

very day they arrived Mr. Baillaigé told me Mr. Moylan proposed to him to go every night to Montreal; but he said: "No; I cannot do that; there are plenty of good hotels here, and I would rather stay at a hotel here or with the good nuns than drive backwards and forwards every day to Montreal." So he would not go, but Mr. Moylan did, and took a team and servant man, and went every night to Montreal, paying the expenses of the man and team there and getting back to St. Vincent de Paul very late the next day. There was such delay in the investigation that Mr. Baillaigé was told by the chief of his Department that he must drop it and go back again. The Commission came back in September, and then in order that the work might be pushed through rapidly Mr. Moylan stayed at St. Vincent de Paul every night, and in three or four weeks the enquiry was concluded. I defy any one to contradict this statement. It shows what expense the country was put to by these journeys backwards and forwards between Montreal and the penitentiary. It has not been customary for me to complain of extravagance on the part of the Dominion Government. I do not care so much about expense on the part of the Dominion, as it is often necessary, but I strongly favor economy in local government. In any case there is no necessity for incurring expense for which there is nothing at all to show, expense that is only associated with loss of time. I shall, on another occasion, before Parliament rises, show why a full enquiry was not had into these matters. Though they may appear trifling when they are enquired into, they will be found important.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The Government have no objection to the address.

The motion was agreed to.

SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The Order of the Day being called:—

Consideration of the Report of the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (135) "An Act to amend 'The Seamen's Act.' Chap. 74 of the Revised Statutes."

HON. MR. ABBOTT said: Referring to the discussion which took place on Friday with regard to this Bill, my hon. friends will remember that there was a sugges-

tion made that there might not be a judge having jurisdiction in matters of *certiorari* resident at or near the place where conviction takes place, and therefore it might be difficult to obtain a stay of proceedings without too much delay. I have considered that question and discussed it with my colleague, and I now move that the House do not concur in the amendment made in the Committee of the Whole, but that it be further amended by adding these words:—

"But if no judge having jurisdiction in respect to writs of *certiorari* is resident at or near the place where any conviction or order is made, the county judge of the county wherein such place is situated shall have power to hear and determine any application to stay proceedings upon such conviction or order."

HON. MR. POIRIER—Our judges are county court judges, and they should be so described in the amendment.

HON. MR. POWER—The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is a proper one, because in the Lower Provinces there is not a judge for each county—they are county court judges, and, as a rule, there are three counties in each judicial district.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Would the judge having jurisdiction in those counties not be a county court judge?

HON. MR. POIRIER—It is "county court judge" in the statute.

HON. MR. POWER—In Nova Scotia they are called county court judges.

HON. MR. McINNES (B. C.)—Would that amendment be applicable to British Columbia, where we have no counties whatever?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—No. What is the division there?

HON. MR. McINNES (B. C.)—District.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Then it would be better to have it "county court judge of the county or district." I move that these words be inserted in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. POIRIER—The Act says "*certiorari* to a Superior Court;" in New Brunswick the name of our Superior Court is the Supreme Court. I suppose it would embrace our Supreme Court?