

hardly believe that in the depression between 1873 and 1878, when our workmen found it almost impossible to live; that during all that time they brought thousands of mechanics into the country; that during all that time it never occurred to them that it was a shame to bring immigrants into a country, the labor market of which was already overcrowded. Yet they stand up to-day and tell this Government that they have been doing wrong. Sir, I believe that the policy announced by the Minister of Agriculture here, a few days ago, in reply to the hon. member for Ottawa, was strictly correct. I believe it is time that certain organisations in the old country, and certain charitable institutions, were given to understand, in some way, that Canada is now large enough to have a pauper population of its own. I believe it would be better if we were to discriminate, even more than we have done, against that class of immigrants coming to this country. The Government have shown every desire to do in this matter all that any Government can do. We have the assurance of the Minister of Agriculture that discrimination will be made against that class of immigrants coming to this country, and that the attention of the Government will be devoted to the introduction of agricultural and farm laborers. But we have something more substantial than that; we have the announcement of the Minister of Finance, in the interests of the mechanical classes, that prison labor will be prohibited altogether. I say, Sir, in concluding these few remarks, that in every respect the Government has done everything that it could do for the working classes, for all the industrial classes, in fact, for all the producing classes of this country. I say that no Government could have done more than it has done, and as all Governments are liable to err, possibly our own Government, in some respects, is not infallible. The First Minister always declared that public men were liable to make mistakes, and Governments were liable to make mistakes. But upon this question of the National Policy it will be to the everlasting credit of the First Minister, that from the day he announced that policy to the people of Canada he has remained faithful to the doctrine; and up to this moment he has shown no sign of departing from it; but, as he stated at the magnificent gathering in Toronto, a gathering of the young men, the old men, and the middle-aged men, who assembled to do him honor, he has nailed that principle to the mast-head of his party, and is willing to stand or fall by it, and in that statement he voiced the sentiments not only of his followers in this country, but, in my opinion, of the large majority of the people of Canada.

Mr. JACKSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:15 a.m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### LEVIS ELECTION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to say that I have made enquiry with respect to the issuing of a new writ in the case of Lévis, and I find that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, has not yet received

the necessary instructions to enable him to issue a new writ in that case. When is it proposed to give those instructions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No notice had been given by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the Department of the Secretary of State, but to-day the Government have given orders to have the writ issued without delay, at once.

Mr. BLAKE. I find it exceedingly difficult to understand the course of procedure in these cases. From the statement made by the Secretary of State to this House, it appears to be his duty to give notice to have the writ issued.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said I had not received it.

Mr. BLAKE. Either there has or has not been delay. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was furnished with the necessary information by the Government as to what was to be done with respect to one of those two notices, that for the West Riding of Northumberland, in time to enable the writ to be issued yesterday. With respect to the case of Lévis, the hon. gentleman says the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not give him notice, and that is the reason, and the only reason, the hon. gentleman has given for not having acted in that case. My belief, however, is that there is another reason, because I cannot see that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would have omitted to give notice as to Lévis and given notice as to West Northumberland. If he conceived it to be his duty to give notice at once in the one case, why should he have delayed with respect to the other? We all were informed of the fact that the warrant had been issued in that case, and the Government upon receiving that notice proceeded without delay to execute their part of the law and to give the necessary instructions. They pick and choose. In the one case, they give instructions; in the other case they delay. That is making a convenience for their own purposes of the law, which was not to be so used. The law is to be used in the general interest, and equal justice is to be meted out to all the constituencies; and, therefore, I conceive that the privileges of this House have been violated and the Government have neglected a duty imposed upon them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not believe the Government have been in any sense guilty of a breach of the privileges of Parliament. Notwithstanding the forcible language which has been addressed by the hon. gentleman opposite, the clerk says the uniform practice is for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to wait for instructions after you, Mr. Speaker, have informed the House that your warrant has been issued. With respect to the writ for West Northumberland I can speak myself. The fact is simply this: Going out of the Chamber I saw the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and, as he knew that I came from Ontario, he said he had received a warrant for West Northumberland. I said, "Very well; you had better have the writ out. Who is the returning officer?" He told me. I said, "Appoint the same returning officer."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not think blame should be attached to anyone in this matter. I received to-day information from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and we ordered that a new writ be issued in the case of Lévis. There has been no reason, although the hon. gentleman opposite insinuates there has, why I should have delayed the issue of the writ, if it had been within my power to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a return here, showing that in the vast majority of cases writs were issued the day following; and in many cases on the same day, as that on which the warrants reached the clerk's hands. Here we have three days' delay in one case, and I say the spirit of the election