

NOW READY,

In Pamphlet form, Speech of the Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, K. C. B., On introducing the Bill to give effect to the Treaty of Washington, at the House of Commons, on the 3rd day of May, 1872.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

Ottawa Store—James Angus. Breadmen Wanted—Orms & Son. Operator Wanted—G. A. Wall. Clerk's New Method—C. H. Dixon.

Ottawa Times

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1872.

LA. EST NEWS ITEMS.

Negotiations between the Imperial and American Governments respecting the Treaty of Washington and the supplementary articles have been resumed.

Hon. Joseph Howe has left town for the benefit of his health.

A meeting of delegates from several Canadian societies of the Province was held in Toronto on Tuesday, when it was resolved to hold an excursion to Queen's Head on the 16th of August.

Col. G. T. Denison, jun., was requested to deliver an oration, and it was resolved to invite the Governor General, Lieutenant Governor, Ministers of the Crown, and Mayors of cities and towns.

Earl Granville has directed that 148 volumes published by the Foreign Office on behalf of Her Majesty's Government.

An English lady in the city of Birmingham has been made to pay a fine of £20 for giving an undesired "recommendation" to a discharged domestic.

A somewhat laughable "ring" has been formed in California, where this year's grain crop is very large.

Some very gentlemanly have bought up the entire stock of grain, so that the farmers are at their wits' end to know how to bestow their grain.

The movement among the English agricultural laborers continues to spread. There are 4,000 members of the union in Warwickshire, and throughout the country about 50,000 agricultural laborers in the union.

It seems that, unlike news of most terrible disasters, the intelligence of the earthquake at Antioch was by no means exaggerated. The telegraph did not tell the whole truth. English merchants have received advices that scarcely a family in Antioch remains intact.

Mr. Leander M. P. P., is at the Russell House.

Mr. Smith, Collector of Customs in Toronto is in town.

BRITANNIA.

In our report of Mr. Currier's speech yesterday, instead of the word "inferior" read "superior."

CONSISTENCY.

Consistency is a jewel, especially in a journalist. To give our readers an idea of the value which may be placed upon its utterances with respect to public men, we give the following extracts:

"The Ontario combination (i. e. Mr. Sandford Macdonald's Government) has no internal cohesion except from the possession of office and its attendant advantages; yet there is no doubt that its subservience to John A. Macdonald is weaker than it would otherwise have been."—Toronto Globe, June 3d.

"Whatever opinions Mr. Sandford Macdonald held in his own mind, derived from no other man's mind, and they were put into practical operation also after his own fashion."—Toronto Globe, June 3d.

"We would like to know how these two statements agree, or how we can reconcile the idea of Mr. Sandford Macdonald's being a free man, and his subservience to John A. Macdonald, with the fact of his 'putting his own ideas into practical operation after his own fashion.'"—Toronto Globe, June 3d.

THAT "UNITED" OPPOSITION.

The leading Opposition organ is very much concerned lest the friends of the present Dominion Government should be disappointed in their expectation of achieving a great triumph at the next elections. It advances them not to reckon too much upon it, and then repeats its usual statement to the effect that the Opposition were "never a united and enthusiastic, more homogeneous or more cordial than they are now." Of course we all know that this is a mere assertion, and is altogether opposed to the truth. What amount of unity or enthusiasm, what homogeneity or confidence can there be in a party constituted as the Opposition is? Even supposing that they were able to defeat the present Government and obtain office, it would be impossible for them to carry on the public business for any length of time, from the utter lack of unity of purpose among and how many conflicting elements and hostile political ideas. At present the only unity which exists among them, such as it is, is solely the result of their desire for office and power which animates them. Upon no one great question are they united. They are not battling for any great ideal or political principle upon which they all think and feel alike. The only link which unites the various parties which constitute this "enthusiastic," this "homogeneous" Opposition is hatred for Sir John Macdonald's Government and the desire of office for themselves. Such a faint and feeble union is not a union at all, and it is not a union which can be relied upon to do anything for the benefit of the country. The origin of Mr. Jones and the other

the only allies whom the Grits can find in Nova Scotia, has boldly declared itself in favor of Annexation. It has done more than this. It has alarmed, and has even gone so far as to inform us upon what terms the Grits are to have the support of the Nova Scotia wing of the Opposition. It says these terms are that "they help to loosen the bonds cruelly imposed upon the Nova Scotians by the Act of Confederation." These, and none other, the Grits are straight forward and outspoken enough to assure us, are the terms upon which they will agree to work with the Ontario Grits. We have no doubt that the latter are ready enough to unite with them or any other set of men upon any terms. They are desperately hard up for allies. In fact the Grits in the course of the same article intimates that the entire cord is complete. It says:—

"After five years waiting, we shall have Ontario, New Brunswick, and even Quebec, have each in turn grown disgusted with the unscrupulous carpet-bagger whom their former confederates, the Grits of 1871. They, and the Grits of Ontario at their back, have thrown themselves out. A new set of men more able to do our present wants and political aspirations in Canada have been found. This is remembered immediately following upon the remark that the bonds imposed by the Act of Confederation must be 'loosened' and the intimation conveyed in no dubious language that our present 'political aspirations' are or at all events ought to be, in the direction of annexation to the United States. Under these circumstances we are naturally led to enquire what will be the result of this 'loosening' of the bonds? Will the Grits adopt the 'enthusiastic and homogeneous' Opposition. The Nova Scotia wing of the party as we have shown, have informed us what is to be their 'enthusiastic' word. It is 'Down with the Union.' Will the Grits adopt the same? Will they inscribe upon their standard the legend 'Loosen the bonds cruelly imposed by Confederation,' or will they fight under one flag and their allies under another? These are pertinent questions, and say and do what the Grits leaders may, they are questions which the people of Ontario will have answered. The members of the Nova Scotia Opposition in the columns of their acknowledged organ declare they will unite with no party in Ontario or Quebec who do not pledge themselves to assist in breaking up the Union, or as they call it, 'loosening the bonds cruelly imposed by the Act of Confederation,' and it is then directly stated that after five years waiting allies have been secured. If this means anything, it means that the leaders of the Ontario Grits have pledged themselves to assist in breaking up the Union. And these are the men who have the impudence to ask the people of Canada to entrust the administration of public affairs to them and their annexation friends in Nova Scotia. What do all the manifest whining of the Opposition organ about its 'loyalty' and its affection for the 'loyalty' amount to, when we find the men whom it represents contented to ally themselves with those who stow their hostility to our present constitution, merely for the sake of achieving a party triumph?"

"Oh, but it says the present government are 'reckless.' It falls how to tell us in what their recklessness consists. Their endorsement of the Washington Treaty is allied to as a crime, yet we cannot help thinking it would seem far more 'reckless' on the part of the Canadian Government to have consented to accede to the treaty than to have refused to accede to it as they did. What is more, we have to be satisfied in saying that Mr. Mackenzie and Mackenzie had held seats on the Ministerial side of the House, they could not have adopted any other course, unless indeed their Annexation colleagues had compelled them to do so in the hope of producing a bad feeling between Canada and the Mother Country. In what have the Government been reckless? Because they have undertaken a restriction of public property, which are necessary to our progress, and have done so with the understanding that not one dollar is to be added to our taxation? It is because last year the annual burdens of the country were reduced to the extent of \$800,000, and this year were diminished by upwards of \$1,200,000? Is it because this year after year taxation diminishes and revenue increases, because energetic steps are taken to open up our magnificent country in the North West, because the scheme of British North American Union is being faithfully carried out, and we are not to be disappointed in our expectation of achieving a great triumph at the next elections. It advances them not to reckon too much upon it, and then repeats its usual statement to the effect that the Opposition were 'never a united and enthusiastic, more homogeneous or more cordial than they are now.' Of course we all know that this is a mere assertion, and is altogether opposed to the truth. What amount of unity or enthusiasm, what homogeneity or confidence can there be in a party constituted as the Opposition is? Even supposing that they were able to defeat the present Government and obtain office, it would be impossible for them to carry on the public business for any length of time, from the utter lack of unity of purpose among and how many conflicting elements and hostile political ideas. At present the only unity which exists among them, such as it is, is solely the result of their desire for office and power which animates them. Upon no one great question are they united. They are not battling for any great ideal or political principle upon which they all think and feel alike. The only link which unites the various parties which constitute this "enthusiastic," this "homogeneous" Opposition is hatred for Sir John Macdonald's Government and the desire of office for themselves. Such a faint and feeble union is not a union at all, and it is not a union which can be relied upon to do anything for the benefit of the country. The origin of Mr. Jones and the other

DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

THE SENATE.

Wednesday, June 5.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the National Association of Canadian Assurance Companies of Canada, and it was read at the table, and then referred to a Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON presented report of Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, favorable to reception of petitions from several Boards of Trade, and of J. Smith and others, for railway objects. Also, on bills establishing St. Catherine's Board of Trade, and incorporating Island Marine and Fire Insurance Company, and London and Canadian Loan Office, all of which were read a third time and passed.

COPYRIGHTS.

The House then went into Committee on the bill to amend the law respecting Copyrights.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER in the chair.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL presented the pleasure he felt that Hon. Mr. Ryan had always taken so deep an interest in the question was presented to give the benefit of his knowledge of the matter.

Hon. Mr. LETELIER DE ST. JUST doubted the advisability of prohibiting the importation of books and newspapers from the United States, and he was opposed to it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said it was the invariable practice to prohibit importation of works which were copyrighted in England or the United States.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU contended that the bill, if passed, would not only be antagonistic to Imperial legislation but actually in conflict with a Treaty existing between Great Britain and France. The 15th and 17th sections of the Imperial Act expressly stated that the rights of British copyrights should extend only to Great Britain, and yet it was now proposed to pass a bill in the face of that Imperial statute. He contended that even if the British Government had consented to anything except Canadian copyright works—it could not be retrospective.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the very preamble of the Bill stated the reasons why the Government believed Canada could legislate directly on such a subject, and it was contended that since it was passed the British Parliament had also passed the British North America Act, which gave power to legislate with respect to copyrights; and it was a well understood principle that when the Legislature expressed its opinion as to the law to be applied, it was to be applied.

The Union Act was broad, and applied to copyrights generally, and could not be limited as the hon. gentleman argued. He contended that the Government could have no possible objection whatever with the matter before the House. That Treaty referred to French copyrights, and not to British. It was surprising that learned gentlemen should bring it up. Canada had representative institutions, and it was claimed by the hon. gentleman that we had under these institutions the right to deal with such a question as Imperial legislation. He contended that we had under these institutions the right to deal with such a question as Imperial legislation. He contended that we had under these institutions the right to deal with such a question as Imperial legislation.

Hon. Mr. DORRIS said that no complaint had been made, that certain public officers should be ex officio Returning Officers, and that the Government might appoint as Returning Officer whomsoever they pleased.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD said that under an Act of last session, and moved that the bill be not now read, but be read a second time three months hence.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU again urged his view of the subject.

Hon. Mr. RYAN expressed his astonishment that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) should suppose that the Government would be in a position to propose a bill to give effect to the Act of 1849, and that he would be in a position to propose a bill to give effect to the Act of 1849.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD said that he had never heard of a single charge of impropriety in the House or out of it against a Returning Officer.

Hon. Mr. H. L. VON said that he had always understood the cry of "hear, hear!" to have been given to the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, in taking exception to it. While he expressed his regret to emphasize any of the particular statements of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that the hon. gentleman was libelous. It provided that Ministers of Ontario should not sit or vote in the Dominion Legislature. The hon. gentleman had been strenuously denying. He was now an avowed newspaper proprietor, and was some extent responsible for newspaper utterances.

Hon. Mr. DORRIS contended that not less than ten constituencies were disfranchised by the corrupt conduct of Returning Officers.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD stated that the bill was not now read, but be read a second time three months hence.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved concurrence in amendments to the Bill to incorporate the Antioch Company.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD said the bill should be read a third time.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved concurrence in amendments to the Bill to incorporate the Antioch Company.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD said the bill should be read a third time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, June 5, 1872.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 2 o'clock.

A discussion arose in the second reading of the Act to extend the law respecting the duties on the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. WOOD (Bran) thought there was no necessity for such a bill, or that it would diminish revenue.

Hon. Mr. J. A. MACDONALD replied to the objection raised, and alluded to the good effects which had sprung from the passage of a Bill for the purpose of extending the law respecting the duties on wine, &c.

Hon. Mr. GRAY thought the details of the Bill were covered up in such an extraordinary way that it was impossible to vote for it. He thought there would be a great deal of trouble if the Bill were carried. It was a monstrous piece of legislation. The hon. gentleman had not been satisfied with the Bill. He thought the people of New Brunswick would be justly angry if they were asked to vote for it. He thought the relations between landlord and tenant were not the same here as in England. He had been present at several meetings of the law, and had been struck with the quiet way in which elections had been carried out.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the House divided on the amendment. The House divided on the amendment.