

June 12, 1872

McDonald (Lunenburg)
 McDougall (Lanark North)
 Morris
 O'Connor
 Pickard
 Robitaille
 Ryan (Montreal West)
 Shanly
 Smith (Selkirk)
 Stephenson
 Tilley
 Tupper
 Wright (York West)—53

Mackenzie
 McDougall (Trois-Rivières)
 Nathan
 Pâquet
 Ray
 Ross (Wellington Centre)
 Schultz
 Simard
 Snider
 Street
 Tourangeau
 Webb

NAYS

Anglin
 Bellerose
 Gaucher
 Grover
 Keeler
 Lawson
 Masson (Soulanges)
 Perry
 Ross (Dundas)
 Scriver
 White (Hastings East)—21

Members
 Baker
 Bowell
 Gaudet
 Jones (Leeds North and Grenville North)
 Lapum
 McDonald (Middlesex West)
 Munroe
 Ross (Champlain)
 Ross (Prince Edward)
 Thompson (Ontario North)

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU moved to remit the fee of J. E. Archer for a private bill.—Carried.

* * *

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGE F. G. JOHNSON

Mr. SCHULTZ remarked that the instructions submitted to Judge Johnson in regard to the Manitoba Claims, did not include the claims of one class of people who were entitled to the consideration of the Government. He would move, therefore, "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, that certain claims of sufferers by the Red River insurrection, which were not within the scope of the instructions given to Judge Johnson, be taken into consideration with a view to their compensation." He contended that Judge Johnson's instructions only covered claims for compensation for losses of property and imprisonment, and that there were many other legitimate claims outside of these. The prisoners had nearly all of them lost a year's time with damage to their respective occupations, and some had suffered serious damage by continued illness. Then there were the legitimate claims of the half-breed population for various losses arising out of the rebellion. He wished to press the matter on the attention of the Government.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the motion of the hon. gentleman was somewhat out of order, but taking it on its merits he thought it would be unwise to press it any further just now. Since it was brought before the notice of the Government, they would, as a matter of course, look into the matter, and if it was found that any just claims had been overlooked, the Government would be bound to enquire into them. He thought the hon. gentleman should be satisfied with this answer and with the fact that he had brought the matter before the attention of the House and would withdraw his motion.

Mr. SCHULTZ replied that on this assurance from the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald), he would withdraw the motion.

* * *

RETURNS

Hon. Mr. TUPPER presented the report of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; also a return on the subject of meteorological observations.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN presented a return from the surveyors and engineers on the subject of divisions C. D. & E. of the Pacific Railway survey.

* * *

THE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNROE before the orders of the day were called, would ask the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether they intended to make a report? He considered it a very great importance to the agricultural interests of the country that such a report should be presented. His conviction was very strong that the farming interests should be protected. They were deserving of such protection, and he hoped that all the information which had been gathered on the subject would be brought before the House.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE objected to the matter being debated by the hon. gentleman. He had asked a question and should confine himself simply to that.

Mr. JONES (Leeds North and Grenville North) as Chairman of the Committee, explained that they had been unable to report, because answers to their questions had only been received within the last day or two, and it was now found impossible to get a quorum of the Committee.

* * *

CRIMINAL APPEAL

Mr. HARRISON moved the second reading of the bill to extend the right of appeal in criminal cases. He urged that legislation was very much required on this subject, and thought that there should be an appeal in criminal instances of injustice which had occurred under the existing law, but would not press the bill.

The order was discharged.

* * *

STOLEN GOODS ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. HARRISON on the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of the bill to amend the law relating to advertisements respecting stolen goods, said the objection to the bill, he understood, was that no particular case had been alleged showing the necessity for the proposed change in the law.