

Mr. MILLS said the hon. member for Northumberland had proceeded to answer a speech made by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during another debate.

Mr. TUPPER said that, while such was true, the hon. Minister had reiterated his former statements.

Mr. DYMOND said he had not understood the Chairman to rule that the hon. member for Northumberland was in order. He, therefore, called upon the Chairman to rule whether that hon. member was in order or not.

Mr. MASSON said the hon. the Premier had told the Chairman he had no right to rule as he had done, and the hon. member for North York had expressed surprise at the ruling.

Mr. DYMOND said that all he desired was a ruling by the Chairman, and he would willingly bow to it.

Mr. MITCHELL said that, while he admitted that in the course of his remarks he had not spoken strictly to the question before the Chair, he had been led by the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to defend his action in a previous Session. He claimed he had a right to follow the hon. Minister in the reference he had made.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will confine himself to the resolution before the Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL said he was pointing out that the hon. Minister had chosen to refer to the subject in a manner that justified his (Mr. Mitchell's) administration of the affairs of the Department in connection with legislation on the question now before the Committee.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland): I did not say I undertook to justify the hon. member's administration of the Department while he was at its head. I pointed to a particular Act.

Mr. MITCHELL said he could point to more than one Act. He was endeavouring to show his (Mr. Mitchell's) justification, and that the hon. Minister had allowed an Act, which he had defended and extolled in the House, to remain a dead letter on the Statute-book.

Mr. TUPPER.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to speak to the question.

Mr. MITCHELL said he had shown that his hon. friend was not consistent in carrying out the measures which the hon. gentleman himself had advocated and supported, and which had been introduced by him (Mr. Mitchell). The hon. gentleman, therefore, need take no particular credit to himself when he said that he supported the Deck Load law, which was putting money in the pockets of the hon. gentleman and his friends here, and of other ship-owners in the Dominion.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland): How?

Mr. MITCHELL: By lessening the dues on your ships, by increasing your profits, and by making greater returns; that is how, and it is a very practical way.

Mr. SMITH: The ship-owners did not think so.

Mr. MITCHELL said he was in favour of this measure, but the hon. gentleman had chosen to say that he would not give this House any further information. He had known gentlemen in this House say they would not give information or details and he had afterwards known them to do so, and this not very long ago either. It was quite possible, too, that when the hon. gentleman had this measure before the House again they would obtain some more information respecting it. He (Mr. Mitchell) did not desire to protract the discussion. He had said what he had to say respecting this measure; he had done so in an intelligent manner, and he had endeavoured to make himself understood, and comprehended and felt. But when the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman opposite told him that he was not going to get information regarding a matter on which he had a right to procure information, particularly when the finances of the country were affected by it, he would endeavour to get it out of him by hook or crook before the hon. gentleman could have his measure passed through. He would reserve any further remarks he had to make, unless he was again called up, until the matter came before them in another shape.