

the negative side and have chosen to be unbelievers on the question, have not succeeded in disproving any one of the statements made by these commissioners, or in refuting the arguments they have brought forward.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think it is due to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, to say that his opening speech was compiled with great care, and contained much useful information. It has given rise to a most interesting, even if somewhat prolix, debate. I hope he will not consider that, because at this late hour we have become a little restless after hearing a very long speech, and many tedious readings in another quarter, and because I drew his attention to the fact that he had no right to reply, and was speaking entirely with the indulgence of the House, that I had not full appreciation of the value of the information which he has given us. For one, I thank the hon. gentleman very sincerely for having brought the question before the House. I declined to speak upon it, because it has been a subject of exhaustive discussions in another quarter, and in those discussions I took an active part there and on the hustings. There was nothing, and could be nothing, new in the general argument, to one who had watched very closely the whole of the National Policy debates and speeches for the last eight years. For that reason I did not feel inclined to take any part in the discussion here, but I was perfectly willing to listen, and I have remained, not without a trial of patience, here this evening to listen to arguments which contained nothing that I had not heard quite as forcibly stated often before; but I felt it due to the hon. gentleman, as I had suggested to him that he was making a speech which was a little out of order, to make this explanation, which I trust he will accept.

HON. MR. DEVER—I wish to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman from British Columbia is, certainly, entitled to our thanks for the manner in which he has brought—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. This is not an explanation.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman is certainly out of order in what he is saying now. That is not an explanation.

HON. MR. DEVER—I may not have taken the proper course to make an explanation, but my object is to say that while the hon. gentleman from British Columbia is entitled to our thanks for the manner in which he has brought forward this question, I cannot agree with him—

HON. M. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. This is not an explanation.

HON. MR. SMITH—I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate adjourned at 11 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, April 29th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (S), "An Act to amend an Act respecting Offences against the Person."

HON. MR. GOWAN—I beg to move the adoption of the first and only amendment that I have to propose to this Bill, to strike out the words "and compellable" in the 11th line. I do so in deference to the strongly expressed opinion of my hon. friends opposite, who consider that it would be better not to compel the wife under such circumstances to give evidence. I myself am not very strongly struck with the force of the objection, but I do not think I would be justified in pressing it in the face of their opinion. Every member owes a debt to the pro-

HON. MR. MACDONALD.