

and duty to protect the interests of society, and he felt satisfied that this was only the commencement of many other similar applications and this case would be cited as precedent.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said the evidence in the case went to show that the husband and wife had had no personal intercourse whatever since the wife had left her husband's house, and it had been shown that from the time the evidence was taken up to the time the Committee were sitting she was absent from him, and the letter she had written to to him had been unanswered. There had been no intercourse between them, either personal or by correspondence, in any way, from the time the wife had left her husband's house. The evidence of guilt had been produced before the Committee in the most clear and distinct way in which it could be taken until this Senate has the power to examine witnesses under oath. The House indicated its wish not to have this matter brought before them, and they deputed their power to a committee, who having heard the evidence which had been taken under oath, and having heard the witnesses, they have intimated there was no collusion between the parties, and report in favour of the bill. He did not quite agree with his hon. friend, (Mr. McCully) that they should create a court to deal with cases of marriage and divorce, because he thought the establishment of such a court would create too great a facility for the dissolution of the matrimonial bond, and would tend to increase the number of applications for divorce, while the present course tended to check these applications. These were the opinions he had formed for the moment on the subject. The bill now before the Legislature, so far as he had formed an opinion, had been established by such evidence as he thought justified the House in adopting the report of the Committee and passing the bill.

**Hon. Mr. Locke** gave notice of enquiry for Wednesday next, relating to filling up the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Wier.

The first report of the Joint Committee on the Library was read and accepted.

The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill from the House of Commons, intituled: "Stationery office establishment Bill,"

**Hon. Mr. Dickson** in the Chair,

The said bill was reported without an amendment.

## CURRENCY BILL

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Currency,"

**Hon. Mr. McCrea** in the chair.

**Hon. Mr. Steeves** said the provisions of the bill did not carry out its object, as stated in the preamble, that there should be a uniform currency throughout the Dominion.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said that to prevent making changes in the currency too often it was thought desirable to submit to present evils, and wait until they ascertained whether the monetary arrangement agreed to by the Conference at Paris would be adopted by the United States.

**Hon. Mr. Wilmot** said if the recommendation of the Conference at Paris was not adopted, we should adopt the Nova Scotia system, and one advantage to be derived from it would be, it would relieve the silver nuisance by reducing its value compared with the sovereign.

**Hon. Mr. Tessier** said legal tender notes were legal tender in Nova Scotia, as well as in other parts of the Dominion, therefore a person in Montreal with £1,000 in gold could get one thousand pounds in legal tender notes for it at the rate of 2½, but if he went to Halifax he could buy up legal tender notes with his gold and reap a profit. It this was carried on to any extent the Province of Nova Scotia would certainly lose by it.

**Hon. Mr. McCully** said there would be no advantage gained in that way as the notes would not be of the same value in Montreal as in Halifax.

**Hon. Mr. Campbell** said this bill would provide a remedy for this difference of currency, in case Congress agrees with the recommendation of the Conference held at Paris, because then the bill would introduce a uniform currency with the United States and some of the principal powers of Europe, but in case Congress does not accede to that recommendation, then some other bill will have to be presented for the consideration of Parliament, having for its object the assimilation of the currency of the Dominion alone. In the prospect of Congress adopting that bill it was thought best not to make any change in the meantime. Correspondence has been going on between the chairman of the Committee having that subject under consideration in Con-

gress, and the gentleman who is at the head of the Finance Department here, and there is every reason to think that Congress will adopt that measure, and we will have a uniform currency which will be the same all over the Continent and in the United States. In reference to the objection made by his hon. friend (Mr. Tessier) he did not think anything would occur to interfere with the value of Dominion notes; those notes so far as issued in the Lower Provinces were marked redeemable there, and those issued here are redeemed here. They did not purpose to take sovereigns for more than they were worth.

**His Hon. The Speaker** said they were mixing up the question of currency with the question of gold. If they took gold as the standard they might divide it into seven parts in one place, and into four parts in another, and call these four parts as good as the seven, but still the gold would always remain of one value. The sovereign at \$5 in Nova Scotia was worth no more than \$4.86 $\frac{2}{3}$  here, and the same rule would apply to the legal tenders which were as good as gold.

**Hon. Mr. Reesor** said though duties on customs had to be paid in gold, it was not so in regard to duties paid as internal revenue; this

was an advantage in favour of Nova Scotia which, taken in connection with other concessions to that Province, would, he was afraid, stir up something like dissatisfaction in the far west.

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell** explained that the question of the value of the sovereign and bank notes had been worked out in business connections for years past. The bank notes of St. John had always commanded a premium in Nova Scotia equal to the difference between \$5 and \$4.86 $\frac{2}{3}$ .

**Hon. Mr. Wilmot** said his experience in regard to the conference held at Paris was, that they should establish a coin to pay the balances between nation and nation; bills of exchange were often sold in St. John, and in Quebec, at four or five per cent. less than the value of the sovereign; then the gold went out and the banks lessened their accommodation. This measure recommended by the conference was not so much for the internal trade of these countries as the external trade.

The bill was then agreed to, read a third time, and passed.

The House then adjourned.

---