

April 14, 1871

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 14, 1871

The **SPEAKER** took the chair at 1 p.m.

The matter was dropped.

---

*Prayers*

---

\* \* \*

### HUDSON'S BAY CLAIMS—AN EXPLANATION

### AFTER ROUTINE

#### MESSAGE FROM PRIME MINISTER

**Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER** read the following telegram received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald respecting a statement made in Nova Scotia papers:—

“I see that Mr. Wilkins says he was denied a judgeship on account of his opposition, also that he was offered by Hon. Mr. Archibald a seat as Commissioner for assimilating the law. Take occasion to say in the House that he was never thought of as a Judge, and that it was the intention of the Government to put all the Attorneys General of the Provinces on the Commission for the assimilation of the law.”

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON:** What does he say was the intention?

**Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER:** To put all the Attorneys-General on the Commission, but Mr. Wilkins was never thought of as a Judge.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON:** Was any statement ever made in this House with regard to that matter?

**Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER** said he thought that there was some statement made about the middle of the session.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON** did not think so; he would also say that he thought it exceedingly inconvenient that the Minister of Justice, now in Washington on public duty, should think it due to this Parliament to send a message referring to a statement made in Nova Scotia newspapers unknown to this House. He thought the whole thing was irregular, and he would go farther and say it was improper.

**Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS** said he thought the statement was made not only in this House but in the Nova Scotia Legislature.

**Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS** wished to make an explanation respecting his remarks on the vote of \$40,000 for losses by the rebellion in Manitoba. In answer to the hon. member for Hastings he (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) had said that no Government could divert this money or any portion of it to liquidating claims of the Hudson's Bay Company. It seemed that a very different construction had been put on the remarks. He had merely said that the Hudson Bay Company's claims were of a very different character from those which this money was voted to meet; that this formed no precedent whatever for the Hudson's Bay Company's claims, and he wished to avoid any discussion as the Government were not prepared to entertain any such claims, but he did not entertain the opinion that this Government or any other Government could not pay the claims.

**Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North)** asked whether any of the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company which he understood were very large, were to be paid by this Parliament.

**Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS:** Most certainly not. It is not the intention of the Government to pay any such claims.

\* \* \*

### MARQUETTE ELECTION

In reply to Mr. Schultz,

**Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER** said the Baldwin Act would be the best rule to guide the House in the case of the controverted elections in Manitoba.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON:** The Baldwin Act does not apply.

**Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER** said he did not know what the House would do next session, but it was very likely that the proceedings under the Baldwin Act would be adopted. As the member for Châteauguay had said, the Baldwin Act did not apply to Manitoba, but that it would be a good rule for the House to adopt.