

more than three or four times during a year in the province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. POWER—You are singularly fortunate.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—And that is a less inconvenience than furnishing the public with an opportunity of stating later on that such and such a juror differed from the majority because he was a Liberal, or a French-Canadian, or an Irishman. We should avoid that as much as possible, for the present, at any rate. Therefore, on principle, I am opposed to the amendment submitted by the hon. gentleman. As to the question of urgency, I do not think it is prudent or necessary to accept this amendment without a careful examination of the code to see whether this amendment will dovetail properly into it. A third reason is that the Bill that is now before the House deals only with clerical errors.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—No question of principle whatsoever is involved in this Bill. On the two grounds that I have mentioned, it is not advisable to accept this amendment. I really believe it would defeat the Bill. It might not go through the Lower House, and I doubt very much whether it would be supported by my own province, on the grounds that I have stated.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—As to the question of urgency, if it should be the means of defeating this Bill, as my hon. friend suggests, I would not press it. At the same time, I am not with him on the other reasons that he gave us, because I know in the province from which I come, frequently through the obstinacy of one jurymen, the ends of justice have been defeated. From some tampering, or other cause, one man has been induced to hold out against all reason and against the charge of the judge: he does not give his reasons, he simply determines that he will not yield. As to the secrecy of the jury, that is simply with the grand jury. In the case of the petit jury, ten minutes after the verdict it is known how they all stand. There is nothing in the point with regard to secrecy. The province of Quebec may be an exception, but in the province of Nova Scotia, the ends of justice have frequently been defeated for want of such a provision

as this which the hon. member from Halifax suggests.

Hon. Mr. GOWAN—This is really a more debateable question than hon. gentlemen suppose. The unanimity of jurors has been required for ages and a very great difference of opinion exists on the subject. It has been urged that even if eleven could give a verdict, the very moment the jurors retired to their room, their first act would be to ascertain by a general vote how they stood, and if they found eleven of one opinion they might go in and return a verdict at once, but if the twelfth man could say "Stop a moment, I have something to say to you about this: I insist upon giving my reason," they must remain. Now, the matter being one on which a great difference of opinion exists and a serious principle is involved, it would be wrong at this stage, when dealing with this technical small amendment to the Code to introduce such an important principle.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—I must confess that the temperate and calm manner in which the hon. gentleman from Halifax introduced this motion commends itself largely to me, and I do not say that in regard to the proposal which he has brought out my sympathies are not very largely with him, but it does appear to me that a fatal objection lies in the fact mentioned by the hon. leader of the House, that this is a Bill merely for the purpose of making certain technical amendments to the Code, and it is of great importance that it be carried through at the present session. I therefore urge the hon. member from Halifax to withdraw his motion with the proviso that if he introduce a short Bill next session it will be considered, and I shall be disposed to go with him if I feel as I do at present, but the remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. member from Barrie seem to me to put beyond question the desirability of his withdrawing his motion and not dividing the House at the present time.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken sympathizes largely with the view I entertain in this matter, but there is a certain amount of misapprehension in the minds of some hon. gentlemen who have spoken with respect to the position of the matter. In the first place, the hon. member from Barrie