

I have never heard objections raised to any committee because it represented all the Provinces of the Dominion. Now, in this instance my hon. friend has not said a word against any member of the committee. He is apparently perfectly satisfied with the committee, and I think the House is satisfied, yet, if my hon. friend's ideas were carried to the extreme which he advocates we would be obliged to strike the names of good members from this committee. The hon. gentleman is not appointed because he belongs to a certain Province, but because he would take a useful and intelligent part in the proceedings of the committee, but if it happens that there are such men in every Province, as I know there are, it is desirable, *cæteris paribus*, that every Province should be represented. That is the object of the mode of selection in suggesting to the House the appointment of this committee, and I am happy to know that my hon. friend, though he is an exception, will prove a member who will be of great advantage to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

INQUIRIES CONCERNING PUBLIC MATTERS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (A), "An Act to make further provisions respecting inquiries concerning Public Matters".

In the committee.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I explained yesterday the general purport of this small Bill. The original Act provides for the making of inquiries under a commission by the Governor in Council, and it is provided there that the commissioners shall have power, under the second section, to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence, but no such witness shall be obliged to give an answer which would render him liable to prosecution. It is for the purpose of remedying a difficulty that has arisen out of that section that this Bill is introduced. By it, that section 2 is repealed, and the two clauses which are before the House are proposed to be substituted. Clause 2 is simply a repetition of section 2 of the old Act, and section 3 removes the claim which a witness may make of privilege in answering

questions which might criminate him. That is done in the usual way, by providing that no evidence so taken shall be admissible against him in criminal proceedings. It is of frequent occurrence in our legislation that witnesses are obliged to answer questions which might criminate them, but in such cases they are relieved from the consequences of giving such evidence.

HON. MR. MONTGOMERY, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

HON. MR. ALMON—Under the Canada Temperance Act a man who is brought before a magistrate may be asked if he has been fined before; he is obliged to answer, and if he says "yes" he is punished. That is one of the outrages which that Canada Temperance Act permits. It grates very much on the feelings of people of the 19th century, and I trust that this Bill will remove one of those very objectionable clauses from the Canada Temperance Act.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I will inform my hon. friend that this Bill applies only to the process of inquiry by commission under a particular statute in public matters. It does not apply to trials of that description.

HON. MR. ALMON—I am very sorry that it has not a wider scope.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The amendment of last year does away with the objection to which my hon. friend refers.

HON. MR. ALMON—It did away with the section which compelled a woman to give evidence against her husband, but if I am correctly informed it does not remove the objectionable section to which I have referred.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

CORRUPT PRACTICES IN MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (B), "An Act

HON. MR. ABBOTT.