

## THE SENATE

Monday, Dec. 9, 1867.

Several petitions were presented in favor of Major Robinson's route for the line of the Intercolonial Railway.

### COMMERCIAL BANK.

**Hon. Mr. Hamilton (Kingston)** from the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, reported the Bill to amend the charter of the Commercial Bank, without amendment. Report adopted.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** moved that the Bill be now read a third time.—Carried.

The Bill was then passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Commons.

### POSTAL BILL.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** moved that all the words now found in brackets be expunged.

**Hon. Mr. McCully** begged to call the attention of the Hon. Postmaster-General to the fact that there existed some difference in the several Provinces in the value of the currency, and that in effect 3 cents in Canada was not the same as 3 cents in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and to ask whether payment would be taken for postage in the present currency of the Provinces until a measure to settle the currency was passed. He begged also to ask if the postage stamps issued since the 1st of July, quantities of which were, no doubt, in the hands of the merchants—for they bought them by \$10 or \$20 worth at a time—would be taken. He took the liberty to make these enquiries because the bill was to come into operation on 1st April next. He might here say, too, that his remarks would equally apply to the payment of *ad valorem* duties, but of course that was another subject.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said that with regard to the postage it would be accepted in the currency of the Provinces until a new currency was established.

**Hon. Mr. Allan**, referring to clause 65, said, as he understood the policy of the Government in the establishment of the Savings Bank, they proposed to establish institutions which would afford to the poor and working people the opportunity of safely investigating their savings, but not to provide the wealthier classes with a new mode of investment. If this were the object contemplated he thought the

maximum sum to be received from any individual should be limited in the Act. He thought, also, that the exemption of such deposits from attachment by legal process was objectionable. There was no such clause in the Savings Bank Imperial Act, and he did not see why it should form part of the bill. He knew such an exemption had been made in respect of life insurances, but that was a very different matter. With this exemption parties might find the means of lodging money in different names to accumulate large sums in the proposed Savings Bank, and then defy their creditors.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said that as the bill would have to come again before the House, he thought it would be better to send it to the other Branch as it was, and if it were not there amended in the sense desired, this House could deal with it again.

**Hon. Mr. Allan** thought it would be more inconvenient then than at the present moment. If the Government would say that they would make the proposed alteration in the other House, he would not further object. It was certainly not desirable to have a Savings Bank, in which parties could lodge large sums beyond the reach of seizure.

**Hon. Mr. McCully** said that the removal of the exemption would not give creditors in Nova Scotia any advantage, as they could not levy upon any funded debt.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell**—The debtor can now put his money in his pocket, and nobody can touch it.

**Hon. Mr. McCully**—If the Sheriff could get at actual bank notes, the property of a debtor, he could seize them in Nova Scotia, but he could not seize a note of hand. The creditor might put the debtor in jail, and keep him there until he made an assignment and gave up all his property.

**Hon. Mr. McCrea**—We had a garnishee law in Upper Canada, by which money might be stopped in other hands.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn**—So have we in Lower Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Wilnot** said he did not see why the amount should be limited, while the interest was not. The House was legislating in this matter for the public, not for a bank, and he entirely differed from hon. members, who wished to limit the deposits, for, if the Government could get money by this means, at 4 per cent., instead of 7 or 8, they should avail

themselves of it. But then, he thought, they should have a longer notice than three months for repayment, it should be twelve months.

**Hon. Mr. Bureau**, (in French), maintained that it would be exceedingly dangerous to allow moneys to be lodged not liable to seizure. In Lower Canada the names of depositors were concealed as much as possible, but still they were not beyond the reach of the law. In Nova Scotia they had a more violent remedy than in Canada, since the debtors were put in prison until they had made a disclosure of their effects. He repeated his objection to render the moneys unattachable, as it would open the way to innumerable frauds. He would, however, be willing to allow the clause to remain, if the sum was limited to \$200. There was, however, a remedy in Lower Canada when fraud was suspected, for the debtor could be brought up on a writ of *capias ad respondendum*.

**Hon. Mr. Macpherson** said that as understood the spirit of the bill in so far as it referred to the Savings Bank proposed to be established, it was to afford to the working people a safe means of placing their savings, and for this purpose it provided that sums of \$1 would be received. That object should be kept in view. He was aware that the Government contemplated the introduction of another measure, under which the wealthier classes would have the opportunity of investing larger sums, but as this bill was designed for the labouring orders he thought that the limit of \$200 was quite high enough. As to the provision which exempted the deposits from seizure, he feared it was a dangerous one, unless the amount so protected were restricted to \$100. At any rate the measure should not be open to the construction of leaving room for dishonest practices.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** repeated that any change desired might be discussed when the bill came back from the Commons.

**Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just** thought it would be better and more dignified for the Senate to send the bill as perfect as possible to the Commons, than to re-commence and amend their own work when it came back.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said that the amount of the single deposits should be limited by Orders in Council. All such things would come under the cognizance of the Treasury Board, and such regulations would be made from time to time as might appear expedient.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** said it was objectionable that any sum should not be liable to seizure for the honest debts of the depositor. Failures sometimes happened of a fraudulent character, and parties disposed to attempt them could under the Bill lock up their moneys in the Savings Bank and then set their creditors at defiance. Nothing would be easier for such a person than to lodge several sums of \$200 in different names, and so place all his means beyond the reach of the law. It was true that people might invest money in Life Assurances which would be exempt from seizure, but the propriety of this had been questioned, for there was no maxim of law clearer than that all a man had was the property of his creditors. It was in this that the main objection lay.

**Hon. Mr. McCully**—If a man were to deposit the money in his wife's or son's name, what then?

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn**—It was none the less a dangerous policy to exempt the deposits from seizure.

**Hon. Mr. Dickey**—It had been assumed that the limit of \$200 was to prevent large sums from being lodged, but might it not be the policy of the Government to get as much money as possible by means of the projected institution. He had been happy to hear the new Minister of Finance, who was an ornament to the Ministry, referring in terms of commendation to the Savings Banks of Nova Scotia as examples which the Dominion might profitably follow, but he was sorry that the Hon. Postmaster-General had not been able to take any example from the Post Office system of that Province, by adhering to the rates of postage which prevailed there, viz.: 5 cents and 2 cents in the counties, for letters, leaving the newspapers free. He was also sorry that he (the Postmaster-General) had not considered the state of public feeling there, and he (Mr. Dickey) was persuaded if things had been left as they were, a larger revenue would have been derived than would be collected under the present Bill. Referring to the difficulties in connection with the currency, he thought it would be desirable to postpone the commencement of operations under the bill until first of January, 1869. Before its provisions could be known to all newspaper publishers in Nova Scotia, their arrangements for next year would have been made, and they would be placed under considerable disadvantages should the law become operative, as was proposed, on 1st April next.

**Hon. Mr. Robertson** said the difference in the value of the currency in the Provinces was very small as between Canada and New Brunswick, but between Canada and Nova Scotia it was about 2½ or a little more—not quite 3 per cent., and Nova Scotia would have no room to complain, as the difference was in its favour. As to the limit on the deposits to be made in the Savings Banks, he thought it should be left to the Government, and that it was unnecessary to alter the bill.

**Hon. Mr. Wark** thought it would be of little use to fix a limit to the deposits, for means would be found to lodge large sums if the depositors desired. Money was often placed in other names than that of the proprietors, and he himself had been applied to give a discharge for sums lodged in his name, of which he knew nothing. The institution as he understood was not for the poor only, but for the purpose of aiding the Government, and if they could deal with the floating debt of the Dominion by borrowing at 4 per cent., the more they got the better. The rate on the certificates was not binding at 5 per cent., but might be 4½ per cent., if the Government thought fit. The same might be said with regard to the notice of withdrawal, it might be longer or shorter, and the Government might give ½ per cent., more for longer terms.

**Hon. Mr. Miller** said that he had intended to have made a few additional remarks when the bill was before the House for the second reading, but the hour of 6 having arrived, the speaker left the Chair. He had particularly intended to refer to the proposed newspaper postage at greater length. He had been represented, however, as saying that the proposition was no boon to Nova Scotia, but that was not precisely what he had said. What he did say, was, that while on the whole the bill might be an advantage to Canada, it would not be so to Nova Scotia. He did not mean to assert that it would be disadvantageous to that Province, for it would not be much the worse off. (The idea in the hon. member's mind seemed to be that the reduction contemplated by the measure, would, so far as Nova Scotia was concerned, be neutralized by the imposition of a postage rate on newspapers.) The opposition to Confederation in Nova Scotia rested a good deal upon the anticipated results. It was confidently predicted that a tax would be laid upon newspapers, and that stamp duties would also be imposed. And now if the newspapers were made liable to post-

age, the parties who had urged these objections would point to their realization in justification of their course.

**Hon. Mr. Wier** begged also to remark he had not stated prepayment in the United States was tried and abandoned. It was in England.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** said he desired to bring up another feature of the bill, in order to ascertain the views of the House upon it. He referred to the exemption from postage of newspapers and periodicals devoted to Education, Religion, Temperance and Agriculture when addressed to subscribers from the office of publication. These papers and periodicals were now sent free, but under the bill, this provision was to be changed, and all papers alike would be subjected to a prepaid rate of one third of a cent. Now, while there was a general unanimity in the secular press in favour of having their papers carried free, they often indulged in a fling at the exemptions. The question to be considered was whether this distinction in favour of the Religious, Educational, Temperance and Agricultural papers, and periodicals, was a well grounded one. He thought it was, and that it was susceptible of proof. It was not correct to say that these publications were got up for gain, for the means were more frequently provided by associations of philanthropic men, who had no other object in view than the dissemination of useful and improving information. If other hon. members proposed to let all the newspapers go free, he would support the proposition, but if not, he would maintain that the former exemptions just referred to, should be maintained and the circulation of such publications encouraged. If the revenue were thereby diminished, it would only be an application of it to the encouragement of morality and education. The hon. member here traced the effects of these newspapers and periodicals in their influence upon the masses, and asserted they exerted a powerful effect in elevating them and educating them to a proper sense of the duties they owed to themselves and to society. In this way, though indirectly, the Government derived large advantages, and he conceived the House ought to get the seal of its approbation upon such efforts. (Hear, hear.) If the House went with him, he would move to recommit the bill.

**Hon. Mr. McCully** said that having been in the chair of the committee, he had not had the opportunity of stating his opinions upon the bill, but he most strongly approved of all that had now fallen from the hon. member

(Mr. Sanborn). There was a wide distinction between the secular press and the publications to which that hon. member had referred. The one class were published for profit, the other from benevolent motives, and he believed that a proposition to maintain these exemptions would receive the approbation of a large majority of members. The measure ought not to pass out of the House without the expression of its opinion that this literature should circulate to the remotest settlements of the country free of postage. Another argument in favour of abolishing the newspaper postage altogether was that this postage was almost exclusively paid by country people. The inhabitants of the cities and towns got their papers free, but the far away people who were the least able to pay the tax, were made to bear it. It might be said that the service was done for them, and that it must somehow be paid for. But as the mail service had to be performed, it would not add materially to its cost to carry the papers free.

**Hon. Mr. Christie**, after describing what constituted a newspaper, and what a periodical, said he hoped the Hon. Postmaster-General would concede the point respecting exemptions. He (Mr. Christie) was absent when that feature of the bill came under consideration, else he would have advocated the continuance of such exemptions. As had been very truly remarked, these publications were chiefly supported by associations, and they accomplished a large amount of good in various ways. By improving the morals of the people they diminished crime, and in this way contributed to lessen the expense of government. But with special regard to the agricultural periodicals, they unquestionably should pass free. The *Lower Canada Agricultural Journal* was published by the Board of Agriculture, not for profit surely, but for the sole purpose of disseminating valuable information where it was very much wanted. And was such a publication to be taxed? Would it conduce to the public interest to make that journal pay postage? The *Journal* was published at a very reduced rate, and a part of the grant allowed to the Board was expended upon it, it being allowed to be retained for that special purpose. He contended that this periodical, sustaining, as it did, one of the most important interests of the country, had a good claim to pass free, and the people had a right to say whether it should or not. Passing on to Nova Scotia, he had received from the hon. member who had just spoken, a valuable publication of the Board of Agriculture for

that Province, and he would ask whether that too was to pay postage. He did not know whether there was a similar periodical in New Brunswick, but if there was, he might put the same question in relation to it. In Upper Canada a journal had been published by the Board of Agriculture there, but it had been found to be unremunerative, and had been abandoned. The matter had, however, been taken up by a private concern, which published the *Upper Canada Farmer*, and it was aided by the County Agricultural Societies, which subscribed for large numbers, and circulated them throughout the country. This was the only agricultural publication he knew of, got up by private enterprise, and he thought he had said enough to show that it too ought to pass free. He hoped his hon. friend would press the point, and be sustained by the House.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said he did not wish to discuss the subject, but would again suggest whether it would not be better to let it stand until the bill came back from the other Branch. If not amended there the point could be brought up in this House and discussed, and the sense of the House taken upon it.

**Hon. Mr. Christie** said he had great objections to such a course.

**Hon. Mr. Botsford** said he could not concur in the course suggested by the Hon. Postmaster-General, for although the clauses in brackets were expunged the other Branch should know the opinion of the Senate in relation to them. If the House was disposed to amend the clauses in question there could be no better time to do it than the present, and it was a fallacy to argue for any other course. He (Mr. Botsford) felt the full force of the arguments in favour of the exemption of Educational, Religious, Scientific, and Sunday School publications, and would support the motion. He had not troubled the House with any remarks while the bill was under debate, as so many other hon. members appeared anxious to speak, but he must say he regretted that at this short part of the Session the Government had meddled at all with the question of imposing postage on newspapers. So far as he had been able to collect opinions there was no desire for a change in the letter postage. Everybody was willing enough to pay 5 cents, and when the arguments were sifted it would be found, that, what with the book and parcel posts and other items of revenue, the Department would have been within a few dollars of being self sustaining without the newspaper

postage. He was sorry the Hon. Postmaster-General had moved at all in the matter. He (Mr. Botsford) felt bound to say on strict principle that the newspapers should pay postage, as well as other mail matter, but at the inauguration of the Dominion there were prejudices to be conciliated, and, perhaps, a good deal of ignorance to be put up with. Under the circumstances he thought it would have been wise to have some consideration for the feelings and wishes of those who were opposed to the new state of things. He was aware that there was a deep seated feeling in both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick against newspaper postage, and if it should be pressed it would add great weight to the objections urged against the Union. It had been predicted that one of the first acts of the Government would be to impose this newspaper taxation, and if imposed the consequences could not but be injurious. Respecting Confederation itself, some parties were very enthusiastic, and it was fondly imagined that the moment it was accomplished great advantages would result, but if Parliament commenced by imposing new taxes before there was time to discern the benefits of the Union the effect must be very prejudicial. As to the education and other formerly exempted papers he considered the demand for their continued freedom from postage entirely reasonable. There were but few of these publications in the Dominion, and science had not been brought to bear upon the labours of the farm in these countries as in Europe, but it was now generally admitted that information upon this particular subject was most urgently needed. Great advantages had already resulted from the circulation of the *Canada Farmer* in New Brunswick, where it was already pretty extensively known, and he had no hesitation in saying that in his opinion the exemption in its favour, as provided in the existing law, should be maintained and embodied in the Bill before the House. He confessed he would prefer to see the bill withdrawn altogether for the present at least, and left over to be dealt with at the ensuing part of the Session. In conclusion the hon. member said that at first the legislation of the Confederated Parliament should be of such a character as to interfere as little as possible with the prejudices and prepossessions of the people of the Lower Provinces.

**Hon. Mr. Bourinot** considered that free postage should be extended to all the newspaper press. It was impossible to altogether prevent the expression of political opinions

even in journals not professing to be political, but where perfect freedom in the expression of opinion was allowed, they counteracted each other, and were as a bane and antidote. Of course a religious paper contained something else besides religion, and a temperance paper something else than essays upon the good to result to mankind from the drinking of cold water; but he, nevertheless, was strongly of opinion that temperance papers especially should be sent free by post.

**Hon. Mr. Dickey** heartily agreed with the hon. gentleman who had last spoken, and regretted that he (Mr. Bourinot) had not spoken similarly when the bill was in Committee of the Whole. He looked upon the time for discussion, however, as now passed, and was not now before the House at all.

(The Speaker read Hon. Mr. Campbell's motion, that all the paragraphs within brackets should be struck out.)

**Hon. Mr. McCully**—With the view of obtaining a recorded expression of the opinions of the gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, which could not be obtained when the House was in Committee, would move in amendment,

"That the bill be recommitted, that a rate of 5 cents on letters be substituted for the 3 cents proposed in the bill, and that newspapers pass free."

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** objected to the amendment at this stage of the proceedings. It would be time enough when the third reading of the bill came up. All that was proposed was to strike out the money clauses between brackets, and which, constitutionally, this House could not debate.

**Hon. Mr. Speaker** was seemingly about to rule the amendment out of order on the plea that no money rate could be inserted in it, when

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** stated that the amendment was not an amendment at all, inasmuch as it did not refer to the motion before the House, which was simply to the effect that certain clauses within brackets should be struck out preparatory to the bill being read a third time.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** (apparently in reply to Mr. Speaker) the House can initiate anything which took burdens off the people; if they could not put burthens on the people.

**Hon. Mr. McCully** considered that the proposed amendment would be an intimation to the other Branch of the Legislature of the Senate's opinion. The Union Bill went down from the House of Lords to the Commons, with the clauses which had been in brackets, printed in red ink.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell**—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The bill went down to the Commons with such clauses in blank, and the Commons had them afterwards printed in red ink for their own information and guidance. He suggested the propriety of letting the present bill go to the Commons in blank, but was quite prepared to go into the discussion of the propriety or impropriety of suffering Religious, Temperance, and other such papers to pass free by post, and with that view it seemed to him the most convenient course would be for the House to resolve itself into Committee now, when such matters might legitimately be discussed.

**Hon. Mr. Christie** looked upon the proposed mode of dealing with the Agricultural newspaper question as "round about." He looked upon it as a bill originating in the House, and he deemed it inconsistent with what was due to themselves to send it down to the Commons, reserving their opinions until the Lower House had sent it back to them again. Why all this round about way?

**Hon. Mr. Wark** considered that if the bill was to be altered now was the proper time.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn**, seconded by **Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just**, moved that the bill be recommitted so as to exempt from postage papers devoted to Agriculture, Religion, Temperance, Arts, and Manufactures.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell**—It must be obvious that this motion cannot be in order, not being germane to the question, and suggested that his motion (relative to striking out clauses in brackets) should first be carried, when the bill might be recommitted.

**Hon. Mr. Tessier** contended that the motion in amendment was altogether out of order, and stated that he would raise the question, when the time arrived for putting it as a motion.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell's** motion was then carried.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** submitted a list of words, omitted to have been placed in brackets, when the Bill was printed, which ought to

have been so placed, and moved that they should be struck out of the Bill, which was carried; and then moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** moved in amendment that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted so as to exempt from postage papers devoted to Agriculture, Science, Religion, Temperance, Arts, and Manufactures.

**Hon. Mr. Tessier** rose to order. It was important that they should proceed in accordance with the rules of the House and consistently with long established usage. The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman was an infringement on the privileges of the Commons; but there was a still stronger objection to the latter part of the amendment intended to amend something that was not in the bill at all, now that the bracket clauses had been struck out. It was only in Committee that wrong clauses could be discussed in the Senate at all, because then no minutes of amendments are made. The House, however, it was clear, could not receive a motion in amendment to a non-existent clause. (The hon. gentleman read an extract from proceedings of Lords to show the practice there with such bills.) He contended that in the House of Lords all such bills went down with blanks for the money clauses to the Commons, and were afterwards printed in red ink, merely to show the opinion of the Upper House, with a note that they were to be inserted in Committee.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** was really surprised at the position taken by his honorable friend on this question, and inquired if the highest legislative body in the country should place itself in a position by which it would be unable to express an opinion; and that too, when the Postmaster-General had admitted that so soon as his (the P. M. G.'s) motion passed, his (Mr. S.'s) motion would be in order. The motion stated what he had a right to state on every bill brought up for a reading, that this bill be not now read a third time, and that there should be exemptions on a certain class of newspapers. If the House had not the right of expressing its views on subjects, it ought to be abolished altogether. All that is asked is that the bill be sent back into Committee, and that that Committee should have power to do a certain thing on a certain class of newspapers. If they had not the opportunity of expressing their views, they ought to be abolished as a legislative

body altogether. It only asks that the bill be sent back into Committee, with power to do a certain thing.

**Hon. Mr. Dickey** could not help admiring the ingenuity of his friend to the left, who first objects to the amendment because it was not germane to the motion then under consideration, and next to an amendment being made to a clause which had no legal existence. His hon. friend had voted for the second reading with all the clauses in it, and put difficulties in the way of doing precisely the same thing now.

**Hon. Mr. Blair** believed that it had never been held in Canada that the Upper Chamber could legislate on such matters. It was meddling with a subject in which they had no power to meddle. He believed the House would be glad to have the opinion of the Speaker on the matter.

**Hon. Mr. Botsford** contended that the motion was perfectly in order, and perfectly constitutional. As soon as they had reported their opinion, the clause, as amended by them, could be struck out. Why was it in brackets at all, unless to suffer an expression of opinion to the motion upon it?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell** recommended that the House should govern themselves by such rules as prevailed in England, and that it might be well to accept the suggestion of his colleague the Postmaster-General. The motion to go into Committee was fatal, inasmuch as it set forth several specific objects to be discussed. Of course, he was responsible for the bill with his colleagues, and if it should go into committee was quite prepared to discuss the details of the bill again—if for no other reason than to gratify hon. gentlemen, who were not in their places when the bill was in committee. He did not believe that the country would sustain the position which hon. gentlemen had assumed in drawing distinctions between one class of newspapers and another.

**Hon. Mr. McCully** read an extract from the proceedings of the House of Lords, to show when and how a bill may be recommitted, which was as often as "the House thinks fit."

**Hon. Mr. Campbell**—That is not the question here.

**Hon. Mr. McCully**—When his hon. friend the Postmaster-General proposed to strike out the clauses, then in his opinion, was the proper time to move for a recommittal. So

that the opinion of the House, on certain clauses, to be placed by the Commons in red ink, might be ascertained. He hoped, however, that the House would not be prevented by any mere forms from expressing an opinion, or in other words, stultifying itself, as it was proposed to do. If his hon. friend (from Quebec) who had got them into this difficulty, would only fall upon a way to enable them to express an opinion, without infringing upon the rules of the House, he should be very glad.

**Hon. Mr. Tessier** said it was far from his intention to prevent any expression of opinion in the House, but already their opinion on this very matter, the expediency of suffering Religious or Temperance papers to go free, had gone forth, and these gentlemen might then, if they had chosen, have moved amendment after amendment; but the present motion was especially to take a course which they had no right to take in a matter in which the expenditure of money was concerned. It is really decided by this motion, if carried, that \$4,000 or \$5,000 will be taken from the public chest to carry those religious papers free through the mail.

**Hon. Mr. Christie** pointed out that the Fisheries Bill created a new office, involving a money expenditure, but his hon. friend (Mr. Tessier) gave it as his opinion that there was then no breach of order whatever in making such a motion, but now he does so.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** thought it would be as well for the House to dispose of the point of order, and he would suggest, if it were out of order, how it might be made in order.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** conceived that if his motion were out of order, the Government had stultified themselves in bringing forward the motion for striking out the clauses within brackets.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** explained that the bill, now that the clauses in brackets had been struck out, could not very easily be amended, and at the same time denied that the House could at any time insert a clause having money in it. The bill, however, could be simply sent back to a Committee of the Whole House.

**Hon. Mr. Sanborn** withdrew his motion, and adopted the suggestion of the Hon. Postmaster General, and it was resolved that the bill be recommitted, and the House adjourned until to-morrow.