

JUST ARRIVED FROM LONDON.

WHITE KID BOOTS. Kid Congress. Kid Shoes.

Black Kid Slippers. The most ever imported to Canada.

PALACE SHOE STORE. 107, SPARKS STREET.

Local Intelligence.

NEW FRANCHISE—A woman named Thomson, from the country, fell on the ice at the By Ward Market yesterday, fracturing her right arm severely.

PROOF PROOF—A few pairs still left at The Dominion Shoe Store, corner Sparks and O'Connor streets. (Get a pair.)

NUISANCE ABATE—The patent medicine and galvanic battery men have found their way back to the city markets, and into the pockets of the gullible ones.

CONVICTS—Dr. Wolf, of the Department of Agriculture, has so far recovered from his recent attack of erysipelas, as to be able to attend duty again.

THE WEATHER—The temperature was again very mild all yesterday, but to rain fell, and the forecast for today is that the weather will become more settled soon.

BRITISH MAIL—A mail for Great Britain per Canadian steamer, close at the Post Office here, at 12:05 to-morrow. Registered letters should be mailed one-half hour earlier.

DARK—Last night was as dark as Erebus, and Corporation lamps were hardly sufficient to render darkness tolerable. Some awkward collisions were the result.

THE STREETS—The streets and footways are still in a very disagreeable state, with slush and snow; though no rain fell yesterday, and pedestrianism is tiresome, difficult, and dangerous.

FOR THE FINE DRESS BALL—Ladies will wear in mind, that J. W. Ryan, of Wellington street, has carried out a series of costumes in silks, satins, tulle, and organzines, which he offers at exceedingly low prices.

THE NEW CHAUVIN BRIDGE—The contractors for this work commenced operations yesterday morning, when a large number of laboring men were employed. A large force were put on.

LOVE FEAST—A Love Feast, the first of the kind, was held at the Methodist Church last evening, when there was a large attendance. The services were altogether of a very interesting nature.

OVER—The dullness which has been reigning at the Police Station for some days, has been broken up by the fact that yesterday morning, their being three drunk, one larceny, and a civil case on the roll, who had to interview Mr. O'Gara.

SLIPPERY—The streets were in a very slippery state last evening, and walking was most disagreeable. A gentleman in the Wellington street, yesterday, slipped and fell on his back; the picture he presented on recovering himself was anything but an enviable one.

MESS' and Child's Rubbers at cost price, and other goods, always go to 43-46 Broad W. A. Lamb's.

HOOK AND LADDER COMPANY—At a meeting of the Sapere Hook and Ladder Company, held on Tuesday night, the following officers were elected for the coming six months:—W. O. McKay, re-elected Captain; J. Dyer, re-elected Lieutenant; J. D. Doran, re-elected Secretary; M. Lapointe, re-elected Treasurer; J. Ricard, re-elected Engineer; L. Ricard, re-elected Bugler.

OUT FOR PRACTICE—The "Conqueror" fire engine was out for practice yesterday, and threw a fine stream clear over the tower on the George street Station. A considerable crowd gathered around to see the performance, and just when the stream was at its strongest, a part of the hose burst, scattering their right and left styles. The water of the tower got a thorough drenching.

A SERMON—We have been favoured with a copy of a sermon preached by the Rev. Canon Bedford Jones, LL.D., on Sunday, January 2nd, 1876, in the Church of St. Alban the Martyr, Ottawa, on "Edification."

LABRETY—Henry Charles, a boy sixteen years of age, the son of respectable parents, has been sentenced at the Police Court to four months imprisonment and hard labour, for stealing a cloth coat, cap and some other articles from a neighbour's house. This sentence His Worship, Mr. O'Gara, passed as a light one, but it ought to be sufficient to make other boys keep their hands from picking and stealing.

NEW GAS LIGHTS—Messrs. Lambert, Meech & Co., Wellington street, have purchased the patent right of the "Bell Vapor Burner," which they are introducing in this city in great quantities.

THE QUALIFICATIONS of the gas are that it gives a light equal to ordinary coal gas, steady and brilliant, and it is as cheap as coal oil. The firm are prepared to supply on any orders they receive.

OUT AGAIN—Mary Higgins was tripping round the market yesterday, as bright as ever, and that, too, not five minutes after her liberation from Castle Powell, if she received the twenty-four hours sentence imposed upon her by Mr. O'Gara the previous day. May look by if she will soon be completely recovered from the mania she received at the hands of Coghlan, which was at one time thought to have endangered her life.

W. A. LAMB is offering all goods at great reductions for cash during this month. Call and prove the assertion, at 43-46 Broad on Sussex street.

ERRATA—Some slight typographical errors occurred in the letter of "Spectator" in the report of the annual meeting of the Protestant Orphan's Home, that it is under contemplation to erect a new Home of more capacity and convenience than the building at present used for that purpose. The site has been purchased, and as it is on an airy and pleasant locality, it may reasonably be expected that Ottawa will soon have another fine public building added to its many institutions of a similar kind. The work will not be commenced as soon, but as soon as practicable.

THE DOMINION BOARD OF TRADE.

SECOND DAY.

In our report of yesterday's proceedings Mr. Joseph (Quebec) was made to say that he strongly opposed the adoption of the appointment of official commissioners under the Insolvency Act, and Bank Inspectors, whereas he vigorously opposed it. The error occurred by reason of the non-observance of the name of the speaker from the chair; one gentleman advocated the appointment, and he was mistaken by our reporter for Mr. Joseph.

The day proceedings were opened by the calling of the roll and the reading of the minutes of the previous day's meeting.

CANADIAN LLOYDS. Mr. DIXON moved a resolution, urging the Government to at once establish a Canadian Lloyds for the survey and registration of Canadian ships.

In speaking to the motion, he cited several instances where the interests of shipowners had suffered from undue interference by the British Lloyds' surveyors. He used strong arguments in favour of the establishment of a Canadian Lloyds, where vessels could be classified and rated according to their condition and capacity. He thought that undue interference was exercised in England by a Canadian shipper.

Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL (King's County, N.B.) said the idea of a Canadian Lloyds was first introduced by the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, in 1867, and now the question has assumed most serious importance. He stated that the shipping of the year now amounted to 10,000,000 tons, representing a money value of \$300,000,000, of which a large proportion was owned by the Dominion of Canada. In a very long speech he advocated the establishment of a Canadian Lloyds, and the intervention of the Canadian Government to prevent the British Board of Trade from interfering with Canadian shipping.

A VISIT FROM MINISTERS. At this juncture the Hon. Messrs. Smith (Marine and Fisheries) and Bourne (Customs) entered, and were received with an outburst of applause.

Mr. WATSON (St. John, N.B.) moved in amendment to the resolution, that a Lloyds, if established, should be placed on the same footing as the similar institutions in England and other countries.

Mr. HARRISON (St. John, N.B.) spoke in favour of the establishment of a Lloyds, and cited the Bureau Ver's established in France some years ago, stating that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

Mr. GRANT (Quebec) spoke to a similar effect. He alluded to the ideas of Mr. Hainsworth, which he carried out in the Dominion of Canada, and stated that the rating of vessels by that institution was accepted all over the world. He claimed the same right for Canada which owned one quarter of the whole tonnage of the world's shipping.

Mr. FAIRBANKS (St. John, N.B.) and Mr. DONALD (Quebec) also spoke upon the subject, and the Hon. J. D. Dufferin, who presided, said that he had to-day struck upon the question by the Board of Trade, existing in Canada relative to the loading of vessels and their sea worthiness.

He thought, however, that the duty should be general, and not confined to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HAYES (New York) said that it had come under his knowledge that tea dealers in New York had been selling tea at the rate of 100 cents per pound in California. He mentioned this fact, because it had been said that the imposition of the duty, and there was no doubt but that they would, as it was now, tea merchants in the United States were stocked. The market was completely overstocked.

A long discussion took place upon the subject, and finally the amendment was ruled out by a majority of 11 to 11. The following result:—Yeas, 26; nays, 11.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC. The Hon. JOHN YOUNG read a long paper on the subject of transportation, and traffic as respecting the Northwestern States and the Northwest Territories of the Dominion. He contended for moving a series of resolutions on the subject, to be submitted to the Government.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

He thought, however, that the duty should be general, and not confined to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HAYES (New York) said that it had come under his knowledge that tea dealers in New York had been selling tea at the rate of 100 cents per pound in California. He mentioned this fact, because it had been said that the imposition of the duty, and there was no doubt but that they would, as it was now, tea merchants in the United States were stocked. The market was completely overstocked.

A long discussion took place upon the subject, and finally the amendment was ruled out by a majority of 11 to 11. The following result:—Yeas, 26; nays, 11.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC. The Hon. JOHN YOUNG read a long paper on the subject of transportation, and traffic as respecting the Northwestern States and the Northwest Territories of the Dominion. He contended for moving a series of resolutions on the subject, to be submitted to the Government.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal. He contended that the construction of the canal would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion, and that it would be a great benefit to the Dominion.

Mr. HAYES (New York) seconded the motion, and contended for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Canal.