

darker on the Opposition side of the House, and I determined to throw more light upon them, so that they might see as well as we do. There is an item of \$2,500 to meet expenses of some repairs we did ourselves, and an item of \$7,500 for the engines below, wires and lamps connected with the electricity. These we have purchased. When we called for tenders, our idea was that, if we found the experiment a success we would purchase the engines and other apparatus at the rate tendered for, but if we did not find it a success, then the tenderers would have to remove their engines without any cost to the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not seen the electric light on the Senate side, and do not know how it works there, but I must confess to some disappointment from the result on this side. The light does not commend itself to me, as I had hoped, from what I had seen of the Edison electric light in other places. But I do not think it has had quite a fair trial, and I should be sorry to see the hon. gentleman adopt permanently any such plans of electric lighting as is now adopted. The lights are too low. The great advantage of the electric light is that you can get it high up, first of all; and secondly, with a comparatively small expense, you can diffuse it through the whole room. In the dining room of the House of Commons the light is so low that when you are standing it is almost on a level with the eye, which makes it very disagreeable. The same observation applies, to a considerable extent, in the other rooms where the lights are used. I have seen them in very high rooms of a private mansion, just up in the ceiling, and diffused all over the room. I have seen a large drawing room which, I suppose, was about 20 feet high, with forty-two lights all over the ceiling, and the result was a diffused light all over the room, of a most delightful kind. Instead of that, when you have the light concentrated, as in the House of Commons restaurant, with three groups of three or four lights each, and when it is as low as it is there, it is not satisfactory—it is disagreeable from its brightness, being near the level of the eye. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt the electric light permanently in the building—I hope he will not do so without considering these suggestions. The real advantage of electric light, apart from the question of coolness, of its heat rays being so few compared with its light rays, is the possibility, in consequence of the coolness, of its being put high up in a room, and in consequence of the facility of sending the wires wherever you like, you can, with very little additional expense, diffuse the light all over the room. These are the two advantages, but we do not gain them at all by the present plan. I must confess that I would prefer—if I was offered a choice of the old gas lights in the dining room and the electric light—I would prefer the gas lights.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right about these lights being too low down, but we placed them there for the reason that we did not wish to disturb the gas lights, so that we might be able to use them in case the electric light did not work well. Therefore, in order to avoid the danger of a failure of the new light and the danger of expense, we directed the workmen to put their lights on the gas chandeliers. It was an experiment. If it answers tolerably well in that way, then we shall remove these lamps and put the electric lights at the proper height, so that we may have all the benefit which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, of having the electric lights at the proper height. If hon. gentlemen will be kind enough to go to the Senate they will find that the light there is much more brilliant. It is placed higher up and seems to be a better light than that on this side—I must say that frankly, and I expressed that opinion to my officers. I said to them that, in my opinion, the light on the Senate side was the stronger and brighter light, and that seems to be the general impression. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, because it has only confirmed my opinion—

and if we adopt the light we shall have to change the lamps.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:15 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 5th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. WHITE moved the adoption of the Seventh Report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Report concurred in.

### PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

Mr. BEATY moved that the time for receiving Private Bills be extended to Monday, 7th instant, and that for presenting reports, to Saturday, 12th inst.

Mr. BLAKE. Are we to understand that all hope of procuring at Easter has been abandoned?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. member will explain the object of the Committee in making the recommendation.

Mr. BEATY. From the observations made by hon. members it appeared not quite certain that the House would not sit on the week after next. It was thought that this Bill (London Life Assurance Company's Bill, which is deemed of public importance, might not reach its final stage until next Saturday.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am satisfied that members of the House do not mean to sit any such length of time. If the time were extended to Monday next it would be sufficient, as business can be got through in that time.

Mr. BLAKE moved to strike out Saturday and insert Wednesday.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It seems to me that the House ought fairly to consider whether the practice which is springing up is one which should be encouraged. This Bill is simply a Private Bill regulating the internal affairs of an insurance company. There is no public interest connected with it, and the Bill is not of such a character as to justify the House in setting aside its rules. If this practice is to be continued, then those who have doubtful Bills to introduce should not give notice, but petition the House at the end of the Session for permission to bring in the Bills, and the very fact that this is permitted will be taken as showing the urgency of the legislation. I will vote against the amendment if I stand alone. We should at once stop the practice which is growing on the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I entirely concur with every word uttered by the hon. member for Cardwell. It is perfectly monstrous, unless a Bill is of such importance that the Government deem it is in the public interest to pass it, that it should be brought in at this time. It makes utterly useless every precaution to protect private interests; and if the hon. gentleman wants a seconder to any motion bearing on the subject, I will be happy to act as such.