

Carroll,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davidson,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Delisie,	Rinfret,
Dickey,	Sanborn,
Edgar,	Savard,
Edwards,	Scriver,
Fauvel,	Semple,
Featherston,	Simard,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Spohn,
Fraser,	Sutherland,
Gauthier,	Trow,
Geoffrion,	Truax,
Gibson,	Vaillancourt,
Gillmor,	Watson,
Godbout,	Welsh,
Grieve,	Yeo.—88.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) to amendment, agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to on a division.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.55 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. MULOCK moved :

That it is desirable that any witness called before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, be examined under oath or affirmation touching any matters coming before them.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) further to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said : The principal provisions of the Bill are four. The first is that the divisions of the Exchequer Court shall have jurisdiction to decide disputes between claimants to patents of public lands, where any dispute of the kind may be referred to the adjudication of the court, as, for instance, where a deceased person has become entitled to a patent if the patent has not issued and there are rival claimants to the estate. The second provision refers to cases in which a judge is disqualified from sitting. At present there are no means by which a substitute judge can be appointed, unless the judge is actually disqualified by interest. But there happen to be some cases where there are other reasons than actual disqualification to make it desirable that the judge should not sit, as, for instance, cases in which as Deputy Minister of Justice he has given an opinion. The object of the provision of

the Bill is to enable a judge to be appointed *ad hoc* in such cases, and to make good his jurisdiction, notwithstanding that the regular judge may not have the interest absolutely to disqualify him in law. Another provision is to confer on the court jurisdiction between subject and subject, to give remedies in cases under the patent law in relation to copyrights and trade marks. Finally, the remaining provision is to introduce the interpleader practice in Exchequer Court cases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. Minister refers to patents in lands, does he refer to patents that may be issued by one of the departments here, or to patents generally ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Patents to be issued from the departments here.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before taking up the Orders of the Day, I hope the House will allow me to draw its attention to an article which I find in *Le Monde* of this morning, in connection with the position which I took in this House on Monday night. The article, as I translate it, reads as follows :—

“MR. JONCAS VOTED WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT.

“Mr. Joncas was elected by acclamation at the last election. Until lately the member for Gaspé had almost always supported the Government ; but he is of Liberal origin, and as the herring-keg will always smell of the herring, so now Mr. Joncas has retained the taste of his early years, and he now returns to his first loves, without any ado. Perhaps the best way after all to pass from under one flag to another is to march off in silence.”

Mr. Speaker, *Le Monde*, of Montreal, has always made itself the mud-cart of the Conservative party since it came into existence. The editors of *Le Monde*, of Montreal, have made their paper the vehicle for all the filth with which the Conservative party wants to cover its opponents, and I am not at all surprised if I find myself a little besmattered with mud by the editors of *Le Monde*. I would not pay any attention to this article were it not for its giving me the occasion to explain the vote which I gave here on Monday night against the Government. The editors of *Le Monde*, Mr. Speaker, have such supple spines, they are so accustomed to crouch neath the whip that lashes them, they are so used to quietly and smilingly wipe away spittle thrown in their faces, if it pays them to do so, that they cannot understand independence of character in other people. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the motion of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, on Monday night, because I wanted to protest by my vote against the principle which seemed to have presided at the formation of the present Administration. I wanted to protest by my vote against the fact that the senior Privy Councillor of Her Majesty, the first lieutenant of the chief whose death has left such a great vacancy among us, the one we are still in mourning for, and whose loss will be long and keenly felt by the Conservative party, had been left aside. I wanted to protest against the complete ignoring of the man who for twenty-five years of his life, in weal or woe, fought by the side of the chief whose loss we lament. I had another reason, Mr. Speaker, for my vote, a reason personal to me, which it does not suit me to make public here to-day ; but grave interests con-