

Hon. Mr. TUPPER took occasion to attack the Government, charging them with having advocated one thing in opposition, and with acting otherwise by Order in Council, in the heat of an election, and for the purpose of securing the election of a Government supporter. He was glad that the motion had been made.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he had no objection to bringing down the information asked for. The hon. gentleman opposite had succeeded in placing the matter a little unfairly before the House. He had said that the Government and their supporters were formerly opposed to the tariffs on these railways. He could tell him that they found fault with them still. (*Hear, hear.*) He explained that the Order in Council only made the rates the same as they were on other Government railways. Arrangements were made for the change before the members left the city of Ottawa last session; and he could inform the hon. member for Cumberland that the election would have been gained for the Government in any case. (*Hear, hear.*)

The motion was carried.

* * *

ST. PETER'S CANAL

Mr. FLYNN moved for reports, plans, specifications and estimates made in connection with the contemplated extension of St. Peter's Canal.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he was perfectly willing to agree to the motion, but all the papers asked for could not be brought down. The specifications and some other things were not completed.

The motion was then carried.

* * *

IMPORTATIONS OF RAILWAY CARS FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALKER moved for a return of the number of railway cars, both freight and passenger, that have been imported at various times from the United States by our Canadian Railway Companies, since the 1st day of January, 1873; also the value of the goods and the duties paid on the same by each individual Company.

* * *

AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS

Mr. ORTON moved for a suspension of the rule in reference to Select Committees, and an increase in the number of members of the Committee on agricultural interests, in order to add the following names:—Messrs. Sinclair, McGregor, Bunster, Montplaisir, McDonnell, Biggar, Monteith and Ferris. He moved to increase the membership at the Committee to twenty-one, with a quorum of seven instead of five.

Mr. DYMOND said that before the motion was carried, he thought it would only be respectful to the House to let them know

something of the causes which led to its being moved. When the hon. gentleman proposed the Committee to enquire into the interests of agriculture—no small interest, as the hon. gentleman told them at the time—he complained that in this House it was not fairly represented. He (Mr. Dymond) supposed about four-fifths of the members of the House might be said to represent the agricultural interests. They either represented agricultural counties, or they sat for constituencies which were dependent to a great extent upon agriculture for their prosperity.

Yet he was credibly informed that it had been found impossible to get a quorum of five righteous men to save the great agricultural interests from destruction. (*Cheers and laughter.*) He thought this showed there was something radically wrong in this matter; that the hon. gentleman had run beyond the reaching of wisdom in proposing this Committee and that it was very desirable that he should receive assistance from some gentlemen of larger experience who would be able to help him out of what he (Mr. Dymond) thought was a serious dilemma.

He (Mr. Dymond) did not know precisely, his parliamentary knowledge being so limited, upon which principle these Committees were appointed. He had thought, when a Committee of this kind was proposed, it was generally refused, unless a majority of the House had something like a sympathy with its object. He knew, of course, that it was not competent for him, at that stage, to discuss the propriety of appointing the Committee in question, but he thought they had evidence, first in the proposal to reduce the quorum and now to add to the Committee, that the whole matter required reconsideration, so far as that was possible at the hands of the House.

He was not himself an agriculturist, having hardly, perhaps, acquired the qualification which Brigham Young demanded of his emigrants, viz., that they should be able to grow a cabbage, but he represented a large agricultural constituency, and he was anxious that his constituents should not imagine that their interests were being trifled with either by a Committee or by the House at large. This was in reality trifling with them, unless there were some real purpose to be gained—unless the hon. gentleman could get up in his place, and show that by enlarging this Committee he was going to do something for the agricultural interest. When the hon. gentleman moved for his Committee, he was warned that, as upon a former occasion, it would prove a failure, it being a simple repetition, if the expression were Parliamentary, of old jokes of the same kind.

He (Mr. Dymond) therefore ventured to move that instead of the last three names on the list, the names of the hon. members for London (Mr. Walker), Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and Waterloo South (Mr. Young) be substituted. He thought these gentlemen would help the mover of the motion in bringing the matter to an issue, although not perhaps the issue he expected when the motion was proposed. (*Cheers and laughter.*)