

decide whether the case should proceed any further or not.

The motion was agreed to.

SAFETY OF FISHERMEN BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. POWER moved the second reading of Bill (E), "An Act for better securing the safety of certain Fishermen."

He said—I do not think it necessary to go into any lengthened explanation of this Bill. The title, I think, will commend it to the House. It is not an unnecessary measure, because every season we read accounts of fishermen who have either lost their lives, or suffered great distress from the absence of the provisions of this Bill. There are certain modifications desired in the measure, which can be made when it comes before the Committee of the whole House. The hon. gentleman from Alberton has called my attention to the fact that they have no fog in the neighborhood of Prince Edward Island, and consequently, as the provisions of this Bill would not be required in the neighborhood of that favored land, it would be unreasonable to require the owners of vessels to go to the small expense which would be necessary to comply with them. The measure was discussed last year, when it passed through this House without a division. The sentiment of the Senate was almost unanimous in its favor. It failed to pass the Commons, because it reached that Chamber too late in the Session to get through. I beg leave, therefore, to move the second reading of the Bill, with the understanding that any objection to it may be dealt with on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I have no objection to the Bill passing, with the understanding that in Committee of the Whole it may be remedied in the direction that my hon. friend has just stated.

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

The Senate adjourned at 4 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, February 10th, 1890.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

MANAGEMENT OF THE WELLAND CANAL.

ENQUIRY.

HON. MR. MCCALLUM rose to inquire—

What action the Government intends to take on the evidence taken before A. F. Wood, Esquire, commissioner, as to the conduct of the officials on the Welland Canal, in the management of that important public work?

He said: Some of you may remember that I made some remarks in this Chamber last Session about the management of the Welland Canal, and urged the Government to have an investigation into the conduct of Mr. Ellis, the Superintendent, and others in connection with the maintenance and repairs of that important public work; and for having dared to express my views and stated what appeared to me to be facts, I was threatened through the press by the Superintendent with an action for libel, laying the damages at ten thousand dollars. However, the action did not come off. The Government appointed a commissioner to examine and report as to the statements made by me from my place in this Chamber. I attended that investigation, and examined witnesses in behalf of the public and took notes of the evidence taken. I did not argue the question as to the evidence taken before the commissioner for this reason: there was a disagreement between the commissioner and myself as to keeping a record of the arguments, and having them sent along with the evidence to the Government and afterwards to the public. So I left the commission. After I left Mr. Rykert, M. P., argued the case in behalf of the canal officials, and the commissioner sent me a copy of what he, the commissioner, calls the balance of the evidence or testimony and Mr. Rykert's arguments in defence. My reason for alluding to the matter is that what is said to be the balance of the testimony puts me in a false light. I do not like to say it was wilfully done, although it looks like it.

But I consider it my duty to show that what is recorded as having taken place before I left is not correct. I cannot say