Constitution, and

without any reason. The grounds stated in the preamble that this Legislature had passed an address in favor of Confederation in 1863, was no justification, because there was no evidence to show that we were nearer to Confederation now than we were then. We had no assurance that the Maritime Provinces would accept the Quebec scheme, to which this Legislature was pledged. He contended that a corrupt bargain had been made with the Legislative Councilors, that they would be retained in their seats provided they would vote for the Quebec resolutions. He charged the hon. member for South Oxford with direct responsibility for all the bad measures that had been agreed to by the Legislature since the time he joined the coalition Government. They found also that the Government had made a bargain with members of this House, they not only got a promise from the Government, but a letter written by the Finance Minister, binding them to pass a bill to amend the school law. They got these gentlemen's votes for the Quebec resolutions, and now the Government failed to pass that bill.

Hon. GEO. BROWN denied that there was any pledge from the Government. The question was not considered by the Government.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL said, without entering upon the extent or the nature of the promises made, he protested against giving it the character of a corrupt bargain; it was a fair stipulation as to legislation on a question of public policy.

Hon. Mr. DORION then read Mr. Galt's letter to the School question, pledging the Government to legislate upon it.

Hon. Mr. BROWN again denied that the question had ever been considered by the Government.

Hon. Mr. DORION contended that when a secret pledge was given upon one point, with the view to influence action upon another, he held it was a corrupt bargain. Holding very strong views against this bill, he would move that it be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON rose to have the floor for half-past seven.

The amendments made to the Municipal Bill by the Legislative Council were read a second time.

The House rose at six o'clock.

Third Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 7 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER with the leave of the House, moved that there be a sitting to-morrow from eleven to one, and three sittings on Wednesday. He explained that he asked for three sittings on Wednesday in case they might be needed.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD wished for some explanation of this extraordinary departure from the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER said the Government did not anticipate that the measures before the House to-day, would have consumed so much time in their discussion. He found no fault with that discussion, for no doubt it had been useful, but as he had said before, the Government intended to dispose of every measure on the paper; (hear, hear) he wished to provide for three sittings on Wednesday in case they might be wanted.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD assailed the bill to postpone the Legislative Council elections, which he said was a plan to make these gentlemen members of the Legislative Council for life, in defiance of the wishes of the people. The members on his side were ready to raise their voices against this exceptional legislation in violation of the Constitution, and in defiance of the rights of the people, by which twelve gentlemen were to be foisted upon the country as legislators for life. He and his friends objected to the violation of the rules of the House in favor of such an outrageous act, as that which they proposed to pass at the close of the last session of the Canadian Parliament. He referred to Hon. Mr. Cartier's "Gluck" and said, it had deserted him on the Lower Canada School question, when he saw he was about to lose his office if he redeemed his pledge.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER replied. He said that in private and public life his word had always been taken as his bond, and nobody had ever been disappointed in it. He hoped the hon. member for Cornwall would withdraw his objection and allow the motion to pass, as then they might get the session closed on Wednesday, but if this motion were not carried, and if members wished to delay the business they might do so, but he could assure them, as he had before, if the Government measures were not passed to-morrow, then they would be the next, or if not the next day, then the day after. No matter how long they must be passed, (Hear, hear.) He had given his word to the member for Chateauguay that the Supply Bill should be the last Government measure, and

he would keep his pledge. As to what the hon. member for Cornwall had said about the Protestants of Lower Canada having his (Mr. Cartier's) word, it was true they had his word, and his word would be kept.—(Hear, hear.) There had been a difficulty about carrying it out this session, but the majority of the members for Lower Canada would redeem that promise in the Local Legislature, and the Protestants were not afraid to trust them. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. HOLTON was willing that the Supply Bill should be read in its order on the paper, but he and his friends objected to the passage of this most monstrous bill in violation of the constitution, at this period of the session.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said the Attorneys-General East and West had pledged their words that every notice on the paper should be taken up, and the Government should proceed with the business in their own way.

The bill to enable compensation to be made to the heirs of Elizabeth McKay, with amendments, was read a third time and passed.

The discussion on the Legislative Council election postponement bill, and Mr. Dorian's amendment (six months' hoist) was resumed.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said a few words, and proposed to allow the measure to take a stage, and have the discussion again, so that other measures might be proceeded with.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON.—Though he had paired upon this bill with the member for Addington, he desired to say a few words on this extraordinary and very objectionable measure. It had been introduced at the very end of the session, when the parties chiefly interested had not had time to be heard of it. The people had not had the opportunity of being heard, and the only chance of their being protected was by the action of their representatives on the floor of this House. He had no personal objection to any one of the gentlemen who were to be continued by this bill for another year. On the contrary in so far as he was concerned, he would be very glad to see them all returned to their position in the Council. He would be especially glad to see the representative of his own division, Hon. G. W. Allan, returned again, for he was one who had endeared himself to every one, by his many excellent qualities. Four of the six gentlemen from Upper Canada were conservatives, and upon this ground he, as a conservative, had no objection to their being continued in the Council, but he did not think that a Conservative, he was bound to conserve the rights of the people. It would have been far more honorable to these gentlemen to have allowed them to appeal to their constituents, when no doubt they would have been elected by acclamation. He desired to enter his protest against this extraordinary and unconstitutional bill.

Mr. McKENZIE said it was an extraordinary thing that this bill had not been brought down at an earlier period of the session. It was a violation of the people's rights to make nine, at least, of these twelve men Legislative Councilors for life.

Dr. PARKER said they had done so already by all the members of the Council.

Mr. McKENZIE did not admit that they had agreed to select the Councilors from among the present members, but these members were supposed to have the confidence of their constituents, and now this House has been called upon to deprive the people of giving an expression of their confidence. In case it might occur that Confederation was not passed by the Imperial Parliament so soon as was expected, then this bill would be a precedent for this House to extend its own duration. It was an outrage on the constitution, against which he protested. There was no use in discussing it at this late day, and indeed it appeared to him to have been kept back purposely to avoid discussion.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER said the bill had to originate in the other House.

Mr. McKENZIE said he did not think so, the resolutions changing the constitution of the country, and the bill applying the elective principle to the Upper House both originated in this House. He would however content himself with entering his protest against the bill.

Mr. RANKIN said the hon. member for Lambton had been responsible for the state of affairs which had thrown the hon. member for South Oxford into the arms of his hon. friend from Kingston.

Mr. McKENZIE.—I acquiesce in it.

Mr. RANKIN.—That hon. member is, therefore, responsible for the circumstances which had rendered the bill necessary. He then referred to the probability of the early accomplishment of Confederation. He contended that the Lower Provinces, having once rejected the Quebec resolutions, had gone as far in eating their own words as any people

could have done: they had appointed delegates to go home to England to arrange for Confederation, with a perfect knowledge that the people of Canada, who formed four-fifths of the people of British North America, were pledged to the Quebec scheme without alteration or change. He believed therefore that that scheme would be carried out, and he would give the Government an unswerving support in all their endeavors to accomplish it. He did not see how any gentleman who had taken so strong a part in forming the coalition, who had supported it in trampling upon the very spirit and essence of the Constitution, could now object to this measure, which grew out of the state of affairs which he had helped to bring about. He could understand why the member for North Ontario, (Mr. M. C. Cameron), opposed this bill; that gentleman was consistent in doing so, for he had moved that the Quebec scheme should have been submitted directly to the people, but the member for Lambton opposed that amendment, which was designed to prevent a great violation of the constitution, and he need not now make a wry-face at the small one.

Mr. HAULTAIN did not agree with the members for Lambton and North Ontario when they called this bill a violation of the Constitution. It was a change and not a violation of the constitution, but a change which he very much regretted, as such changes, proposed without any reason, were calculated to bring the constitution into contempt. He was astonished that the gentlemen on the Treasury Bench should have introduced this bill on so slight a pretence. How did the case stand? Why that a few gentlemen, if they desired re-election, might have to spend a little money, but was this a reason that the constitution should be changed?

Mr. DUNKIN said it did seem to him that the gentlemen who supported the Quebec resolutions were just in the position indicated by the member for Essex. The effect of these resolutions was not only to change the elective to the nominated principle, but to confine the selection of the nominated members to those who had been elected by the people. He did not see anything particularly constitutional in voting for twelve gentlemen who would either never be called upon to discharge the duties of their office, or who would first have to be nominated for life.

Mr. POWELL thought the argument that this bill had been kept back until members had gone home proved nothing against the Government, though it might show that members had neglected their duty. He had been much amused to see the members for North Ontario and Lambton, coming to the same conclusion upon this question. The member for North Ontario had been consistent. He had moved when the Quebec Resolutions, charging the whole Constitution of the country as being changed, that the important question should first be submitted to the people by a constitutional appeal. But the member for Lambton had voted "Nay" on that amendment, for then his own seat was in danger. He had however consulted his constituents, (laughter) and how did he know that the gentlemen in the other House had not consulted their constituents? As to its being a violation of the constitution, had not this Legislature made the law which applied the elective principle to the Upper House, and surely it was competent to change it.

The members were then called in, and they divided on Mr. DORION'S amendment, which was lost. Yeas, 17; nays, 35.

YEAS.—Messrs. Brown, Burwell, Cowan, Dorion, (Hochelaga), Dufresne, (Iberville), Gibbs, Haultain, Holton, Labreche-Viger, Lafontaine, MacDonald, (Cornwall), Mackenzie, (Lambton), Magill, McKellar, Oliver, Ross, (Dundas), Southey.—47.

NAVS.—Messrs. Archambault, Ault, Bell, Bellerose, Carling, Cartier, (Attorney-General), Cauchon, Chapais, Cockburn, Currier, DeBoucherville, Denis, Dickson, Dufresne, (Montreal), Dunkin, Ferguson, (South Simcoe), Higginson, Howland, Langevin, LeBoutillier, Macdonald, (Attorney-General), MacFarlane, McDougall, McEwen, Morris, Morrison, Powell, Rankin, Robitaille, Somerville, Sylvain, Taschereau, Willson, Wright (Ottawa County).—25.

Mr. Mackenzie left for the train immediately after the vote. The reading of the division was called for, and he being out of the House, Mr. Cauchon objected to his name, and it was struck off accordingly.

The second reading was carried on the same division.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON then stated that he and his friends would have no objection, since the Government had taken the whole responsibility of the bill, to allow it to pass through all its stages. (Hear, hear.)

The bill was then passed through Committee, read a third time and passed.

The bill to amend cap. 23 of the Consol-

dated Statutes of Canada, relative to agriculture, was considered in committee, reported, and read a third time and passed.

The House then divided on the motion in amendment to going into committee on the bill relating to Sheriff's fees, which was under discussion in the morning. The amendment was lost. Yeas, 24; nays, 27.

YEAS.—Messrs. Ault, Bell, Biggar, Brown, Burwell, Currier, Dorion, (Hochelaga), Dufresne, (Iberville), Gibbs, Holton, Howland, Labreche-Viger, Lafontaine, Macdonald, (Cornwall), Magill, McGivern, Morris, Oliver, Parker, Rankin, Ross, (Dundas), Scatcherd, Willson, Wright (Ottawa County).—24.

NAVS.—Messrs. Archambault, Bellerose, Cameron, (Peel), Carling, Cartier, (Attorney-General), Cauchon, Cockburn, DeBoucherville, Denis, Dickson, Dufresne, (Montreal), Dunkin, Haultain, Higginson, Knight, Langevin, LeBoutillier, Macdonald, (Attorney-General), MacFarlane, McDougall, McKellar, Morrison, Powell, Robitaille, Somerville, Sylvain, Taschereau.—27.

The bill was then passed through committee and reported.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of the bill granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for defraying the expenses of the Civil Government, for the year ending 30th June, 1867.

Mr. MCGIVERN called the attention of the Government to section 29, of the American tariff bill, passed by Congress in July last, which provides that goods shipped at any port on the northern, northeastern or northwestern frontier, by any vessel, wholly or in part owned by a foreigner, and taken thence to a foreign port to be reloaded and reshipped to any other port on said frontier of the United States, by the same or any other vessel, foreign or American, with intent to evade the navigation laws of the United States, the said goods shall be seized and forfeited, and the vessel shall pay a fine of fifty cents per ton on her admeasurement. Mr. McGivern contended that this clause would operate very seriously to the injury of Canadian shipping on the Lakes, as well as to the commercial interests of Canada. While the Home Government, and the Canadian Government, were pandering to the people of the United States, the Legislature of that country was taking the most oppressive and exclusive measures against us. He urged upon the Government the adoption of retaliatory measures, out of respect to our own dignity.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAND regretted equally with the member for Lincoln, that the legislation of Congress would interfere injuriously with our shipping interest, but, as it was an act of the American Congress, leaving no discretion in the hands of the Executive, he did not see that any steps could be taken by this Government to interfere with its operation.

Messrs. Holton, J. S. Macdonald, and Brown made a few remarks upon the point.

Hon. Mr. BROWN called the attention of the Government to the vacant offices in the County of Bruce.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL stated that the papers connected with the separation were not yet completed (or only lately completed.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN contended that the whole matter ought to have been settled long ago. He then referred to the vacant Registrarship of Huron, which it was generally understood the member for Huron and Bruce was to get that office. It was an extraordinary spectacle to see that hon. member supporting the Government for the sake of that office. (Oh.)

Mr. MCFARLANE repudiated the charge brought against the member for Huron.

Hon. Mr. BROWN said the hon. member for Huron had told him himself that though he was not an applicant he was going to get the office.

Mr. HAULTAIN deeply regretted the withdrawal of the Lower Canada school bill. He thought that bill should have been passed by the House, and was very sorry to see the influence brought to bear upon the House in this matter.

Mr. DUNKIN charged the defeat of the School bill upon the course of the Lower Canada opposition, in getting a measure introduced with reference to the schools of Upper Canada.

Several other members ventilated their specialties, and the supply bill was passed.

The House then went into Committee on Mr. McKellar's bill relative to the fees paid to Registrars in Upper Canada. The bill was reported and passed through all its stages.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD called attention to the changes made in the assessment act by the Upper House, to which the Assembly had tamely submitted, though it was the usurpation of a power which that House did not possess. Their power in respect of all bills imposing taxes was confined to approving or rejecting the bill. He reproached the government with not having guarded the privileges of the popular branch of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. BROWN called attention to the advertisement of the Receiver-General for the issue of Debentures. He suggested that Debentures of \$20 and \$50 should be issued to reach a class who would be happy to invest small sums in government securities, but who could not command \$100. The Debentures should also be left in the banks, so that when a party paid over his money he could get his Debenture at once.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAND thought \$100 small enough for a debenture, and as to placing them in the banks, it had been considered that as nearly all the small sums were deposited there, they would not be very anxious to have depositors withdraw the deposits to invest in Government securities.

The members for Carleton and London endorsed the suggestion of the member for South Oxford.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL said the Bank of Montreal at all its agencies, was now prepared to grant receipts for money paid on account of debentures, and the debentures would be issued through that bank as soon as they were ready.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER then said as business had progressed so expeditiously he asked the gentlemen opposite to consent to a sitting tomorrow at eleven o'clock.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD asked whether it was intended to go on with the bill relating to Sheriff's fees?

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said it was not his intention to proceed with the bill. When he found an Upper Canada majority against it, he concluded at once to drop it, as it was purely an Upper Canada measure. (Hear.)

The motion was carried, and the House adjourned at a quarter past twelve.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, AUG. 14, 1866.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 11 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON moved that the employees of the House be paid monthly in advance. He explained that a similar motion had been agreed to in the Upper House. In the Departments, the clerks had received a month's pay in compensation for expenses connected with the removal from Quebec.

The SPEAKER did not approve of the plan adopted in the Upper House. If it was the intention to give the employees an allowance, let it be given at once, but do not make an arrangement which had practically the effect of giving them a month's pay without the appearance of doing so.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD complained that the salaries of the House were most unevenly distributed—some of them too high and some of them too low. Messengers, who had next to nothing to do, were paid more than two hundred pounds a year, when clerks, young men of education, only received six hundred dollars. He protested against this system of bringing up the question on the very last day of the session, when there was no time to consider it.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected to the motion. Let a proposition be fairly submitted, and he would be prepared to consider it.

The SPEAKER said there were six persons employed in the House at a salary of \$600 per annum. With the present cost of living, he did not consider that sum fit to maintain an officer of this House. Unless the House expressed a wish to the contrary, it was his intention to raise their salaries to \$800 a year, a sum which was hardly equal in keeping house to \$600 several years ago. Unless this was done, he should consider it his duty to dismiss these officers, as it was beneath the dignity of the House to keep them employed at such a rate. (Hear, hear.) He had recommended to the Government that in compensation for removal from Quebec, that those having claims of \$1000 or over should be paid 5 per cent, on those under that amount 10 per cent, and he thought this a much better course.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON and others expressed their satisfaction with the Speaker's views, and their willingness to leave the matter in his hands.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON withdrew the motion.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said there were too many clerks about the House. There was a host of people lounging about in every passage; they were in fact in the way. He objected to the employees of the House receiving a gratuity as they had already received an allowance from the Board of Works' contingencies for the expense of removal from Quebec.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD presented the report of the Commissioners appointed to investigate the losses caused by the Fenian Raid in Upper and Lower Canada.

Hon. Mr. CARLING, seconded by Mr. Shanly, moved that 3,000 copies of the Municipal and Assessment acts, Upper Canada, in one volume, be printed for the use of members.

The SPEAKER doubted if there were funds