

based upon no information which the Senators have. There is no petition before the Senate that I have heard of, showing reasons why this resolution should pass, or setting forth the claims of the gentleman to whom he refers; but while I object to the motion, I beg leave to state that I know nothing whatever of the merits of the artist who is referred to. It is one of the objections which I have to the passing of this resolution—that there is no sufficient evidence before the House, even supposing it were one of the privileges of the Senate to pass a resolution which involves the expenditure of public money. After long experience in this House and in other legislative bodies, I am not aware that a similar motion to that has ever been proposed in the upper branch of any legislature that I have had experience of. There is no precedent for it, and I trust, under those circumstances, that the hon. member will see that however much merit this artist may possess, the course which the hon. gentleman has taken is not one which can be adopted by the Senate, and that he will, after having expressed his opinion of the merits of this gentleman as an artist in the eloquent terms he has done, deem it desirable to withdraw his motion.

HON. MR. BOURINOT—I have listened to the remarks of the hon. mover of this resolution. No doubt his views to some extent meet with the approval of every one who has heard them. But the question arises whether the resolution should be introduced in this hon. House. In my opinion it ought not be entertained here at all. If the object of the mover is simply to recommend a sculptor as a person entitled to some support from this House, he has accomplished it. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has anticipated many of the remarks which I intended to make at the outset. I am glad that he has spoken because he can do so more effectively than I can. I endorse his views. I look upon the course taken by the hon. gentleman from Woodstock (Mr. Alexander) as being one that should not in any way be encouraged, as it is making use of the Senate as a sort of advertising medium to make known the talents of artists, and many others might take advantage of this precedent if it were in any way countenanced. The hon.

gentleman's remarks were very eloquently expressed and were very creditable to him, and now that he has spoken, I hope he will withdraw his resolution.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER — If the House will permit I will give three precedents from the House of Lords for the course which I propose. In 1852, the House of Lords appointed a select Committee to inquire into the claims of Baron de Bode for pecuniary relief, in respect to a certain claim against the Government; and in the following year Lord Lyndhurst moved a resolution, based upon the report of this Committee, "earnestly recommending this claim to the favorable consideration of the Government."

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—What has that to do with it? This is a different thing altogether.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER.—It is a matter affecting money. In 1860, a Lord's Committee upon Floating Breakwaters, &c., recommended "that a sum not exceeding £10,000 be placed at the disposal of the Admiralty," to enable that department to test any plans for the suitable construction of such works.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD.—Was it recommended by a message to the House?

HON. MR. ALEXANDER (continuing)—On July 5, 1861, Lord Shaftesbury moved an address to the Queen, in favor of the extension throughout India, of the best systems of irrigation and internal navigation. The previous question was proposed on this motion, on the ground that the Government were themselves prepared to carry out the principle advocated as fully as possible, but would consider "the adoption of such an abstract resolution to be inconvenient." The House of Lords have on many occasions taken such a course, not that they actually make positive substantive motion for a money vote, but wherever they feel that it is in the public interest, they make such a recommendation. I have shown three precedents from the House of Lords, and Todd's Parliamentary Practice states with regard to these questions that they were decided merely upon their merits, and not upon any question of the constitution-