

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—Yes. If we had risen without reporting anything, it would have been killing the Bill; instead of doing so we sent the Bill back to the House.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Yes, but the hon. gentleman said: 'Has the committee not power to kill the Bill?' I said not. The hon. gentleman said that the committee could clause by clause reject each clause of the Bill.

The SPEAKER—There is nothing before the House.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—It is a question of explanation of what I said yesterday.

POSITION OF COLONELS AT TERCENTENARY.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

Has any provision been made or will any be made by the militia authorities to give honorary colonels and honorary lieutenant-colonels of regiments a fitting position in the military turnout at Quebec on the occasion of the tercentenary?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The answer is: It is usual, at all important military reviews, to reserve a space for the accommodation of officers in uniform, among whom honorary colonels and lieutenant colonels of regiments would, of course, be included, close to the saluting flag.

An arrangement of this sort will be made at Quebec on the occasion of the military review, subject, of course, to the requirements of the National Battlefields Commission. All other celebrations in connection with the Quebec Tercentenary are in the hands of the National Battlefields Commission and not of the Militia Department.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Are we to understand that the Department of Militia surrenders their power to the Crown?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—On other occasions than the review. At the military review, space is reserved for officers in uniform; but on the other occasions the Commission takes precedence.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—I would point out to the hon. minister the point that my hon. friend from Stadacona is aiming it:

Under the Militia and Queen's Regulations, the colonels have a right to fall in at the rear of the staff at the saluting point; but if I remember correctly—I may be wrong—they have to fall in on foot. Would you ask the honorary colonels holding important positions—like Lord Strathcona and others—to fall in on foot behind all the generals who will be at Quebec on horseback? I think that is what my hon. friend meant. The hon. minister might ascertain whether they would fall in mounted or dismounted?

AN EXPLANATION.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation. Yesterday when the Bill respecting the hotel site at Ottawa was before the House, I understood the hon. senator from Wellington to make a personal reflection on me, and I retorted as I thought somewhat in kind. Since then, I have looked at the report of the debates and find that I heard the hon. gentleman incorrectly, and that he made no personal reflection. I am sorry, therefore, that under a misapprehension I retorted as I did.

ACCUSATIONS AGAINST J. McGOVERN.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

1. What is the precise nature of the accusations brought forth against Mr. J. McGovern, foreman on the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Rivière du Loup?
2. Who was appointed commissioner to hold the inquiry?
3. When was the appointment made, and when and where did the inquiry take place?
4. When was the finding given, and what is it?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to put that question to the minister in the other House.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I have not been elected to the Commons.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—But the hon. gentleman has friends there.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I have a right to put the question here.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes, I presume the hon. gentleman has. I think with my hon.