

DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

MONDAY, Feb. 27.—The Speaker took the chair at 3 p. m.

Among the petitions presented were several in favor of and against the Bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, a number in favor of the Presbyterian Temporalities Fund decision, and one of the Great Western Railway against the Bill to constitute a Board of Railway Commissioners.

Sir Charles Tupper laid on the table a return of the correspondence, etc., relating to the letting of the contract for the Emory Bar and Port Moody section of the Canada Pacific.

The following Private Bills passed the second reading:

To incorporate the Rainy River Improvement Company.—Mr. Kilvert.

To incorporate the Teoumsh Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macmillan.

To incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—Mr. Williams.

To incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.—Mr. McCarthy.

Dr. Orton introduced the Bill to amend the Act relating to interest on moneys secured by mortgage on real estate, which was read a first time.

Mr. McCarthy introduced the Bill intitled an Act to enable any person charged with an indictable offence to be admitted to give evidence in his own behalf. He said that while the Bill provided that any person charged with an indictable offence might give evidence in his own behalf, the right of cross-examination was to a certain extent curtailed. Such a witness was not to be called for the prosecution, and when called on his own behalf the cross-examination might, at the order of the judge, be limited to matters of reputation and character.

Sir John Macdonald, in reply to Mr. Dawson, said that the lecture of Sir Francis Hincks on the Boundary Award did not accompany the documents sent as the case for Ontario.

Mr. Mackenzie asked for a number of particulars relating to the sale of land on the corner of Sussex and Rideout streets, Ottawa, but the matter was allowed to stand, as Sir John Macdonald had not had his attention directed to the question in time to learn particulars.

Sir Hector Langevin, in reply to Mr. Ellicott, said it was not at present the intention of the Government to place a sum in the estimates for the purpose of building a post-office and custom house in the town of Brampton, but the matter would be considered during recess.

Mr. Mackenzie—Another tour. (Laughter.)

Mr. Patterson (Essex), moving for the Orders in Council regulating the ferries between points in Canada and the United States, stated that at present the power to regulate these ferries was held by the Dominion Government, although some rights were held by municipalities from the Province. The matter was of great importance, affecting such places as Windsor, Sandwich, Brockville, Prescott and others. In some cases sub-lessees of ferries did not carry out the conditions on which licenses were granted, occasioning great public inconvenience. The Government should make more stringent regulations, and should see that they were more stringently enforced.

Mr. Sprout moved for a return showing the name and number of boats or sailing vessels lost on the Canadian inland waters since 1870.

Mr. Lane, in seconding the motion, said there was more or less disaster yearly on the Georgian Bay, and thought a large proportion of these annual losses might be avoided by a more thorough system of inspection.

Mr. McCallum regretted that this matter had been brought up in the House while several cases mentioned are pending in the courts. He believed that in several disasters enumerated which had happened on the northern lakes it would be established that the vessels were seaworthy. It was evident that the London disaster was almost wholly due to the overcrowding of the vessel.

The motion carried.

Mr. Cameron (Huron) in moving for correspondence and reports relating to the Charybdis said that in the seasonal papers for 1881 there would be found a voluminous correspondence between the Canadian and Imperial authorities with reference to the acquisition of this vessel. The papers did not show very clearly upon whom the flash of genius first came which culminated in the transfer of this gift, but it appeared that before the Charybdis was finally sent to Canada there was a good deal of haggling as to whether the guns and provisions belonging to her should also be handed over to our Government. The negotiations were finally concluded by the transfer of the boat with all her unconsumable stores on board to the Canadian Government, and on investigation it was discovered that there were no stores of any description to be found. On examination of the correspondence it would be found that the vessel was described as an old type of corvette that had served seven and a half years in the Chinese seas; that she was twenty years old; had neither provisions nor coal on board; and that it was necessary to purchase a heavy anchor to keep her steady in port. The speed of the vessel was stated to be seven knots per hour, and the number of men required to work her was placed at 180. An inspection of the engines revealed the fact that they were much worse than was expected, and considerable trepidation was felt in attempting to cross the ocean in winter weather, or in fact in any weather. The inspectors reported that the condition of her boilers at that time rendered an attempt to cross the sea almost certain to be attended with the loss of the vessel and all on board. This argument was of course unanswerable (laughter) and the needed repairs were made, after which the vessel was brought to St. John. But even here the new arrival was a source of apprehension, for it was found impossible to keep her moored, and, breaking loose, she wandered about St. John harbor to the damage of shipping and actual loss of life. But there was a grim side to this question. What object had the Government in acquiring the vessel at all? The Prime Minister had said that the vessel was necessary as a training ship, but so far no attempt had

been made to utilize the craft in this or any other way. The grim side was the cost necessary to repair such a vessel, so utterly rotten and useless for any purpose whatever. Before leaving England it was estimated that £2,000 would be required to make the vessel fit to cross the ocean. So far it appeared that £21,000 had been expended on account of the Charybdis, and a further sum of \$1,200 was asked in the Estimates. He advised the Government if they could find no practical use for the vessel to send it back to England and relieve the people of St. John and the Dominion of a dangerous and expensive burden.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Cameron (Huron) moved for a copy of the judgment of the Court of Chancery and Court of Appeal of Ontario in the case of McLaren vs. Caldwell et al., and correspondence on the subject since the date of the last motion.

The motion carried.

In a debate on the appointment of a committee to inquire into the effect of the National Policy on the farmers of Canada.

Mr. Gault thought the prices received and general prosperity among the farmers was proof positive of the benefits of the N. P. to the agricultural interest. He failed to see the necessity for such a committee.

Mr. Mackenzie—I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Gault) he might ask that the committee have power to inquire what has been the effect of the N. P. on owners of cotton mills.

Mr. Gault—I can tell the hon. gentleman, as I am perhaps the largest owner of cotton stocks in the Dominion, that so far my cotton stocks have not paid me 3 per cent. I hope the day is coming when they will, though.

The motion dropped on the Speaker's ruling.

On motion of Sir Hector Langevin, the House adjourned at 10.20.

OTTAWA, Feb. 28.—The Speaker took the chair at 3 p. m.

Sir John Macdonald, in reply to Mr. Mackenzie's questions relating to the sale of lands on the corner of Sussex and Rideau streets to Mr. W. F. Powell, said that the sale was made by private arrangement. The price of the lot was \$1,550, and the size of the lot was 155 feet on Rideau street by 50 feet on Sussex street.

On motion, the time for receiving petitions for private Bills was extended to ten days from to-morrow.

Sir Charles Tupper arose amid applause to continue the discussion on the Budget. He opened by saying that he did not discuss the question of protection and free trade as an abstract question. Although the free trade policy adopted by England was considered the best for that country, it would not affect the issue between parties here. He maintained, however, that as a practical matter the tariff of Canada must be to a large extent charged to bear a proper relation to that of the great republic to the south of us. He would be able to show that the low tariff of 1867 was sufficient protection for Canada under the circumstances of that time. The great war had so demoralized the labor market of the United States that Canada was enabled to compete against her neighbors to advantage. At the time there was little machinery manufactured in Canada, and the Government allowed all except that of the class manufactured here to enter free, so as to encourage the establishment of factories. In the great fishing industry also a policy of protection had been pursued. All would remember the taunts thrown across the House and prophecies that nothing would ever be received, yet as a result of that they had received \$4,500,000, and to-day the Minister of Finance came down and demanded, and justly demanded, that no less than \$150,000 should be voted as a bonus to the fishermen whose fishing grounds were to a certain extent given over to the fishermen of other countries. This would show that the same policy of 1867 was now being carried out—a policy of protection. They would remember also that the first Conservative Government had endeavored to have a tax imposed on coal and on agricultural products. He (Sir Charles Tupper) had, from the first moment he entered the House, advocated a duty on coal, for, as a pure matter of revenue, he could see no reason why it should be exempt from duty any more than any other article. The ex-Finance Minister had denounced the tax on coal as an odious tax, and the leader of the Opposition spoke against it as sectional. They argued that it was a tax on a necessary of life. Yet this same gentleman put a tax on clothing, which was in this country more a necessary of life than coal. Coal oil was also a necessary of life, and yet for two years a struggle had been carried on against the late Government to reduce the tax on coal oil, and was not this sectional tax? They took office with an overflowing revenue when the industries of the country were in the highest state of prosperity, yet five years of misrule and of lessened prosperity showed that they were unfit to grapple the questions with which they had had to do. It had been argued that he (Sir Charles Tupper) was a free trader when he was in the Nova Scotia Legislature. He was a free trader, but only because the community was so small that it was useless to try to carry out a policy of protection. He claimed that the revenue on coal was not paid by the people of Ontario. The Minister of Finance thought the people of the United States paid one-half of it. He differed with him in this respect. The people of the United States paid all the duty. Coal, instead of being increased in price, had actually been decreased. The bulk of coal from the United States was fixed and governed by competition. The moment duty was imposed on coal going into Ontario it became a competitive point and the United States were threatened to have their Ontario market displaced by Nova Scotia coal. In 1881 there were 341,239 tons of coal sent out from the Nova Scotia mines more than 1878. The number of men employed was increased by 465. The number of days worked was increased by 184,918. In like manner the import of coal at Montreal and Quebec and the tonnage of shipping from Sydney had largely increased. No doubt could be entertained that this had all been brought about by the encouragement given to this important industry by the imposition of a duty of 50 cents per ton. The leader of the Opposition had shown great anxiety about the indebted-

ness of the country. He might thank God and take courage while the present Finance Minister had charge of affairs. He would find that public works could be carried on without increased taxation, and without making the interest on the debt greater. The surplus was not, as was claimed, taken out of the pockets of the people. At least \$750,000 of it came out of money saved on the intercolonial that would otherwise have been spent. Although the expenditure in some branches of the public service was larger than before, the revenue was also larger. After the cost of construction of the Pacific Railway, every dollar of which expenditure was provided for, the Finance Minister has been able to show that the public debt would only be \$203,000,000. He would draw attention to the statement made by that hon. gentleman that if all the fertile land of the Northwest were disposed of at \$1 per acre, and the hon. gentleman opposite could not question that calculation, it would reduce the debt of Canada to \$100,000,000.

It now being 6 o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

Sir Charles Tupper, resuming, proceeded to make a few further observations in reply to the speech of the ex-Minister of Finance on the Budget. The hon. gentleman in his remarks had given utterance to a deliberate insult upon the Minister of Finance, a gentleman who, from a comparatively humble sphere in life, had risen to occupy one of the highest positions that it was in the gift of the people to bestow. At the end of three years and four months the Government had 90 of a majority at their back, strengthened by the free will of the sovereign independent people of the country, and the blight that existed under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite had been removed, and they recognized that the true interests of every class of the population was to maintain and sustain the great National Policy to which the Government had committed itself, and which had already proved eminently beneficial to the people of the country.

Mr. Cameron (Huron) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir Richard Cartwright did not hold it worth while to follow the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman had made some curious blunders in speaking of the loans effected by him (Sir Richard Cartwright) in England. The hon. gentleman found fault with the mode in which these loans were placed, but it was exactly the same mode adopted by Sir A. T. Galt, Sir Francis Hincks and Sir John Rose, any one of whom was infinitely better authority than the Minister of Finance and Minister of Railways and all their colleagues and supporters. When he first went on the market he found Canadian securities paying 5 per cent., and he was the first man who succeeded in negotiating a loan at 4, thereby rendering, he claimed, a certain service to the people of Canada. The Minister of Railways no doubt knew how little value he (Sir Richard) attached to the tornado of words from him. It affected him no more than a hail storm on a hill top. Before he could fear the censure of these hon. gentlemen he must learn to respect them. He feared neither their censure nor the uttermost they could do. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

Mr. Anglin said that if the Opposition could accept as absolutely true all the statements made by the Government and their supporters, they might be expected to allow the utterances of Ministers in this debate to pass without question. They were forced, however, to regard many statements made by the Government as at least a skillful perversion of facts, and in no case more than in the assertions made by the Minister of Railways with regard to his political attitude in the Maritime Provinces. In relation to this duty, it had been stated that a prominent boat-owner and member of the House had been allowed to purchase his coal in American ports for the use of his vessels in Canadian waters.

Mr. Mackenzie Bowell—Any steamboat owner can do the same.

Mr. Anglin—Can he buy coal to bring to Canada and be used in Canadian waters?

Mr. Mackenzie Bowell—Certainly, the hon. gentleman should know that nothing is liable to duty until it is landed in Canada. (Opposition cries of "Oh, oh.")

Mr. Anglin thought that on the statement just made by the Minister of Customs a new light was thrown on this subject, and it was well in the interest of many boat owners who had been paying a duty on their coal that they should know what the law allowed them to do in laying in their supplies of coal. The hon. Minister had been trying to prove that the duty on coal was paid wholly by the American dealer. If such were the fact why not double the duty? (Cheers.) Canadians were under no obligation to make these matters convenient for the Americans, and if the latter paid the duty, we might as well have it increased. However, hon. gentlemen had a right to count largely upon the credulity of many people in the country, and the knowledge of this power had often incited them to make audacious and unwarranted statements; but, while the hon. gentleman was indulging in reckless statements a member of the House had taken the trouble to telegraph to Detroit and Windsor, inquiring as to the present price of coal. The result of these inquiries showed a difference of 75 cents in price between the two places. Hard coal at present was \$7.50 per ton in Windsor, and in Detroit \$6.50 to \$6.75. Difference in cost of transportation could not affect the price, because coal could as easily be laid down in Windsor as in Detroit.

Mr. Mackenzie Bowell—Who is your authority for this statement of prices?

Mr. Anglin—The gentleman who had sent the telegram was Mr. A. Bartlett, Police Magistrate of Windsor. He thought the hon. gentleman should not question the accuracy of the statement.

Mr. Mackenzie Bowell—It is all right. Mr. Bartlett is a very respectable Grit.

Mr. Anglin—All Grits are respectable, and when they cease to be respectable they cease to be Grits. (Cheers.) The inter-Provincial trade had grown up, but it was one-sided. In the Maritime Provinces they imported a great deal for the Western Provinces, the goods brought in being largely to replace goods formerly manufactured in the east. In St. John, for instance, there were to-day fewer hands employed in factories than before the tariff. In no case

could it be shown that the condition of the laboring man was improved by the policy of protection. He doubted if it could be shown that in any case wages of laborers or artisans had been increased directly through influence of the National Policy. The Finance Minister had claimed that the National Policy benefited the agricultural implement makers in giving them a home market, and enabling them to extend trade in the Northwest, but manufacturers in this line had a market before, and even had they been given no advantage except an easy means of access to the country they would have held the market in the Northwest also. Carriages had also been referred to, but all they could be shown was that while the duty on the material for carriages was increased, the price had gone down. If the Finance Minister expected to get much support from the carriage manufacturers he would find himself mistaken. In calculating the increase of the number of operatives in the factories the Finance Minister counted even little children, and then calculated each hand as a head of a family of four, thus arriving at his extraordinary statement that the encouragement given had resulted in giving sustenance to 100,000 extra people. If these people were in the country, where are they to be found? They are not in St. John or other New Brunswick towns. He challenged members of the Government or their supporters to point to a single instance in which the National Policy had really benefited the farming population.

Mr. Boutbee moved the adjournment of the debate.

The House adjourned at 12.55 a. m.

A "MANLY WOMAN"

Successfully and for Years Personates a Duke's Son.

HER CAREER AS "LORD A. CLINTON."

One of the Most Remarkable Swindlers of the Age.

At the Birmingham Police Court on the 8th inst. a remarkable case of conspiracy involving charges of forging the signatures of the Queen, the Prince of Wales, several noblemen and the Lord Chief Justice, was heard before the stipendiary magistrate, Detective Price, of Birmingham, brought from Liverpool Mary Jane Furneaux, who had been arrested by the Liverpool police on charges of conspiracy and obtaining by fraud upward of £5,000 by representing that she was Lord Arthur Pelham Clinton, who died, or, as she said, was supposed to have died, soon after a warrant was issued for his arrest some years ago. The case is reported by the London Daily News. The charges at present are for conspiring with James Gething, a Birmingham engineer, and obtaining by fraud £2,000 from Edward Benyon, of Selly Oak, near Birmingham, and for obtaining in the same way £3,000 from Mr. Screen, the Brades, Oldbury; but there are several other charges to be brought forward. The male prisoner, who alleges that he is the dupe of the female prisoner, and that she has ruined him and nearly all his relatives, was brought before the magistrates in the morning and remanded pending the arrival of the woman, when they will be charged together. The woman, who is the niece of a most distinguished provincial physician, took lodgings at the house of Mrs. Drew, of Aston, Birmingham, about seven years since, and after staying a short time stated as "a secret which must not be divulged" that she was Lord Arthur Pelham Clinton, who had only feigned to have died, and for whom a warrant was out, but for whom Her Majesty was about to grant a free pardon and restore valuable estates which the Crown had confiscated. She graphically described how, as she alleged, the coffin of Lord Arthur Clinton was filled with stones and buried, while the lawyers and doctors were bribed not to inform that the "corpse" had walked away. Mrs. Drew, believing in promises that she would be handsomely repaid, did not trouble about her rent; but, on the contrary, willingly advanced money from time to time to the young "nobleman," and besides this introduced "His Lordship" to several of her relations, who were eagerly anxious to lend money on the same favorable terms.

THE TRUSTEE.

Mrs. Drew and her sister, Mrs. Ward, state that they introduced the woman to the male prisoner, who is their brother, and that he introduced her to Mr. Benyon, from whom she obtained £2,000, and to Mr. Screen, from whom she obtained £3,000 by various instalments from £20 to £1,000, giving as "securities" what purported to be valuable deeds and letters from Lord Coleridge, whom she represented as her trustee. During the time that she was borrowing the money she frequently, or nearly always, dressed as a man "in the height of fashion," with gaiters, lavender kid gloves and walking stick. In this costume she gained the affection of two young ladies, one of whom became so deranged on discovering the fraud that she had to be placed in an asylum, where she is still confined. When arrested the woman was living with her mother at No. 4 Gregson street, Liverpool, and dressed in feminine attire. She is of very slender build, and of extremely masculine appearance. During the journey she several times complained of illness and wanted the detective to alight, but no notice was taken of the request, which was believed to be only a ruse to attempt to escape. When in the dock she might easily have been mistaken for a man, wearing as she did a Newmarket overcoat and her hair being cut quite short. There is no doubt but that the woman has been assisted by some clever persons in her remarkable frauds. Some of the dupes have, at the woman's request, posted at different post-offices letters to Lord Coleridge, and letters purporting to come from His Lordship have been received in reply. In the same way have letters been sent to and received from Her Majesty the Queen and various other illustrious persons. Some of the letters signed "J. C. Coleridge" thank the dupes for being kind to Lord A. P. Clinton and state that "they need have no fear of advancing any amount." On one occasion, after having been, as she said, on a visit to Her Majesty at Balmoral, the woman brought to Birmingham a poodle which she said was Prince

Leopold's dog and that it had been lent to her by His Royal Highness. She said that she was about to revisit Balmoral and asked Mr. Benyon to accompany her. The offer was accepted rather unexpectedly, the woman not thinking Mr. Benyon could spare the time. The woman and Mr. Benyon, however, started for Balmoral, and when in sight of the Castle the former pretended to be very faint and ill and they returned, Mr. Benyon not, however, for a moment suspecting that he was being in the slightest degree deceived.

KNAVE OR FOOL?

The male prisoner states that he has been thoroughly swindled by the woman whom, he says, up to last week he thought to be Lord Arthur Clinton, and who by fraud has obtained all his money. He began, he says, by being bound to her by several loans, all of which he has had to pay. He has in his possession what purports to be a security from Lord Coleridge for £1,000. Three years since he wrote to Lord Coleridge, reminding him of the "bond," and asking for help, but he received a reply stating that His Lordship would put the matter into the hands of the police if he wrote again. He was not, he says, shaken in his confidence of the woman by this letter, and took the same to Mr. Benyon, who replied: "Don't write again to Lord Coleridge, or we shall none of us have a penny." Mr. Benyon at about the same time received a fictitious letter, purporting to come from Lord Coleridge, which "so satisfied him that the adventures was really Lord A. P. Clinton that since that occasion to this week he has never had any doubt upon the matter." The male prisoner adds that last week, being ill and having lost all his money by lending it to "Lord A. P. Clinton," he wrote again to Lord Coleridge, reminding him of the previous letter and the bond he held of his for £1,000. Lord Coleridge replied, stating, "I have placed your letter in the hands of the Birmingham police," and the result was the arrest of the man. So cleverly did the female prisoner act that there is one man in Birmingham—a well-known builder—who even now refuses to believe that she is other than Lord A. P. Clinton, and he believes that he has in his possession most valuable securities which he received from the woman. A letter from a relation of the woman was received in Birmingham shortly after her arrest setting forth that she was certainly the nobleman she professed to be. On several occasions she took her dupes to London and Liverpool, and is described as most lavish in the expenditure of money, taking a cab to go even a few yards or across the street. The Prince of Wales she stated to be her most intimate friend, and in the two thousand and more letters and documents in the possession of the police the name of His Royal Highness is of frequent occurrence. A strange feature in the case is that when unable to obtain further loans the woman took a situation as governess at Casemere Farm, Preston, Bissett, near Birmingham, but was given notice to leave under the belief that she was a man. She afterward took a situation as attendant at Prestwick Asylum, Manchester, but did not remain long. Her latest freak was to write to some of her dupes in Birmingham, stating that she had married a young lady in Liverpool. The reason she first gave for going to Liverpool was that it was at the request of some Cabinet Ministers, who did not wish her to be in London or Birmingham while they were preparing Her Majesty's pardon and the restoration of the confiscated estates.

THE IDIOT EARL.

A Shocking Reminiscence from the Queensberry House.

(From Cassell's Old and New Edinburgh.)

Connected with the Duke's residence in Queensberry House, against which the whole fury and maledictions of the mob were directed at the time of the union, there is a tale of awful mystery and horror. His eldest son, James, Earl of Drumlanrig, is simply stated in the old peoages "to have died young." It is now proved, however, that he was an idiot of the most wretched kind, ravid and gluttonous as a wild animal, and grew to an enormous stature, as his leaden and unornamented coffin in the family vault at Durideer attests at this day. This monstrous and unfortunate creature was always confined in a ground-floor room of the western wing of Queensberry House, and "until within these few years the boards still remained by which the windows of the dreadful receptacle were darkened to prevent the idiot from looking out or being seen." On the day the treaty of union was passed at Edinburgh crowded to the vicinity of the Parliament House to wait the issue of the final debate; and the whole household of the Duke—the High Commissioner—went thither en masse for that purpose, and, perhaps, to prevent him from being torn to pieces by the exasperated people, and among them went the valet whose duty it was to watch and attend the Earl of Drumlanrig. Hearing all unusually still in the vast house, the latter contrived to break out of his den, and roamed wildly from room to room, till certain savory odors drew him into the great kitchen, where a little turnspit sat quietly on a stool by the fire. He seized the boy, took the meat from the fire, stripped and spit it, and he was found devouring the half-roasted body when the Duke returned with his train from his political triumph to find dire horror awaiting him. "The common people, among whom the dreadful tale soon spread, in spite of the Duke's endeavors to suppress it, said that it was a judgment upon him for his odious share in the union. The story runs that the Duke, who had previously regarded his offspring with no eye of affection, immediately ordered the creature to be smothered. But this is a mistake; the idiot is known to have died in England, and to have survived his father many years, though he did not succeed him upon his death in 1711, when the titles devolved upon Charles, a younger brother."

The Montreal Recorder is determined to enforce the observance of the Sunday law requiring the closing of saloons on that day, by announcing his intention of inflicting the extreme penalty of \$75 in every case where a conviction takes place before him. Heretofore the penalty has seldom exceeded \$10 and costs.