

expenses, and this motion is made in order to get at it in another shape. I can only give it in the shape in which the other statement was entered in the Public Accounts.

Motion *agreed to*.

#### SUPREME COURT BUSINESS.

##### MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. FARROW, for MR. MITCHELL, moved for a return showing in detail all fees paid by the Department of Justice, or by any other Department, or in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, to counsel and attorneys in connection with any business before the Supreme Court since its formation, and the names of the counsel and attorneys, and the several suits in respect of which such fees were paid.

Motion *agreed to*.

House adjourned at  
Fifteen minutes after  
Twelve o'clock.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Tuesday, 2nd April, 1878.*

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

#### PRAYERS.

#### SECURING ATTENDANCE OF VOTERS AT THE POLLS BILL.

[BILL No. 66.]

(*Mr. McDougall, South Renfrew.*)

##### FIRST READING.

MR. McDOUGALL (South Renfrew) introduced a Bill (No. 66) To secure the attendance of voters at the elections of members of the Commons. He said his object was to ensure this result in lieu of causing candidates to put themselves in a false position through their agents, who brought persons to vote. It occurred to him there were other duties which electors had to attend to; and he thought that he had provided for them in this Bill. If these provisions were not sufficient, they could be amended in Committee. He admitted that there were other

MR. MACKENZIE.

duties more important, perhaps, than voting, but, at the same time, it was important that the electors should attend the polls. He believed all would agree with him that if this desirable object could be attained without doing them any injury, it was well that this should be done.

MR. LANGEVIN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain how he proposes to do this.

MR. McDOUGALL said he believed it was conceded both here and in England, that as to the explanation of a Bill on the first reading, what he had said was about as much as could be reasonably expected. The hon. gentleman, when the Bill was printed, would perhaps find any further explanation at the present time unnecessary.

MR. MASSON said he hoped that the hon. member for Chateauguay would not have two weights and measures, but tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) that he was making an ambitious attempt to thus impose his views on the House at this late period in the Session, when it was impossible to carry the Bill through. He remembered that the hon. gentleman had made such a statement to his hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy).

MR. HOLTON: This is a little Bill; the other was a big one.

MR. MITCHELL: The hon. gentleman never interferes against his own friends.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: My friend, who introduced the Bill, should carry out the usual practice adopted when a public Bill is introduced. The usual practice is to make a full explanation on the first reading. With private Bills, it is otherwise. If the hon. gentleman will not so inform us, we will have the Bill read.

MR. McDOUGALL said that, so far as he was concerned, he was willing to make the fullest explanation. His reason for not doing so at this particular moment was, because he heard hon. gentlemen expressing the opinion that to give a fuller explanation now would be merely to do what must be done under any circumstances at the second reading.