

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). That is our present intention, but I am willing to have the matter considered. If a change is to be made, it will be announced to-morrow, in connection with the arrangement for the adjournment. We have no present intention, however, to make any change.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MORRISON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a matter which is probably only of personal import. It is in reference to some remarks made by me during the debate on the Yukon Railway Bill. My attention has been called to the fact that in the "Hansard" report of my remarks, referring to the reports of Dr. Dawson and Mr. Ogilvie, I made use of the following words:—

I venture to say that there is not a capitalist in this country who would wish to invest \$100,000 upon the strength of Mr. Ogilvie's or Dr. Dawson's report upon a gold mine.

Until my attention was drawn to these words, I was not aware that I had limited that remark to a gold mine. I was talking of the reports published by Dr. Dawson and Mr. Ogilvie, particularly Dr. Dawson's report of 1887, revised in 1898, and what I was contending was that nobody would be justified in investing money on the strength of those published reports. "Hansard" has it that I added the words, "on a gold mine." To the extent that that may be a reflection on Dr. Dawson, I wish in the most unreserved way to withdraw those words. It was not my intention in any way to refer to Dr. Dawson professionally, but rather to his published report as a surveyor, and not as an expert on gold mines; and if any misunderstanding has arisen in regard to Dr. Dawson's ability as a mining expert, I would be the last person in the world to make any adverse comment. I wish to make this explanation so that if any injury is done to Dr. Dawson, he may know that, so far as my intention is concerned, I did not wish to convey that idea. I am very sorry the words appear as they do. I will not say the words were not used as they appear in the revised report in "Hansard," but they escaped my attention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps it would be desirable, as the matter is of some importance, if the hon. gentleman would say now, with the error before him, what he really intended to say, or what he would say now.

Mr. MORRISON. I thought I stated what I intended to say. I was speaking about the published reports of Dr. Dawson of 1887 and 1898, and Mr. Ogilvie's reports; and I made the remark that I considered that Mr. Ogilvie's report on a gold mine would be of little value in ascertaining the

value of a gold mine, he being a surveyor and not an expert mining engineer. With this remark, in one instance, I coupled the name of Dr. Dawson; but I was talking about his report to the Geological Survey, not on gold mines at all, but on the topography of the country; but the words were added, "on a gold mine." I did not wish to say that capitalists would not be justified in investing on the strength of Dr. Dawson's report on a gold mine, because I think that Dr. Dawson's report on a gold mine, if he had the time and opportunity of investigating it, would be as good as that of any man undertaking to so report. I wish to offset any impression that the addition of the words "on a gold mine" might create, because I certainly had no intention of conveying the idea that a report by Dr. Dawson on a gold mine would be valueless.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to an entry on the Journals, page 216:

And the question being proposed to the House by Mr. Speaker: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?"—and Mr. Speaker being unable to decide from the voices as to the time of reading, he submitted the question to the determination of the House: "That the Bill be now read a third time." and the House resolved the question in the affirmative by the following vote.

Then the votes are recorded, and immediately afterwards appears the entry:

Mr. Hughes accordingly moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

Then there is an entry recording the fact that Mr. Maclean moved in amendment, that the Bill be not now read a third time, but recommended to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding certain clauses to it. That may be in exact accordance with what took place, but it certainly puts the House in the position of having voted twice on the same question. It would appear from the Journals, that after the House had resolved that the Bill be read a third time, an hon. member moved an amendment, and the House voted on that amendment. It seems to me that this record can hardly be correct.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I think that the entry is quite right as it is. The vote which was first taken was taken to decide whether the mover of the Bill was at liberty to move for its third reading now, and the House decided that he was. It was not on the third reading that we voted, but on the question whether the hon. member who moved the Bill would be allowed to move for its third reading at that particular moment.

Mr. ELLIS. If that be the case, then those words should be put in the motion, so that it would not appear on the Journals