

that court. I think it is unfair to the court, it is unfair to other lawyers concerned in these cases, who may not have the privilege of being members of this House, and it is unfair to this House, whose officials are already, it is said, overburdened in the preparation of returns concerning matters of purely public interest. When a case is one of private interest only, in which private litigants are suing the Crown, and where the record will be useful for carrying on the case, it should be obtained in the usual way from the officers of the court. I hope the hon. Premier will give attention to the case, and, after looking into it, will decide, calmly and judicially, whether this is such a return as needs to be brought down in the public interest, or whether it is merely a return required for the conduct of the case itself. In the latter case I think it is one that should not be granted.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. Before six o'clock I had the honor to move for certain records, and I stated in the French language what was my object in doing so. It was to prove that the court of the Dominion Arbitrators does not give justice, and that the law proposed by the Government to replace that court is expected by the whole Province to which I belong. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) opposes my motion, stating that my object was not what I had said, but was to obtain gratuitously a copy of a certain record, and he strongly objected, stating that I was personally interested as attorney in the case, and that the expense was large. I am very thankful to him for giving me the occasion to say a few words about an order given by the Supreme Court concerning the records to which he refers. But I must state first that the person who gave him the information concerning this affair gave him false information. I wish to state, as a matter of fact, that I am not interested in that record, and am no party to the case. It is true, Mr. Gosselin is one of my clients; it is true, I know all about the affair; but I would not mix up in it as attorney, because he belongs to my county, and I do not practise in my county; and besides, it is likely to give rise to difficulty with the public if a member of Parliament interests himself in a case for or against the Government. So that my hon. friend from West Elgin has been misinformed, and has falsely and wrongly informed this hon. House. I am sorry he is not in his seat, or I suppose he would apologise at once. Suppose for a moment that my object was to obtain a copy of that record against the rule laid down by the Supreme court. What is the object of that rule? I think the party who gave that wrong and false information must be the party who obtained the passage of that rule, which says that no record shall leave for one minute the custody of the clerk of that court. There is no court in the Province of Quebec where such a rule prevails. The officers and judges of the courts in the Province of Quebec have generally confidence enough in the attorneys practising there to give them access to the records on mutual consent; and if the Registrar of the Supreme Court thinks that the lawyers who practise there are not honest enough to be entrusted with the records, I think his opinion must give a very poor idea of those with whom he has been dealing up to the present time. Such an order, I know, exists in the Supreme Court, but it is an absurd order. Suppose I were interested in a voluminous record, I would have to go to the court to take communication of the record every time I wanted it. I would not be allowed to take it to my office or have it removed in any way. Well, I have been interested in lawsuits involving millions of dollars, and never has such a thing occurred in my practice. Such a rule adopted by the

Mr. CASEY.

Supreme Court is an insult to the bar; it is an injustice; and I am sure, as soon as the attention of the learned judges who preside over that court is drawn to that order, they will cancel it. The fact is that the one who must have given that false information to the hon. member for West Elgin is the same one, I suppose, who does the best he can to make that Supreme Court disagreeable to a great portion of this Dominion. He forces lawyers to choose agents here at a great expense, and when the bill of costs is taxed he gives one-tenth of what should be allowed, and of what we have to pay to the agent imposed upon us. That great magnate will not allow us to do anything without having an agent. I think this officer, who has so many good friends here, might do something better than send delegates here to prevent what he thinks is not in the public interest. Now, it might be asked, what would be the cost of that copy? Well, it will cost from \$4 to \$5; and the amount of time we have lost in this House in discussing it, perhaps half an hour, will cost let us say, \$500 to the country. So, the hon. member for West Elgin may go back to his constituents and tell them, "through a blunder and a mistake I wanted to save \$5 to the country, and in order to do that I got the country to incur an expense of \$500!" For the future, he had better mix up in things he knows better, and take his information from more reliable sources. I am sorry to have to go into these details; but I wanted the opportunity to say what we think in the Province of Quebec of this by-law, for which I do not hold the Judges responsible. *En résumé*, I may say that my object is, first, to establish that in the interest of the Dominion we want the new law which is proposed by the Ministry. In the second place, it was given the occasion to my hon. friend to learn that when he receives information from anybody he had better see that the information he receives is reliable; and in the third place, in the future, before bringing on these discussions and making small economies at great expense, giving an ox to have an egg, he will, perhaps, deem it more prudent not to try to prevent other gentlemen from obtaining justice in this House. We have not been so exacting when voluminous records have been asked for by him often for useless purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. A sound rule laid down by the House is that proceedings before a court of justice are not obtained in the House, except for public purposes.

Mr. AMYOT. This is for a public purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I know. That is the general rule; still more is it the rule when a case is pending and the ultimate decision not reached. The hon. gentleman says he wishes to have this record in order to prove that injustice has been done his friend, Mr. Gosselin, by the Dominion Arbitrators. But the effort to establish whether justice or injustice has been done is now being made before the Supreme Court or the Exchequer Court, which, I understand the hon. gentleman to say, is the court before which this case is pending, and that tribunal will dispose of the question whether there was error in the decision of the arbitrators or not. If the gentleman will reflect he will see that though he may be able to prove that the officers this Government appointed as Dominion Arbitrators are incompetent, and that through their incompetency a miscarriage has ensued, that will not dispose of the principle of the case. The hon. gentleman spoke as if it were admittedly a proper thing that the records of a court should not be merely investigated by members of the bar at the office of the court, but should be also delivered over into their custody. That may be the course adopted in Quebec, but it is not the course adopted in Ontario, and it is not deemed an insult in that Province that the records of the court are not entrusted in the hands of the profession. I know it does sometimes happen that records disappear.