

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to know whether it is intended, by any provision of this Bill, to prevent political partisans being employed by the officer who makes up the list? In my county a notorious partisan was employed as clerk of the revising officer. I think there ought to be some provision in the Bill by which any person who is secretary of a Liberal-Conservative association, or a Liberal association, or even an association connected with the third party, should be considered disqualified for holding that office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he proposes that election trials should be held by a single judge, as at present?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. MILLS. I would suggest, whether it would not be well that a change should be made in that respect under the Controverted Act. The court is held by two judges instead of one, and, I believe, on the whole, it is much more satisfactory. Certainly there is greater uniformity in the rule by which the conduct of a court is governed where there are two judges than where it is held by a single judge. There is a great difference in the views taken by judges with regard to the procedure under the Controverted Elections Act, and certainly there would be more uniformity were two judges to sit. I may say, further, that the public have greater confidence in the proceedings of a court where there are two judges.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to amend the North-West Territories Act. He said: The North-West Territories Act, which was passed last Session, and under which the Supreme Court for the Territories was established, made no provision for appeals then pending before the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Manitoba, as it was understood, on the information we then had, that there were none pending. It has been found that there were appeals undisposed of, and I introduce this Bill to meet the case.

Motion agreed to, and Bill was read the first time.

#### CUSTOMS AND EXCISE TARIFF.

Mr. RINFRET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in view of the changes which have taken place each year since the Session of 1879, in the levying of the duties of Customs and Excise, to publish and distribute the tariff of the duties of Customs and Excise as it now stands?

Mr. BOWELL. It is the intention of the Government, as soon as the Bill is passed, to publish it for distribution in the usual way.

#### DURANTAYE SENATORSHIP.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether application was made by any person besides the Honorable J. J. Ross for the position of the late Honorable J. C. Chapais as Senator for the Division of La Durantaye? If such application was made, then by what person or persons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whether application were made or not is a matter of no public interest, and the Government does not think this question should properly be answered.

#### KENNEBEC SENATORSHIP.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether application was made by any person besides the Honorable P. Fortin for the po-

Mr. THOMPSON.

sition of the late Honorable Mr. Cormier as Senator for the Kennebec Division? If such application was made, then by what person or persons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Same answer as to the last question.

#### RIVER TRENT BOOMS AND PIERS.

Mr. MALLORY asked, Is there an officer or appointee of the Government whose duty it is to keep booms and piers in order in the River Trent between Rice Lake and Trenton? If so, what is his name and salary, and is it part of his duty to repair those piers and booms if carried away by freshets or other causes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is such an officer. His name is R. B. Rogers. His salary, paid by the Department of Public Works, is \$600 per annum. It is part of his duties to have piers and booms repaired, after he has been authorised by the Department to do so.

#### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SUBSIDY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg leave to move that, tomorrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution, and to say that I have the assent of the Crown to this resolution:—

*Resolved*, That from and after the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven, there shall be paid to the Province of Prince Edward Island, in addition to all other subsidies and allowances now paid to the said Province, an annual allowance or subsidy of twenty thousand dollars, which additional allowance or subsidy shall become payable and be paid to the said Province half-yearly in advance, on the first days of July and January in each and every year, beginning with the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven.

Motion agreed to.

#### HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he has brought down the papers relating to the commission of the High Commissioner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman spoke of it. I will bring them down to-morrow.

#### SUPPLY—9TH BATTALION, QUEBEC.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. AMYOT. Yesterday I had the honor to ask the Minister of Militia for the letter ordering the 9th Battalion to suspend its drills, and for the reasons why they were suspended. The hon. gentleman answered that he did not know whether the reasons had been communicated to the battalion, but that they were contained in the letter addressed to me. I beg to deny that statement. I do not think the Minister made it in bad faith, but, as a matter of fact, I deny it and I challenge him to bring down the papers to show the contrary. On that point, I may say the 9th Battalion had obtained the right of making their annual drill during the season of 1886-87, and they had begun to do so. Three drills were made, when order was received purely and simply to suspend the drill. That order was an insult to the battalion. No reason was given, no communication was addressed to me or any of my officers, that I heard of, giving the reasons for this most extraordinary order. A few days later we received permission to go on again, still without explanation whatever. We were treated more harshly than we treat our servants, because, generally, when a servant is at work in the interests of his master, he is not ordered to suspend without being given the reasons why. I also asked a