

fied when the propositions of the Government are laid before the House.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 62 of the Estimates, No. 164, he will find that \$40,000 are asked from the House for the completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-horns.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this one among them?

Mr. BOWELL. We will tell you when they come down. Motion agreed to.

THE CLAIM OF JAMES DAUPHENÉE.

Mr. KEEFLER moved for copies of all petitions, reports and correspondence in reference to the claim of James Dauphenée, of Bridgewater, in the county of Lunenburg, for payment of claim for refund of expenses incurred by him in discharge of his duties as a Fishery Warden of that county. He said: I may state to the House that James Dauphenée was a Fish Warden in the county, and in the discharge of his duties he brought a number of persons to justice for violation of the Fisheries Act. He incurred a great deal of expense, which has never been refunded to him by the Government. I should like that he would get a measure of justice, either from the Government, or from this House.

Motion agreed to.

CHARGES AGAINST MAJOR PETERS.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) moved for all correspondence, instructions, reports and Orders in Council to date, referring to the charges brought against Major Peters, No. 2 Troop, 1st Regiment Cavalry of London.

Mr. CARON. Hon. gentlemen know that I am always ready to bring down any papers that are asked for, but I consider that in a matter like this it would be unwise to bring down the papers and submit them to the discussion, not only of the House, but of the public, as the efficiency and discipline of the service would be affected.

Motion withdrawn.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of engineer's report of the survey made at Brae, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, during the last summer, with a view to making harbor improvements at that place.—(Mr. Hackett.)

Copy of petition relative to the trade between Canada and the West Indies, and Brazil, signed by the principal fish merchants of the coast of Gaspé and Bay des Chaleurs, and addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance, and of the letter accompanying the said petition.—(Mr. Fortin.)

BI-DAILY MAIL SERVICE OF THE GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDERKIN enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a bi-daily mail on both lines of the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway to all the offices at all stations north of Palmerston; if so, when?

Mr. CARLING. It is not at present the intention of the Government to establish a bi-daily mail to the places mentioned.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL.

Mr. RICHEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 25) to amend the Acts respecting Cruelty to Animals.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

In the fourth and fifth sub-sections the words "wantonly and maliciously" were added.

In the seventh sub-section the words "whether domestic, tame or wild," were struck out.

On sub-section 8 of section 2,

Mr. LANDERKIN. A great many farmers, in slaughtering their hogs, shoot them. Would they be liable to be imprisoned in the common gaol for three months?

Mr. RICHEY. The plain meaning of the clause is that persons are liable only when the animal is kept as a target for the purpose of being shot at; it does not, of course, affect those who kill animals for the purpose of food. The language that is here is the very language that has already been incorporated in the Acts of the United States with regard to pigeon shooting. At the same time, if it is thought that there is any question with regard to the application of the phraseology I am quite ready to accept amendments to make the meaning more clear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I object to the proviso that all animals found at large, under certain circumstances, may be destroyed at view. It is a dangerous power to vest in the hands of a Justice of the Peace that if he happens to find an animal of any kind at large upon the highway, and in any way injured—it does not say how injured—he may give two men as wise as himself authority to kill that animal without any notice to the owner of it, without calling the owner to show cause why the animal should not be killed, or giving him any notice by which an investigation into the condition of the animal might be held.

Mr. BLAKE. There is another objection which occurs to me. It seems to me that it is entirely beyond our jurisdiction. You are making lawful an Act which is destroying the property of another man, which is interfering with civil rights. My horse is hurt, and because, in the opinion of a magistrate, he is not likely to be useful any longer, you are here proposing that it shall be lawful for the magistrate to kill that horse, and that I shall not have my action. It is a question of civil rights, not at all a question of cruelty to animals.

Mr. RICHEY. The hon. gentleman will see that this proviso is not to the one clause only, but a proviso to the penal clause which covers the whole Act. It protects the magistrate who may be called upon to discharge this duty against the punishments that might flow from his act. I think, however, that full provision is made to cover this case in other Acts upon the Statute-book. I consent to the proviso being struck out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In reference to the shooting of pigeons, does the hon. gentleman propose to strike out that also?

Mr. RICHEY. No; I consider that a very important part of the Bill?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Pigeons are used as an article of food. Many farmers raise pigeons, and before they can be cooked they have to be killed. Does it give them any more pain to be shot at as a target than to have their heads cut off? I cannot see that there is any greater cruelty being practiced to them by being shot at as a target than by being shot at on a fence, or on a barn. You cannot take pigeons in any other way than by shooting them.

Mr. RICHEY. I know the hon. gentleman is of a benevolent nature, and is not very much in the habit of attending pigeon-shooting matches. The Committee have taken evidence upon this point from parties who were inimical to the Bill, rather than favorable to it, and every sportsman conceded the fact that it was a cruel and reprehensible practice. In the greatest sporting country in the world,