

large amounts in the Savings Banks. I think up to 1876 or 1877, there was no limit to the amount received; then it was limited by Order in Council to \$10,000, and subsequently, in 1880, it was reduced to \$3,000. I think the practice in England, and this country for some time, was to receive deposits of charitable societies for larger sums than the limit, on the ground that they are supposed to be the collection of savings of a number of individuals gathered together.

STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BECHARD asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to order the demolition of the wharf which the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company have erected, without authorization, in the middle of the Chambly River, and occupying about two-thirds of the said river alongside of the bridge of the said company, in the vicinity of the towns of St. John's and Iberville?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I have the honor to say to the hon. member, that the attention of the Government has already been called to that matter.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a word with reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) in the discussion of the motion of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) is reported in *Hansard* to have said:

"I find, Sir, that the Ontario and Pacific Railway, running through Cornwall to Perth, has been bonded to the extent of \$262,400, and that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) are stockholders in that company."

Then the hon. gentleman said again:

"I find, Sir, that in 1885 this Parliament granted to the Ottawa, Waddington and Northern Transportation Railway \$166,000, and that the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), the hon. members for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé and Mr. Mackintosh) are stockholders in the company."

I simply wish to say, in reference to those statements, that I am not now and never have been a stockholder in either of those companies. I regret I was temporarily absent when these statements were made, and was consequently unable to deny them then, but I take this, the first opportunity which presents itself, to make the denial.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call attention to a matter in connection with the debate of the 4th inst. In giving a list of applicants for coal land leases, I mentioned the name of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as one of the applicants, and the following words were exchanged between us, as reported in the *Hansard* :—

"Mr. HAGGART. An application that I made? For what?"

"Mr. CHARLTON. A coal lease.

"Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not.

"Mr. CHARLTON. I found your name in the returns.

"Mr. HAGGART. No, you did not.

"Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will hunt it up."

I have hunted it up, and this is the document:

"OTTAWA, December 9th, 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honor to apply for a mining location, being west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of second meridian, and I will comply with all the requirements of the Statute and the regulations of the Department.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"JOHN HAGGART.

"The Hon. the Minister of Interior,
"Ottawa."

Mr. MCLELAN.

"OTTAWA, December 15th, 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., applying for a coal mine location, being the west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of the second principal meridian, North-West Territory.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. RUSSELL,

"For the Minister of Interior.

"JOHN HAGGART, Esq., M.P.,

"Perth, Ontario."

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Mr. BLAKE. In pursuance of the Orders of the Day, and for the reasons I stated on Tuesday, no intimation having reached me from any member of the House that any portion of this motion is, in its form or substance, objectionable, I beg to move in the form of which I gave notice:

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada and the people whom they represent in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government, still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882 when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an Address to which this House affirms its abiding adhesion; Humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland;

And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure may be affirmed, and that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Without referring to what has already taken place when this motion was brought before this House on a former occasion, I feel bound to offer a few remarks with regard to the position that I then took, and the position that I intend to take to-day on that subject. It is, no doubt, felt by many of our friends in different parts of the country that the Parliament of Canada ought to be again asked to express an opinion on the subject of Home Rule, or to express its sympathy with the people of Ireland in their efforts to obtain that system of government which we prize so highly in this country. It is no secret, nor did I intend that it should be, because full publicity was given to the facts, that representative men of one very prominent Irish society of this city called upon me, urging the propriety of moving some resolution on this question. Their object, of course, was not to consult with me as to the desirability, or otherwise, of taking that step, because those who have read the reports of the proceedings of the society will see that, in the first place, the society decided that that was the proper step to take, that some resolution should be moved, and they then decided that a committee should ask me to take that step. The reasons that I gave them, I think, hold good at present. I stated, and I repeat now, that, if on that occasion we had not been successful, and whether hopeful of success now or not, if we had failed on that occasion, we might and it would be our duty to make another attempt to gain an expression of sympathy from so important a body as this is. Then, having succeeded beyond, as I stated before, the most sanguine expectations of the most earnest Irishmen in this country, in obtaining a unanimous expression of sympathy from this Parliament in favor of the Irish people and the constitutional agitation they were carrying on for the attainment of that system of government and those constitutional privileges which we enjoy in this country and cherish so highly, I believed, for one, that it was not only not prudent or advisable, but that we had no just reason for asking Parliament to take this question up again. I noticed that in some of the city papers giving my reasons for refusing to move in that direction when I was called upon to do so, it was declared that I stated that my reason was that