

Pozer	Redford
Renaud	Robitaille
Ryan (Montreal West)	Simard
Stephenson	Stirton
Thompson (Haldimand)	Tourangeau
Tremblay	Webb
Whitehead	Wright (Ottawa County)—64

**Hon. Mr. GRAY** then moved that all the evidence laid before, and taken by the Senate in this matter be referred to the said Committee. Carried on the same division (Yeas, 75; Nays, 64).

\* \* \*

### SEIZURES

**Hon. Mr. TILLEY** presented a return of seizures under the Customs Act.

\* \* \*

### BAIE VERTE CANAL

**Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN** brought down the return relating to the Baie Verte Canal.

\* \* \*

### CRIMPING AT QUEBEC

**Mr. SIMARD** before the orders of the day were called, would, in the name of humanity, call the attention of the House and Government to the state of uncertainty in which the commerce of the country was placed, owing to the depredations of crimps in the harbour of Quebec. The hon. gentleman read extracts from newspapers giving particulars of these depredations, in which one sailor, who could not be induced to leave his ship, was shot down in the most cold-blooded manner. He implored the Government to organize an efficient and strong police force to protect lives and property in the city which he had the honour to represent.

**Mr. BOLTON** was glad the subject had been brought up. Petitions had been presented from shipowners in England, complaining of the state of things in the port of Quebec, and he thought that unless some energetic action were taken, it would injure the shipping trade of the Dominion.

**Mr. WORKMAN** said the port of Quebec was celebrated for its lawlessness during the summer season, and in his opinion this was because the law was not properly administered there, and he cited a case in Quebec where a prisoner who had been convicted of crimping was permitted by a judge, after the witnesses had left the country, to enter a plea of not guilty, which resulted in his discharge. Owing to the efficient state of the police in Montreal crimping was scarcely known.

**Hon. Mr. IRVINE** was sorry to say that there was too much truth in the statement of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr.

Workman); but he could not assert that the hon. judge had induced the prisoner to withdraw his plea of "guilty" and plead "not guilty." The man had afterwards been bailed in two sureties of \$40 each. He was of opinion that lawlessness had increased during the past two years owing to the unfortunate desire on the part of the Government to economize, by reducing the water police to a number quite inadequate to the requirements, and he hoped the Government would be induced to increase the force at the port of Quebec.

**Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU** said the Government of Quebec had offered a reward of \$1,000 for the arrest and conviction of the parties who committed the outrage.

**Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER** explained the causes of the crimping at Quebec, and thought the proper remedy would be to furnish the ship builders, ship owners, and others, who employed the men obtained by the crimps to navigate their newly built vessels to the other side of the Atlantic, leaving vessels in this port without seamen, thereby encouraging crimping. He had listened to the statement of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Workman) with great pain. That statement contained good ground for the impeachment of the judge, and the hon. gentleman should be prepared, and ought before leaving his seat to make his statement in writing, in order that the judge, if guilty, might be brought to trial, or he should not have made such a statement.

**Mr. WORKMAN** had received his information from what he considered to be a reliable source, but had wrongly stated as to the judge having induced the prisoner to withdraw his plea of guilty, and was glad to be able to correct his remarks in that respect.

**Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Peel)** had understood that there was some mistake on the part of the counsel of the prisoner as to the effect of pleading guilty under the circumstances, and it being discovered that the only sentence the judge could pronounce was capital punishment, application to change the plea was made and granted.

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE** could not understand how bail in two sureties of £10 each had been accepted for a man who had pleaded guilty.

**Hon. Mr. IRVINE** was in court conducting the Crown business when the prisoner was tried, and then protested against the change of plea.

**Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** agreed that it was unfortunate that the judge had allowed the plea to be withdrawn. The better course would have been to have allowed the trial to proceed, and the judge could have made representation to the Government to prevent the sentence being carried out. He also thought it a mistake allowing the prisoner to be bailed; but it was simply an error in judgment, and judges, like other men, were liable to errors. With respect to the water police force