

gest to the hon. gentleman to have the Bill read at the table at length the second time and save the necessity of sending it to the committee.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time at length at the table.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—This law will now apply to British fishermen—Newfoundland fishermen, for instance, and other British subjects as well. It seems to me that inasmuch as there are no British consuls in our ports it ought to apply only to foreign fishermen who have representatives to look after their interests

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I would just remark to my hon. friend that charity begins at home, and that this fund is entirely insufficient to provide medical assistance and comforts for our own mariners, and it would be rather a large order to take upon ourselves the admission of this class of persons to our hospitals, whose expenses would have to be paid out of the funds of this country.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—One of the conditions of this Act under consideration is that the Governor in Council, under circumstances which may be deemed necessary, may make an allowance in cases of that kind. For instance if a Newfoundland whaler or sealer was driven ashore, or an American vessel was driven ashore in distress and the Captain lost overboard, this law provides that the collector of the nearest port can obtain for distressed mariners an allowance from the Government in such cases.

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

PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a

HON. MR. MILLER.

Committee of the Whole on Bill (19)
“An Act to amend the Law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases.”

On the first clause,

HON. MR. POWER—The leader of the Government might explain the object of the Bill.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I thought I had explained the object of the Bill sufficiently on the second reading. Everybody is aware that there has been some attempt to obtain delays of execution in criminal matters by attempting an appeal to the Privy Council, and there must have been, I presume, some doubt amongst lawyers as to whether or not such appeal existed. This Bill is simply for the purpose of setting that question at rest. Such an appeal has really been applied for, but the Government as hon. members know, were satisfied that no such appeal existed, and they did on one occasion, at all events, allow the execution of the sentence to be postponed to wait the decision of the Privy Council. It is considered to be expedient that this doubt should be set at rest formally by the enactment of the first clause in the Bill which is now before the House.

The clause was agreed to.

On Sub-section 5,

HON. MR. POWER said—I notice that in the chapter of the Revised Statutes from which this is taken, these words follow: “saving any right which Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to exercise by virtue of her Royal prerogative.” I quite agree in thinking that it is not desirable that there should be interminable appeals in criminal cases. I think the Supreme Court is far enough and high enough to allow those appeals to go, as a rule; I simply rose to ask the Leader of the House whether he thinks we can take away Her Majesty’s Royal prerogative to allow an appeal—whether any legislation of Parliament can deprive the Sovereign of the right to grant an appeal?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—On that point I imagine that an Act of Parliament will