

to the maritime ports, where a connection can be made with the Short Line Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WELDON. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in his place, but I understood that the whole of the proceedings of the committee in the Queen's County election case were to be reported. I notice, however, that it simply contains the resolutions which were adopted and the report of the sub-committee. I think all the proceedings should be given—the motions which were lost as well as those which were carried, as I think that is the usual course; at any rate, it was done in the Prince Edward Island case. I think the report should be amended by including the proceedings.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe that this report is neither one thing nor the other. One would have supposed that the committee would have adopted either the one course or the other—either report only the resolution to which the committee came, or report all the proceedings. But besides the reporting the resolutions adopted by the committee—and none others—the report includes the report which was made by a sub-committee created by the committee. Either this should not have been reported or all the motions should have been included, and I think the report should be amended.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The chairman of the committee will be here this afternoon, and I will speak to him on the subject.

Mr. EDGAR. I am a member of the committee, and I distinctly understood that all the proceedings should be reported. There was a little confusion about the time the committee adjourned—most of the members were standing when the motion was put, but I think it was clearly understood that the proceedings were to be reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think all the proceedings are usually reported.

Mr. BLAKE. There is generally a motion to that effect, and in compliance with it, it is generally done. I was informed by one member of the committee that the proceedings were to be reported, and now the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) states that that was his impression.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the motion was that the resolutions should all be reported, but it was a verbal motion, and was probably not understood by the clerk of the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. We had better have all the resolutions and the votes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly, I think they should all be reported. I think I mentioned in the motion that just the resolutions should be reported.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that either too much or too little has been reported. Either the sub-committee's report should not have been reported, or else all the proceedings should have been included.

Mr. McCARTHY. Quite so.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 68) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: I may just say, in explanation of this Bill, that one of its objects is to simplify the proceedings when a petition is presented for the repeal of the Scott Act, or, as the Act puts it, the revocation of the Order in Council bring-

ing the Act into force. As the law now stands the proceedings and forms that are given are applicable to introducing the Act into a county or city, but they are to be changed, the Act says, to suit the proceedings for the revocation of the Order in Council. But on the ballot, difficulties may arise with regard to these forms and proceedings, and difficulties have arisen. The ballot says those who vote one way are to vote for the petition, and those who vote the other way, against it; but doubts may arise—and I understand that, in several cases, difficulties have already arisen—as to whether voters were voting for the Act or against it, when the Act was submitted for repeal. I propose also by this Bill to repeal a very important clause, or rather one which has just come to be very important, and that is the one compelling a man and his wife to give evidence. As first interpreted by the courts it was held that a defendant was not to be compelled to answer questions which would criminate him, but a recent decision of the Chancery division of the High Court of Justice for the Province of Ontario has decided otherwise. I think, therefore, this provision is one which ought not to remain, and I propose to change it by saying that the husband may be a competent, but not a compellable, witness. I propose, also, to change the sub-sections of the Act with regard to the sale of beer and cider, in the direction in which I had the honor to move in the Session of 1885—that is, to permit those who are entitled to carry on the business of brewers to sell to parties in their own county. We know, that as the law is at present, while such parties may sell to those living out of the county, and while people living in the county may buy outside the county and bring it in, those carrying on the business of brewers in which the Act is in force cannot sell to people in that county, which I think is a very absurd provision. These provisions, along with others with reference to druggists—these latter also having been before Parliament—are the principal matters with which the Bill deals.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT ON THE 18TH INST.

Mr. BLAKE. There was a statement made in the House a few days ago with reference to a suggestion that an adjournment for a week should be made on the 18th inst. I think it would be to the convenience of the House that some announcement of the views of the Government should be made, and the earlier the better, so that hon. gentlemen could make their arrangements accordingly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I threw out the suggestion for the consideration of the House. The members of the Government are, of course, obliged to be here to go through their work; but the paper which was handed to me shows that a large number, in fact a majority of the House, were in favor of the adjournment; and, if it be the decided sense of the House that we should have a recess, of course we will submit. I may repeat what I stated before, that Thursday the 18th is Ascension Day, upon which there can be no House sitting. Friday we could sit; Saturday and Sunday we would not sit, and Monday we could sit; so that there would be Friday and Monday as working days. Tuesday is the Queen's birthday, and we generally have adjourned upon that day. It was therefore proposed that the House should adjourn on Wednesday night, and that it should stand adjourned until the following Wednesday night. We would only lose, as it was stated, two days, unless we sit on the Queen's birthday. I would like to hear the general opinion of the House on the subject, but so far as this irresponsible paper handed to me is concerned, it would appear that a majority of the House is in favor of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Practically, you lose the Wednesday as well.