

after night for some three or four weeks; I felt it my duty, at the expense of the delay to public business, to do this, and it was only after some three or four weeks that my hon. friend saw the policy of at once meeting the case and dealing with it, and settling it. I want to say to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, that, if they do not want another delay like this in carrying on the business of the country, they had better refrain from taking away the reasonable time which belongs to private members, at so early a period in the Session. But if they wish to avoid this, let them say at once to those private members who have business of that kind: Come over to our departments and let us go into the matter quietly and coolly between ourselves to see whether we cannot settle these claims—because I am bound to have these claims settled, I do not care what it costs, nor what time it occupies. I merely warn hon. gentlemen that if they insist in taking this day, I shall at every opportunity move one of the motions of which I have given notice, with a view of seeing if I cannot get justice done to the people I represent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will say to my hon. friend that the motion that has just been made will not prevent hon. members taking up private matters as usual. Thursday will be for public Bills, and all these notices of motions and private matters will be dealt with on Mondays and Wednesdays as usual; therefore I think that the object of my hon. friend will not stand. About the claims he speaks of, I hope that when he brings them to the notice of the Government, as he suggests, some means will be devised by which they can be set right so that justice may be done, and that my hon. friend will be satisfied with the decisions that will be come to. Therefore I hope that my hon. friend will not object to the motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will just put my hon. friend right on one point. He says we will have Mondays and Wednesdays to bring these for private members' business. This is a private day, and we have five pages of notices of motion on the paper, of grievances, real or supposed, and we cannot reach one of these to-day. I would remark to my right hon. friend, who has come in since I spoke first, that we have only until six o'clock to-night. Private Bills are first taken up, and then questions put by members, of which there are two pages, and we will not get through with these before six o'clock. There is a ball going on at a very distinguished portion of this city to-night, and I should not be at all surprised if my hon. friends opposite desired to go to this ball and asked us for an adjournment, and so our whole day is taken away and we cannot reach one of these private motions until Wednesday; and no man knows better than the hon. Minister of Public Works that we have no chance whatever of reaching the notices of motions on that day. Are we to be deprived of every opportunity of placing private grievances before this House for consideration and adjustment, by the taking away of the Thursday from us? It is unreasonable. The first Wednesday is a holiday, and, I believe, they expect to get through by Easter. I want the Government to tell us whether they are disposed to deal with these private grievances? I have had for three years some of these cases before this House, and have been told, time and again, that they will be dealt with before the close of the Session, or immediately after, but the Session passes over, and I have never been able to get these claims settled. Now, if the Government will say to private members—I am speaking for myself alone—if the Minister will say to me: Come to my office and talk the matter over quietly for the purpose of settlement, then I shall have nothing more to say about it, and, for the present, I will withdraw my objections to the motion. The right hon. gentleman was kind enough the other day to send me candies across the House. I was very much obliged to him, and accepted them as an indication that the

Mr. MITCHELL.

olive branch was extended to me; and, although we have not been as cordial for the last year or two as we ought to have been as public men, I may say that if he is prepared to say to me, as the acting Minister of Railways did, that he would talk the matter over privately with me, I will be willing to withdraw my objection to this motion; but if he does not, I can assure him that every time the Government move to go into Committee of Supply I shall move an amendment for the purpose of having a discussion on my grievances, as it appears that is the only way I can get justice done to my constituents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We'll, I am like Davy Crockett's coon—I must come down. I will be very glad to sit down with the hon. gentleman if my colleague, the Minister of Railways, is not able to meet him himself, and to go over these matters with him, and to discuss them; and I shall always have a sufficient assortment of candies for the use of my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the hon. gentleman kindly name the day when he will do that?—because that is very indefinite; I would like to have something specific.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I won't say "to-morrow."
Motion agreed to.

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 98) to amend the Winding-up Act, chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The intention of this Bill is to make provision for winding-up companies incorporated by this Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

MONTREAL AND OTTAWA BOOM COMPANY'S BILL.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Montreal and Ottawa Boom Company (Mr. Girouard), read.

Mr. GIROUARD. This Bill was introduced by Mr. Perley, one of the members for Ottawa. After the first reading, I agreed to take charge of it, on condition that it would be modified so as to meet some of the serious objections I had against the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. That you had against the Bill?

Mr. GIROUARD. That I had against the Bill as introduced.

Mr. MITCHELL. A lot of us had objections to it.

Mr. GIROUARD. I will tell the hon. gentleman and the House a little later what my objections were. I had an interview with the promoters of the Bill, and I found that it did not state fairly the object they had in view. The Bill asked that the promoters should have power to build wharves, piers, slides, dams, booms, or other improvements over any part of the River Ottawa from the Chaudière Falls at Ottawa, to the north westerly end of the Island of Montreal, and either on one or both of the channels to the north-west of the said Island and on the shores adjoining the said extent of said river. The promoters, who are owners of sawmills in Ottawa, Hull and elsewhere in the country, contemplated removing to, or at least building mills on the northern portion of the Island of Montreal in my county. They point out many advantages that would be obtained by so doing. In the first place, they say that