

although it was \$15,000 less than that of A. Lindsay. I have discovered that Sheriff Sutton was not a member of that firm, and I take this, the very earliest opportunity that has presented itself, to explain to the House that, when I made that statement, I laboured under a misapprehension. I made the statement in perfectly good faith. I supposed Sheriff Sutton was a member of the firm from what appeared in a record submitted to the country by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. In order further to satisfy the House that I made the statement in good faith, I made enquiries from a gentleman who I supposed would know if the Sutton referred to as being a member of the firm of Batter & Sutton were Sheriff Sutton, and I was informed that he was a member of the firm. I take this, the earliest opportunity of stating that I am now informed that he was not a member of that firm. I desire to make this explanation in justice to myself, and, if any injury has been done to Sheriff Sutton, I desire to remedy it, as I would not willingly do an injustice to anybody; indeed, I am most anxious not to state anything but what will be borne out by the facts. The position I then assumed has not, however, been at all changed from the fact that Sheriff Sutton was not a member of the firm of Batter & Sutton, my contention being that that tender had been passed over, and the contract given to Mr. Lindsay, whose tender was \$15,000 higher.

RETURNS.

REMARKS.

MR. STEPHENSON called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the fact that on the 11th of March he moved for a return in regard to expenditure in connection with the harbour of Rondeau, and that the return brought down contained no new information beyond that of last year's return, and that it furnished no account of the amount of money expended in connection with this survey.

MR. MACKENZIE said probably some expenditure had been made by

MR. LANDERKIN.

the Marine and Fisheries Department; he would look into the matter.

MR. MITCHELL called the attention of the Premier to the motion moved by him last year for all the correspondence and evidence connected with the killing of cattle on the Intercolonial Railway. The return brought down contained nothing but letters between the Department and the claimant, James Nevin. There had, however, been an investigation held and testimony taken, when seven or eight affidavits were furnished by the claimant to confirm the fact stated by him. He hoped the hon. the Premier would bring down those papers in order to show the House the hardship of the case and the injustice of the decision arrived at by the officers of the railroad.

EVIDENCE IN COMMON ASSAULTS BILL.—[BILL No. 3.]

(Mr. Dymond.)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading *read*.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD asked if the hon. the Minister of Justice had examined the Bill with respect to the discussion that took place on it in Committee of the Whole.

MR. LAFLAMME said the only point in regard to which there could be doubt was as to the examination of the wife of a defendant, but as it was proposed to introduce that rule only in cases of common assault, and as the Judge was to declare as to the value of the evidence, he could decide in every case whether her evidence afforded ground for suspicion or not. Many cases might occur where the evidence of the defendant and wife might be of great importance, and where there could be no suspicion as to their character, it might be of the utmost value in determining the case; he could see no objection to the Bill passing in its present form.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD enquired whether the hon. member who had charge of the Bill desired it to be understood that the word "information," in the first clause, applied to information in the nature of an indictment or to an information laid before a magistrate.