

perhaps be able shortly to judge of what additional assistance should be given. Of course the Government is obliged to go very carefully; we do not want to encourage idleness, and we want as far as possible to so treat all cases of suffering as to prevent those who are relieved depending entirely on the food supplied by the Government; we want as far as possible to encourage them to work for a living. In the meantime, instructions have been given to the Lieut.-Governor, having for their object the relieving of any suffering as far as possible, with the means at our command.

THE SMITH DIVORCE CASE,

MOTION.

HON. MR. READ moved

That the fee paid on the Bill intituled "An Act for the relief of Charles Smith" be refunded to him less the expenses of printing and translation.

He said:—In this case the petitioner was not successful and he wishes to be refunded the deposit which he made, less the expenses of printing and translation. There are several authorities for making such a refund.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think my hon. friend should add the expenses of the stenographer.

HON. MR. READ—This is just one of those motions for which we have precedents. There are instances on record where the stenographer was not named, although one was employed; for example, the case of Matthew Gardner, who dropped his bill after a great deal of evidence had been taken. Although a stenographer was employed no deduction was made on that account in refunding the money. I see here that the motion was made by Mr. Dickey, seconded by Mr. Ferrier, that the fee be refunded him, less the expense of printing and translation.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That has been the practice, I believe, but it is a practice that grew up before we employed stenographers.

HON. MR. READ—It is the practice that has been followed since we have employed stenographers. The case to which I refer occurred only two years ago. Mr. Gardner went on with his bill until such time, apparently, as he saw that it was likely to be lost, and then he dropped it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In that case I suppose attention was not called to it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It evidently was an inadvertence. The object of this money is to indemnify the House for all disbursements in connection with the case. If we have been lax and negligent in the past, it is for us to be careful now, and, in this case particularly, there is good reason why we should include the stenographer's fee. I think the merits of this case justify us in making a commencement in this direction. A deduction should be made for every charge that the Senate has been subject to in the way of expenses.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hope my hon. friend will alter his motion to include the stenographer's fee. Why should the public suffer because this man chooses to come here and apply for a Bill to which, as it turns out, he is not entitled? I cannot see any sense in it.

HON. MR. READ—I cannot see why he should be made an example of, and a different course pursued towards him from that which has been followed in other cases. I have given you an instance in point where the only deductions made were for printing and translation.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Attention was not drawn probably, in that case to the matter; there is no difference between the expenses of the stenographer and the expenses of printing.

HON. MR. READ—There is no difference, I admit, but the precedents do not show that such a reduction has ever been made heretofore.

HON. MR. PLUMB—If I remember the case, it was one in which the petitioner had no ground whatever for making the