DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from third page.)

that due security was given for the carrying on of the works. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) now proposed to ask that hon. gentleman to lay before the House the evidence he had to satisfy him that the Canada Central railway had fulfilled the requirements of the Order in Council. It had been alleged that the rails had not been delivered on the line at all, but at Renfrew. The line to be constructed was from the Village of Douglas westward eighty miles, and in connection with that it would be remembered that on the 20th December, 1875, Mr. Foster applied to the Minister of Public Works to have the Order in Council amended so as to make the commencement of his subsidized line at the Village of Renfrew. It now came out that prior to making that application the rails had been delivered at Renfrew, and the application must have been made to save further transportation. He desired to see what evidence the Minister of Public Works had that the work was progressing far enough to justify the hope that the road would be completed at the specified time, namely, that 120 miles could be completed within twelve or fourteen months from the date of the payment of the subsidy. He therefore moved for the correspondence and evidence laid before the Minister of Public Works to satisfy him that the terms of the Order in Council were being complied with; also for a return of all payments made on rails to the Company, the value of the rails, the evidence of the payment of the rails, the payments made for the rails, and the statement as to the distance from the line that the rails had been delivered.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had no objection to the amendment, because he had nothing to be wished drawn back in relation to the matter. He was not, however, aware that he or any other person had offered any evidence as to the progress of the work on the Canada Central.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD pointed out that it was the hon. gentleman's duty to get such evidence because the Order-in-Council stated so.

Mr. MACKENZIE—I dare say that I know my duty as well as the hon. gentleman.

The motion as amended was then passed.

The evening was almost wholly occupied with the continued debate of the insolvency question. Several good and effective speeches were made for and against the law, but it may notice particularly that winding up the debate by Hon. T. N. Gibbs, who expressed himself strongly against the amendments proposed to be submitted by the Minister of Justice. The meeting then went into committee, Mr. Wood's amendment giving the six months' hoist to Mr. Burkett's bill was carried; yeas, 103; nays, 41; majority for the amendment, 62.

THURSDAY, March 1.

THE SENATE.

Mr. READ moved the second reading of the bill to prevent the carrying of dangerous weapons. He said he had been induced to bring forward this measure by the number of deaths which had occurred from the pernicious practice, and from the suggestions of Chief Justice Harrison and other judges that legislation was needed on the point. He quoted from statistics to show the number of deaths resulting from pistols, and he observed that the carrying of deadly weapons was on the increase in this country.

Mr. SCOTT said it was a very difficult matter to legislate on, as there were a great many classes to be exempted from the operation. It could not be laid down as a rule *per se* to carry a loaded pistol only under certain conditions. He had not had time to allow the bill to stand for a week.

Mr. READ said he was pleased to find that the Government had this matter under their consideration, and he would agree to postponement of his bill for a week.

Mr. SKEAD moved the second reading of the Cobourg and Province Line Railway Company bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Cobourg Landing railway charter, and to extend the time for the construction of that railway and bridge.

The bill was read a second time, and referred to the Committee on Railways.

The House adjourned at 5.20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the judgment of the Supreme Court in the Charlevoix contested election case, declaring the election void.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD moved that Mr. Speaker issue his writ for a new election.

Mr. SPEAKER asked whether, in view of the difficulties recently occurring between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Locomotive Engineers, and their employ, and the great injury to the public interest arising therefrom, it is the intention of the Government to prorogue the session in time for the prevention of similar difficulties.

Mr. BLAKE—The very important subject to which this question refers has engaged the anxious attention of the Government. I cannot say that there is any hope of preventing similar cases in future by legislation, but it is my expectation to propose to the House some measure which may have for its end and the prevention of some of these evils, or at any rate securing their mitigation somewhat.

Mr. TUPPER moved for a return of the legend balances carried forward by Order in Council since 30th June, 1875, and 30th June, 1876, and he would like to add to the motion—"and a statement of the amounts considered that the demand was politically wrong, and should not, therefore, be acceded to. He thought that if they admitted the right, and they must admit it, on the part of the Government to ask an income in the number of the Senators on their own responsibility, it was surprising that the law officers of the Crown in England decided that they should be refused, unless they so decided upon the ground that the hon. the First Minister was making a demand which he had no right to make politically speaking, that was to say, a demand which it would be inconvenient to accede to. There was a member of this House knew that it was a most serious affair to change the number of any of the constitutional bodies in this Dominion. In England it was considered a most serious thing, and the Ministers of England, even under circumstances of the greatest difficulty, had always been cautious in recommending the Crown to make a permanent change in the membership of the House of Peers, except it might be in order to reward some public man of high distinction who had deserved to be called into the highest Chamber. On all occasions the Ministers in England and the law officers of the Crown had considered it preferable to forego the right of recommending an increase in the numbers of those constituting the House of Peers, and to allow the Legislature to do anything which to fail rather than do anything which could be inconsistent with the dignity and independence of the House. Well, if that is the instance existed in England where the constitution admitted of that the prerogative was exercised, how much the more should it exist in a country like this, where all know that when the Confederation Act was passed, it was specially provided that the Government should not have the right of increasing the number of Senators for a reason for which which could be done in England, that was for the purpose of rewarding political friends of the Government, and for ousting persons of high standing in the country by whom the Queen thought proper to call to the highest Chamber of Parliament. It was not intended, when our constitution was framed, that this should be done in this country, and therefore it was provided that the Crown should not in this country increase the number of Senators, except to the extent of six, if he were not mistaken. What was the object of this? It was that in case of a great crisis or great difficulty, the Crown could, on the recommendation of its responsible advisers, be allowed to appoint six senators, but no more. When the Confederation Act was passed, it was held that the Crown should not have the right to increase the number of Senators, that they should not swamp the Senate or reverse its character by increasing the number of men in it, whose political opinions were the same as those of the majority of the members of the House of Commons so as to bring the two Houses into accord. No less a person than the President of the Council had written a very able book on this subject, in which he had argued that the power of the Crown should not be used, that it should not be exercised in order to alter the majority in the Senate to one which would represent the views of the Government. What reason had the Premier when he took the reins of office to suppose that he could increase the number of Senators? What reason had he to suppose that the Senate would be hostile to him? In the whole history of our country since the Union, and on this point he would again refer to the opinion of the President of the Council, Mr. Cauchon) said, and it was a matter of history, that since the Union it had never been necessary to swamp the Legislative Council so as to bring it into accord with the political views of the Government. The Premier having proposed to the Governor-General at that time to increase the Senate by 24 members, thought, a slight upon that body. The hon. gentleman should have borne in mind that the Senate was composed of men who knew their duty towards the country, men who knew not well the peculiar relation they occupied on account of the limitation of the power of the Government to offer any resistance to the Government. They know too well that such a thing would strain our constitution to the utmost extent possible, and that the hon. man, in asking without any real reason for it, that the number of Senators should be increased, had tried to make the people believe that he and his Government could not possibly get on with the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) appeared to have complained that the Senate had been formed chiefly from his political opponents, but he must have forgotten that the constitution carried with it a remedy for that evil, if it was an evil. Those who framed the constitution saw very well that in consequence of the appointments and resignations the Senate would be renewed continually, and that a political party would not be in power any reasonable length of time without, in the ordinary course of events, having an opportunity of appointing supporters to that House. It would be remembered that since Confederation there were forty Senators had been appointed, and during the three years of the Mackenzie administration of Sir Alexander Mackenzie they had appointed fourteen. When that was the case, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) should have reflected before he asked to be allowed to make additions to the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) complained that if he had been allowed to appoint Senators in the ordinary way, unfortunately for us, the rejection of the Nanaimo and Reguimalt bill, would not have taken place. He (Mr. Masson) was sorry that was a mistake. Suppose the hon. gentleman had had the power to appoint Senators as soon as he came office, he would have appointed them from among his own supporters. Governors have appointed gentlemen holding opinions on the railway question similar to those held by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake) or the Minister for the Interior (Mr. Mills), and the consequence was that it been that the bill would have been thrown out just the same. He (Mr. Mackenzie) declared not having the control of the Senate, as he had of the House of Commons, but he (Mr. Masson) wished to know if he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he could control gentlemen as the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior do? He could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, he could not control them in the Upper House, consequently he should not charge the hon. gentleman opposite with the rejection of the Cameron terms on the ground that they would have because he had the Senate. Government allowed an increase in the Senate. He concluded his remarks by stating that the action of the Government in the matter was unprecedented, and he hoped that such would never occur again.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the Government had to take into account to render to Parliament and to the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE said it is no objection to the motion. I shall not follow the example of the hon. gentleman by discussing, more so as to bring the two Houses into accord. No less a person than the President of the Council had written a very able book on this subject, in which he had argued that the power of the Crown should not be used, that it should not be exercised in order to alter the majority in the Senate to one which would represent the views of the Government. What reason had the Premier when he took the reins of office to suppose that he could increase the number of Senators? What reason had he to suppose that the Senate would be hostile to him? In the whole history of our country since the Union, and on this point he would again refer to the opinion of the President of the Council. He (Mr. Cauchon) said, and it was a matter of history, that since the Union it had never been necessary to swamp the Legislative Council so as to bring it into accord with the political views of the Government. The Premier having proposed to the Governor-General at that time to increase the Senate by 24 members, thought, a slight upon that body. The hon. gentleman should have borne in mind that the Senate was composed of men who knew their duty towards the country, men who knew not well the peculiar relation they occupied on account of the limitation of the power of the Government to offer any resistance to the Government. They know too well that such a thing would strain our constitution to the utmost extent possible, and that the hon. man, in asking without any real reason for it, that the number of Senators should be increased, had tried to make the people believe that he and his Government could not possibly get on with the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) appeared to have complained that the Senate had been formed chiefly from his political opponents, but he must have forgotten that the constitution carried with it a remedy for that evil, if it was an evil. Those who framed the constitution saw very well that in consequence of the appointments and resignations the Senate would be renewed continually, and that a political party would not be in power any reasonable length of time without, in the ordinary course of events, having an opportunity of appointing supporters to that House. It would be remembered that since Confederation there were forty Senators had been appointed, and during the three years of the Mackenzie administration of Sir Alexander Mackenzie they had appointed fourteen. When that was the case, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) should have reflected before he asked to be allowed to make additions to the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) complained that if he had been allowed to appoint Senators in the ordinary way, unfortunately for us, the rejection of the Nanaimo and Reguimalt bill, would not have taken place. He (Mr. Masson) was sorry that was a mistake. Suppose the hon. gentleman had had the power to appoint Senators as soon as he came office, he would have appointed them from among his own supporters. Governors have appointed gentlemen holding opinions on the railway question similar to those held by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake) or the Minister for the Interior (Mr. Mills), and the consequence was that it would have been thrown out just the same. He (Mr. Mackenzie) declared not having the control of the Senate, as he had of the House of Commons, but he (Mr. Masson) wished to know if he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he could control gentlemen as the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior do? He could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, he could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, consequently he should not charge the hon. gentleman opposite with the rejection of the Cameron terms on the ground that they would have because he had the Senate. Government allowed an increase in the Senate. He concluded his remarks by stating that the action of the Government in the matter was unprecedented, and he hoped that such would never occur again.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the Government had to take into account to render to Parliament and to the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE said it is no objection to the motion. I shall not follow the example of the hon. gentleman by discussing, more so as to bring the two Houses into accord. No less a person than the President of the Council had written a very able book on this subject, in which he had argued that the power of the Crown should not be used, that it should not be exercised in order to alter the majority in the Senate to one which would represent the views of the Government. What reason had the Premier when he took the reins of office to suppose that he could increase the number of Senators? What reason had he to suppose that the Senate would be hostile to him? In the whole history of our country since the Union, and on this point he would again refer to the opinion of the President of the Council. He (Mr. Cauchon) said, and it was a matter of history, that since the Union it had never been necessary to swamp the Legislative Council so as to bring it into accord with the political views of the Government. The Premier having proposed to the Governor-General at that time to increase the Senate by 24 members, thought, a slight upon that body. The hon. gentleman should have borne in mind that the Senate was composed of men who knew their duty towards the country, men who knew not well the peculiar relation they occupied on account of the limitation of the power of the Government to offer any resistance to the Government. They know too well that such a thing would strain our constitution to the utmost extent possible, and that the hon. man, in asking without any real reason for it, that the number of Senators should be increased, had tried to make the people believe that he and his Government could not possibly get on with the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) appeared to have complained that the Senate had been formed chiefly from his political opponents, but he must have forgotten that the constitution carried with it a remedy for that evil, if it was an evil. Those who framed the constitution saw very well that in consequence of the appointments and resignations the Senate would be renewed continually, and that a political party would not be in power any reasonable length of time without, in the ordinary course of events, having an opportunity of appointing supporters to that House. It would be remembered that since Confederation there were forty Senators had been appointed, and during the three years of the Mackenzie administration of Sir Alexander Mackenzie they had appointed fourteen. When that was the case, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) should have reflected before he asked to be allowed to make additions to the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) complained that if he had been allowed to appoint Senators in the ordinary way, unfortunately for us, the rejection of the Nanaimo and Reguimalt bill, would not have taken place. He (Mr. Masson) wished that was a mistake. Suppose the hon. gentleman had had the power to appoint Senators as soon as he came office, he would have appointed them from among his own supporters. Governors have appointed gentlemen holding opinions on the railway question similar to those held by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake) or the Minister for the Interior (Mr. Mills), and the consequence was that it would have been thrown out just the same. He (Mr. Mackenzie) declared not having the control of the Senate, as he had of the House of Commons, but he (Mr. Masson) wished to know if he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he could control gentlemen as the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior do? He could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, he could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, consequently he should not charge the hon. gentleman opposite with the rejection of the Cameron terms on the ground that they would have because he had the Senate. Government allowed an increase in the Senate. He concluded his remarks by stating that the action of the Government in the matter was unprecedented, and he hoped that such would never occur again.

Mr. BLAKE—The very important subject to which this question refers has engaged the anxious attention of the Government. I cannot say that there is any hope of preventing similar cases in future by legislation, but it is my expectation to propose to the House some measure which may have for its end and the prevention of some of these evils, or at any rate securing their mitigation somewhat.

Mr. TUPPER moved for a return of the legend balances carried forward by Order in Council since 30th June, 1875, and 30th June, 1876, and he would like to add to the motion—"and a statement of the amounts considered that the demand was politically wrong, and should not, therefore, be acceded to. He thought that if they admitted the right, and they must admit it, on the part of the Government to ask an increase in the number of the Senators on their own responsibility, it was surprising that the law officers of the Crown in England decided that they should be refused, unless they so decided upon the ground that the hon. the First Minister was making a demand which he had no right to make politically speaking, that was to say, a demand which it would be inconvenient to accede to. There was a member of this House knew that it was a most serious affair to change the number of any of the constitutional bodies in this Dominion. In England it was considered a most serious thing, and the Ministers of England, even under circumstances of the greatest difficulty, had always been cautious in recommending the Crown to make a permanent change in the membership of the House of Peers, except it might be in order to reward some public man of high distinction who had deserved to be called into the highest Chamber. On all occasions the Ministers in England and the law officers of the Crown had considered it preferable to forego the right of recommending an increase in the numbers of those constituting the House of Peers, and to allow the Legislature to do anything which to fail rather than do anything which could be inconsistent with the dignity and independence of the House. Well, if that is the instance existed in England where the constitution admitted of that the prerogative was exercised, how much the more should it exist in a country like this, where all know that when the Confederation Act was passed, it was specially provided that the Government should not have the right of increasing the number of Senators for a reason for which which could be done in England, that was for the purpose of rewarding political friends of the Government, and for ousting persons of high standing in the country by whom the Queen thought proper to call to the highest Chamber of Parliament. It was not intended, when our constitution was framed, that this should be done in this country, and therefore it was provided that the Crown should not in this country increase the number of Senators, except to the extent of six, if he were not mistaken. What was the object of this? It was that in case of a great crisis or great difficulty, the Crown could, on the recommendation of its responsible advisers, be allowed to appoint six senators, but no more. When the Confederation Act was passed, it was held that the Crown should not have the right to increase the number of Senators, that they should not swamp the Senate or reverse its character by increasing the number of men in it, whose political opinions were the same as those of the majority of the members of the House of Commons so as to bring the two Houses into accord. No less a person than the President of the Council had written a very able book on this subject, in which he had argued that the power of the Crown should not be used, that it should not be exercised in order to alter the majority in the Senate to one which would represent the views of the Government. What reason had the Premier when he took the reins of office to suppose that he could increase the number of Senators? What reason had he to suppose that the Senate would be hostile to him? In the whole history of our country since the Union, and on this point he would again refer to the opinion of the President of the Council. He (Mr. Cauchon) said, and it was a matter of history, that since the Union it had never been necessary to swamp the Legislative Council so as to bring it into accord with the political views of the Government. The Premier having proposed to the Governor-General at that time to increase the Senate by 24 members, thought, a slight upon that body. The hon. gentleman should have borne in mind that the Senate was composed of men who knew their duty towards the country, men who knew not well the peculiar relation they occupied on account of the limitation of the power of the Government to offer any resistance to the Government. They know too well that such a thing would strain our constitution to the utmost extent possible, and that the hon. man, in asking without any real reason for it, that the number of Senators should be increased, had tried to make the people believe that he and his Government could not possibly get on with the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) appeared to have complained that the Senate had been formed chiefly from his political opponents, but he must have forgotten that the constitution carried with it a remedy for that evil, if it was an evil. Those who framed the constitution saw very well that in consequence of the appointments and resignations the Senate would be renewed continually, and that a political party would not be in power any reasonable length of time without, in the ordinary course of events, having an opportunity of appointing supporters to that House. It would be remembered that since Confederation there were forty Senators had been appointed, and during the three years of the Mackenzie administration of Sir Alexander Mackenzie they had appointed fourteen. When that was the case, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) should have reflected before he asked to be allowed to make additions to the Senate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) complained that if he had been allowed to appoint Senators in the ordinary way, unfortunately for us, the rejection of the Nanaimo and Reguimalt bill, would not have taken place. He (Mr. Masson) wished that was a mistake. Suppose the hon. gentleman had had the power to appoint Senators as soon as he came office, he would have appointed them from among his own supporters. Governors have appointed gentlemen holding opinions on the railway question similar to those held by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake) or the Minister for the Interior (Mr. Mills), and the consequence was that it would have been thrown out just the same. He (Mr. Mackenzie) declared not having the control of the Senate, as he had of the House of Commons, but he (Mr. Masson) wished to know if he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he could control gentlemen as the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior do? He could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, he could not control them in the House of Commons. It was plainly evident that if he could not control them in the Upper House, consequently he should not charge the hon. gentleman opposite with the rejection of the Cameron terms on the ground that they would have because he had the Senate. Government allowed an increase in the Senate. He concluded his remarks by stating that the action of the Government in the matter was unprecedented, and he hoped that such would never occur again.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said he was somewhat surprised at the manner in which the hon. gentleman had told him (Sir John), that he was surprised at his sympathy with the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Masson) when he (Sir John) had spent all his life in opposing a principle which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) had been, before he made such a statement, should have borne in mind that he (Sir John) was one who would have found that he was entitled to a hearing. It seemed to him (Sir John) that that duty recommended itself to the Government and to the country. His hon. friend, the member for West Middlesex, would see that he (Sir John) was not the author of the use of the produce of malt, of the use of ale, and that there was a heavier duty proposed upon it by the hon. gentleman who was whiskey and other ardent spirits. (Hear, hear.) Even the most enthusiastic temperance man was not so fanatical as to say that he would have found fault with the Government and the Parliament could deal with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE presumed that the hon. gentleman was responsible for his action in raising the duty published the before he went into Parliament. He (Mr. Mackenzie) only had to say that he was sure there was no unnecessary delay in the introduction of the Metcalfe that the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT—Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—I hear the hon. (Mr. Masson) ironically say "hear, hear." (Laughter.) Can only say with respect to Lord Metcalfe, that I believe the principle of Responsible Government was not infringed upon by those who attacked his policy in the matter referred to.

Mr. BOWELL pointed out that the Government had lately endeavoured to remove the difficulty in the way of employing persons convicted of crime in the North-West from themselves, and to put it on the Government of Canada, and which from its nature, being "the only which cheers and not inebriates," was the best suited to the peculiar wants and ardent spirits which had yet been found. (Hear, hear.) But hon. gentlemen put a proposition which might have found some other object of taxation and not have put so powerful a duty on a beverage which was almost a necessary of life among the larger portion of the inhabitants of the Dominion