

gument and policy to suit the locality. I am pointing this out to show they were not honest; they had no policy. They advocated reciprocity in one place, commercial union with the United States in another, and now they demand what they call free trade as it is understood in England. The position resembles that of two farmers, owning adjoining farms. We are asked to take down our fences and allow our neighbour's cattle to come in and eat up our pasture while we cannot send our cattle into their pasture. The opposition claim in effect that our industries must be destroyed and paralyzed whilst our neighbours keep up their high protection.

At six o'clock the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned at six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, April 25th, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.) rose to ask the government:

1st. If James Fitzsimmons was dismissed from the Deputy Wardenship of the British Columbia Penitentiary? If so, what was the date of his dismissal?

2nd. Has James Fitzsimmons been reappointed Deputy Warden of the British Columbia Penitentiary? If so, what was the date of his reappointment?

He said: It was my intention to follow up this by asking for a return of the instructions issued to the Royal Commission that sat last year to investigate the charges of irregularity and wrong doing on the part of the warden and deputy warden and other officers of the British Columbia Penitentiary, also for a copy of the evidence that was taken before that commission and the report to the government of the Hon. Judge

Drake, the commissioner, on the evidence taken, but since placing this notice on the order paper I see that the hon. gentleman who represents New Westminster District in the House of Commons, Mr. Corbould, has called for the very documents that I want. If they are brought down in the other House within a reasonable time I shall of course be saved the trouble of asking for them here, but I hope they will be brought down within a reasonable time and, when submitted, that they will be printed and not merely a type-written copy placed on the table. I want a copy of them to be put in the hands of every member of both Houses for the very good reason that it is an important question indeed, not only to the people of British Columbia but a question involving a principle which is of interest to the whole Dominion. It has given rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction in British Columbia, and if there is justification for that dissatisfaction, I think it is only right and proper that we should have the whole case before us, so that hon. gentlemen can weigh the evidence and judge for themselves.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Before answering this question, I desire to point out the very great inconvenience that must always arise from asking questions of this character and making speeches or drawing deductions from the answers which may be given, for the reason that the House is not in possession of the facts and consequently is not in a position to judge of the merits of the case properly. I am very glad that my hon. friend did not pursue the course that is very often followed, in discussing a subject merely upon a question placed on the notice paper. I do not criticise the correctness or incorrectness of the rule which prevails here. I know that it does exist in the House of Lords in England to some extent, and to a less extent in the House of Commons. I have sat in the gallery of that House and heard these questions put and discussed for hours. The Speaker, however, always keeps the discussion within the limits of the question asked, and does not allow the debate to drift into other questions. I do not think, however, it is a good plan; I like the course pursued in our own country best—simple questions and simple answers without any affirmation whatever of the correctness or incorrectness of the question