

is insuperable, but I am afraid it is. We might possibly make a reference of the question. But, as I understand the effect of a judgment on a mere reference like that, while, no doubt, it would be respected, I do not know that it would absolutely preclude the judges from deciding otherwise in particular cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has not the Supreme Court already refused to give a judgment on a reference?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware that it absolutely refused. In the marriage case, one of the judges expressed the view that one portion of the question need not be answered, and, in the same way, their Lordships of the Privy Council found it unnecessary, in view of one answer given in that case, to answer the second question. But, I do not think it ever has been said by the Supreme Court—well, perhaps I had not better enter into that. My fellow-countrymen have a saying that it is time enough to bid the devil good morrow when you meet him, and as some of these legal conundrums may be described as being the very devil, perhaps it is well not to anticipate them.

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask the Minister of Justice—

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that it is rather a violation of the rules of debate to keep putting a series of questions to an hon. member, and asking him to answer them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is for the liberty of the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to that, it is for the Speaker to say when it is a question of the liberty of the subject.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will not appeal from your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OLIVER: The Speaker is the exclusion officer in this case.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 11.38 p.m.

Tuesday, March 3, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

VACANCY.

RESIGNATION OF HON. F. D. MONK.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to [Mr. Doherty.]

inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Frederick Debartzch Monk his resignation as member for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier in the province of Quebec. I accordingly issue my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 91, respecting the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 92, respecting the Premier Life Insurance Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 93, respecting the Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company.—Mr. Hepburn.

WEDNESDAY SITTINGS.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That on Wednesday, the 4th of March next, and subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the House will meet at three o'clock p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days, and that on said Wednesdays Government notices of motions and Government orders shall have precedence after questions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I suppose there is no serious objection to this motion, but I would suggest that we should be given to-morrow again and that the motion should run from the following Wednesday, the 11th.

Mr. BORDEN: I accept that, and I therefore beg to move that the 11th be substituted for the 4th.

Motion as amended agreed to.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I beg your leave, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Finance to give the House some information, which he seems to have given to the press this morning. I suppose I need not lay down the principle that Parliament is entitled to as much consideration at his hands as is the press. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman with regard to a statement attributed to him in the Ottawa Citizen. The article refers to the new Canadian loan, and in the last paragraph of the article, it is stated that the Minister of Finance said there was no truth whatever in the rumour current here that the Government had in view an issue later on for the purpose of making a loan to a railway corporation; and, that no application for assistance by way of loan had been or was expected to