

Marked Copy

THE SENATE DEBATES

SIXTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

No. 38

Monday, 23rd March, 1896

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, 23rd March, 1896.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

A PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL

MOTION.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON moved

That the Senate is of opinion that the time has come when the consideration of the formation of a permanent International Tribunal may with advantage be entered upon, with the view of affording the various nations the requisite security and protection from a constant liability to the most costly and destructive warfare.

He said: In bringing this motion before this House many hon. gentlemen may think that I am taking a very advanced position, that I am entering upon a new subject that perhaps should not emanate from a body like the Canadian Senate. However, I hope to convince hon. gentlemen before I have got through that it is quite proper, and quite in accord with the principles of our constitution, that it is quite in accord with the sentiments of the Canadian people, and that it is quite abreast of the times in bringing before the House a subject of this character. I may say that one of the motives that I had in bringing this subject before this House sprang from the fact that I was brought into contact with some open letters that were published, addressed to the Marquis of Salisbury, the premier of Great Britain, and as hon. gentlemen know, were written by one with

whom we are all familiar, if not personally at any rate we are all familiar with his presence. He has resided in Ottawa a great number of years, in fact I believe he is a native of Ottawa, and has taken advantage of our library and of our reading room in order to employ his time and improve his mind upon the lines that he has laid down for his own guidance. Hon. gentlemen know that I am referring to our respected friend, Mr. Monk. Mr. Monk deserves great respect. Although the appearance that he presents to the eyes of the world is similar, we may suppose, to the appearance of the savants of the ancient times, yet notwithstanding all that, he is one who is entitled to every respect, and any opinion that he expresses on a subject of this kind is entitled to respect by this hon. House and by the country at large. I may say that the deductions which he draws in the letters which he has addressed to the Marquis of Salisbury are the results of a lifetime of study of the Scriptures and of familiarity with the scenes in the holy land connected with them, and when he presents to us in the form of open letters that are addressed to the Marquis of Salisbury the studies of a life in the way he has done, they mark a new departure, I may say, in political life. The letters to which I refer are essentially political, in so far as they are addressed to a great statesman and in so far as they deal with political matters. In that respect we are perfectly justified in dealing with them from a political standpoint, and we are, therefore, justified in discussing the question as a political question. No one can fail to be struck with the fact that what is known as the Victorian era has been marked by the most marvellous results of advancement and progress, that the advancement

1896

(148)

2

and progress during the Victorian era has been of such a character that it marks it as a period distinctive in the history of the world. And when we recognize that we are approaching towards the termination of the Victorian era, we have a right to sum up and see what is the result of the marvellous progress and development that the world has seen during that era, and how far before its close an advance may be taken towards the consummation of some definite object that has its results in greater benefits to mankind generally. If progress and development and civilization and christianity do not advance the interests of mankind and the nations of the world, then it fails in its primary object, and in discussing this question I take that as my basis. I see, and we all see, that the sovereign whose name is attached to the Victorian era has reigned almost the longest reign that has been known on the British throne, and that her personal reign has been marked by the highest state of christianity, of experience, of political knowledge and of everything that goes to make a great and fine character, that she stands pre-eminently before the world and sets an example of all the virtues which it is desirable that the people of the world should emulate. Not only the Queen in her own life, but in the bringing up of her family and in her family life, has shown an example that we may imitate from one end of the world to the other in its simplicity, in the beneficial results that her rule in her private family has exercised upon those who have grown up around her, who stand before the world as public examples of what a christian family may be brought to, of what virtues they are able to display and what usefulness and advantages they are able to develop in the interest of the nation to which they belong. Alongside of the Queen we have the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, who is approaching the years of a centenarian who has developed the highest type of christian development in his character, allied with great political power, that modern history has shown us. Next to the Queen, who has the greatest political experience in the political history of the world, the result of her long reign as sovereign, and one who has never neglected her duties as the head of the British Empire, Mr. Gladstone, I think, stands next, and no matter how much his opponents may have disagreed with him, everyone will acknowledge that all his acts,

all the political efforts that he has put forth, have been guided from the highest principles that are supposed to emanate from a christian character. Then next to him we have Lord Salisbury, who is at the present moment at the head of the British nation as its political guide and ruler, and he is the representative of that phase of English family life that has for generations sent forth men fitted to cope with the political questions that have brought the British Empire to such great prominence, who have by their training been able to maintain a continuity of public policy that has all led to a certain end; and their great experience, backed up by the support of the nation, essentially democratic in its instincts, backed up by the intelligence of the nation, has brought Great Britain to the highest state of power and prestige that any nation on the face of the earth has ever yet attained. Co-operating with him in the British Government is the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, who, unlike Lord Salisbury brought up as one of England's aristocracy, has sprung from the industrial classes of Birmingham, and he recognizes in the policy that he is now developing with regard to the extension of the world's commerce, with regard to the extension of the prestige and power of the British race, he recognizes the present day facilities for the interchange of trade and thereby the multiplication of the advantages of our civilization to the advancement of the world, to the benefit of the world and to the general diffusion of prosperity throughout the world. These comprise at the present time the leading personnel of the Victorian era as it is drawing to its close, and we have to consider, as I said before, hon. gentlemen, what is all this leading to? What does it all lead up to? I am one of those who thoroughly believe that we are creators of destiny, that while we are creators ourselves, while we have the power of great creative faculties which is seen on every hand, there is a power, a higher power, that develops creative faculties in a different way, and I believe that we all are endowed with that genius that will lead up to and carry out the purposes of a greater Creator in the purposes that he may have in store for the world generally. Now, I should have mentioned in connection with Lord Salisbury's name and the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain's name, another great name on this continent, who probably has exercised his

0 901545

influence in a marked direction, and that is the late President Lincoln who stood at the head of the United States nation and who guided the United States people through their civil war between the years 1860 and 1864. He will always rank high in history for the principles he enunciated and for the faithfulness he displayed in carrying out those principles. These are prominent examples of Christian leaders of public influence, leading their nations in the direction of paths that they think they should be treading. Now, hon. gentlemen, it is within the Victorian era that our railways have been developed, that our steam power has been developed, that our telegraphs have been developed, that our electricity has been developed; it is within the generation of these living men, some of whom I have referred to. All these have come upon the world as new factors, entirely new factors above all the factors of the centuries and ages that have gone past, and these railways, telegraphs and electricity and telephones and all these mighty powers have put us in a position to accomplish what it was utterly impossible for the past ages to have accomplished, what was not within the range of possibility fifty years ago, and when we come to think that the first railroad was projected on this continent, I believe in Boston, in 1827, and that the first steamboat crossed the Atlantic in the present generation, that the United States by themselves I believe have to-day more railroad construction than all the rest of the world put together, that Canada has added its thousands of miles of railroad to the interchange of trade, that the people of Great Britain own the vessels and the ships and the navies which are greater than all the rest of the world put together—at least if they are not perhaps greater than all the rest of the world, they are very great and powerful. It becomes apparent that these two English speaking nations, acting together exercise a powerful influence upon the destiny of the world. We come now to the subject that I have undertaken to deal with, and it is for the House to realize in what path their duty lies. We all recollect how a very short time ago the world was shocked at the massacre of Christians in Armenia. How it went forth that the Turks, under Turkish misrule, were bringing destruction upon a Christian population, one of the most ancient Christian populations of the world in that Asiatic province. Most

people turned their eyes to Great Britain to put a stop to those massacres. Most people thought it became the imperative duty of the people of Great Britain and the British Government to enter, like the Crusaders of old, and put a stop to a condition of affairs which was proceeding under Turkish rule. I have no doubt that if conditions had been such that the British Government could have undertaken it without fear of raising a greater trouble and creating more bloodshed, the spirit was there and willing to undertake the task, but we immediately observed specks upon the horizon which showed a jealous spirit, or whatever spirit it was, on the part of powerful nations, which acted as a decided check upon Great Britain undertaking the task. We saw that in consequence of a minor dispute over the boundary of Venezuela, the president of the United States showed that there was a possibility of the United States making that a *casus belli*. Then in another remote part of the world, the Transvaal, in the interior of Africa, we saw that the Emperor of Germany was disposed to make a *casus belli* with Great Britain there, and added to these was the jealousy among other nations as to the advisability of permitting Great Britain to get a foothold in Armenia. All this operated to permit a continuance of the present state of affairs. Great Britain was checked in any power that she might have possessed in redressing those grievances and putting a stop to those massacres. Hon. gentlemen will agree with me in saying that it is most desirable that such a condition should not continue to exist, that there are certain things that are due to our human instinct which should teach us that we have a duty to perform in order to remove any obstacles that may exist in the promotion of such a worthy object as was contemplated during the last four or five months. The very moment that the Imperial government was attacked for not taking that position with regard to the Armenians, what was Lord Salisbury's answer? "We must either act with the nations or we must act against them. We cannot act singly and lay ourselves open to be attacked by the nations in undertaking a task of that kind and bring more trouble than we are trying to remove. If we cannot convince nations that it is right that we should go in and protect the Christians in Armenia, then we cannot undertake the task." The object of establishing an international

tribunal is to make the whole of the nations responsible for the conduct of such cases as that. When Great Britain found that Germany was inimical in consequence of the Transvaal incident, she was thrown into diplomatic correspondence with France and Russia, seeing that it was absolutely necessary in order to carry out her policy, which is a policy of progress and development, disseminating sound principles of government throughout the whole world, and in order to find allies she sought them in Russia and France showing the necessity of a tribunal of some kind, partial though it may be. Recent events of the past week or ten days have shown us a similar state of affairs. The Imperial Government, which has for many years occupied Egypt for the advantage of Egypt in its progress and civilization, to plant in that ancient kingdom the principles of good government, finds that a new state of affairs has arisen. Italy, a weak nation has marched into Abyssinia and has unfortunately been seriously defeated to the disturbance of the savage tribes in the interior and it is not desirable that those savage tribes should be allowed to get the upper hand of one of the European nations. It is not in the interest of civilization, it is not in the interest of the Christian nations of the world that anything of the kind should be permitted.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Does not the hon. gentleman think he is using strong language in characterizing the Christians of Abyssinia as savage tribes?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I draw a distinction between Christians and heathens. I am referring to the tribes of the interior. They are led by the Dervishes and are fanatical to a degree.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The Italians have not been fighting the Dervishes.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—No, but the trouble has aroused the Dervishes in the Soudan. I was not speaking of the Abyssinians, but of the Arabs in the Soudan district. The defeat of Italy was arousing their enthusiasm and bringing them to the front once more, in order to upset all the progress and civilization that has been accomplished during the last 25 years, notably the suppression of the slave trade and the

opening up of commerce. It became necessary for England once more, in the wisdom of the British Government, to open up the Soudan, but without the support of the nations of Europe she could not undertake the task in consequence of her international obligations in Egypt and she sought the alliance of the Dreibund, Italy, Germany and Austria, who have supported her in undertaking the advances into the Dungola district and the Soudan in the interests of Egypt, and the extension of the boundaries of Egypt and for the purpose of extending the spreading of civilization in that region. No one can deny for one moment that it is part of the duties of Christian nations to diffuse civilization as far as it is possible for them to do so, to give heathen nations in the heart of Africa and elsewhere the advantage of knowledge and progress and to bring them under control, so that their labour and their intelligence can be put to the highest use instead of exactly the reverse, as it is at the present moment. The advance of Italy, against those warlike tribes, has shown the Italian people the difficulty they have to contend with. Where Great Britain, backed by her moral prestige marched into Abyssinia without firing a shot twenty-five years ago, Italy has suffered severe losses. England has marched twice to Kumassi, on the west coast of Africa, without a shot being fired.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—It was not so in the first instance.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—It was, practically.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—No, indeed. Very many shots were fired there.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—The first advance was not quite without firing a shot, but it was practically a peaceful advance, and the last has been essentially so, and a very large district of Western Africa will now be brought within the influence of civilization as developed by the Imperial Government wherever it goes. These are all advantages that cannot be lost sight of, advantages that are sought for by advanced minds and advanced thinkers on lines similar to those laid down by our venerable friend, Mr. Monk, in his letters to Salisbury. Hon. gentlemen know that where there is union there is peace. In

the past history of Great Britain, upwards of a thousand years ago, there was what was called the Heptarchy and those seven kingdoms were perpetually at war with each other. When the union was brought about, peace prevailed and progress and development followed. Then, again, when Scotland, England and Ireland were separated, there was disunion and fighting; when they became united there was peace. It was the same with India before England stepped in and planted the banner of civilization there. The tribes decimated one another, there was perpetual fighting, and famines and disasters were of frequent occurrence. Within the past two centuries that great population, amounting to 300,000,000 people, has been brought under the rule of Great Britain and now peace reigns within their borders, famines are impossible and great benefits are flowing from the development and progress that have there taken place in consequence of British power having planted its foot down and firmly and judiciously exercised control. In the same way, union in other parts of the world shows the beneficent results that have flowed from it. The next point that I desire to make in bringing this question before you is to point out the destructiveness of war at the present time.

Hon. Mr. PROWSE—We know that.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I dare say, hon. gentlemen, you know that, but I hope you will bear with me in order that I may develop, at any rate, what ideas I desire to propound.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—Give us the remedy.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—The hon. gentleman says we know that, but perhaps he does not realize the full extent of the destructiveness of war at the present day as compared with what it was a quarter of a century or half a century ago. He does not know, or he probably knows and does not realize, the enormous amount of destruction that can be wrought to-day upon all that the world has created as compared with half a century ago. It is when we contemplate the tremendous destructiveness of modern war engines that we can realize what an advantage it would be if conditions could prevail that would bring those under control. Hon. gentlemen can rea-

lize that the world depends upon its cable communication, it depends upon its powers to sail the seas with commerce, that the British nation depends entirely upon the importation of food from abroad in order to support its population. The people of this continent largely depend for their means of support upon their power and ability to transport that food to markets abroad. And so it is in connection with all the nations; and if this commerce were suddenly brought to a stop, if our cable communications were cut off, if privateers were to destroy the commerce, if our canals and other avenues of commerce were destroyed by dynamite, our railways and telegraphs cut off and other powers of destruction exercised, you can see how important it is for us to consider the advisability of bringing under control, in some way or other, this tremendous power in order that it may be averted, in order that chaos may not rule, and that the benefits of progress and civilization during the Victorian era may not be obliterated as has so often been the case in the history of the world, when ancient types of civilization have completely disappeared. Now, hon. gentlemen, I will read to you, so as to embody in this debate, the letters that have been addressed by Mr. Monk to the Marquis of Salisbury, and to which I have already referred. They are, I think, worthy of consideration.

Several hon. MEMBERS—Dispense! Dispense!

Hon. Mr. POWER—I think that is a chestnut.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—This is too much.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—They are worthy of being perpetuated in the annals of our legislation.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—Better not—dispense!

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—These are open letters to Lord Salisbury, and as such, they are political documents. Although written by a private individual, it does not make any difference. They are ideas that are worthy of consideration, and as such, are worthy of a place in our Debates. Let

them go for what they are worth, but at the same time, if the hon. gentlemen have read these letters, they will be convinced that there is a great deal behind them, and that they do represent the research of a lifetime of what is, I believe, an earnest man. They can, by no possibility, do any harm, and they may do good. If they are founded upon right principles, it is impossible that they can do any harm, and if they are founded upon wrong principles, still they can do no harm.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—If the hon. gentleman will give us the replies of Lord Salisbury, I think that will satisfy the House, and we will see what he says about it.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I do not want to impose these letters upon the House, if hon. gentlemen wish to dispense with them.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—Read them.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN—I hope the hon. gentleman will not read the letters. I think all the members of the House have had the opportunity of reading them, if they have not actually read them, and I do not see the necessity of reading them now.

Hon. Mr. PRIMROSE—Why should not Monk be immortalized by having them in our Senate Debates?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—It is not a question whether Monk should be immortalized by having them in the Debates, but I claim my right, as a member of this House, to read a public document. If hon. gentlemen prefer that they should be placed in the Debates and the reading dispensed with, I am satisfied.

Hon. MEMBERS—No, no.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I think, th n, I will read them.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Let them be printed as read.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I read letters to the Marquis of Salisbury, British Premier :—

OTTAWA, CANADA,
24th December, 1895.

TO THE MARQUIS OF SALISBURY,
BRITISH PREMIER, &c.

The present attitude of the United States government towards the British, may be perhaps a providential circumstance, which might now easily

be utilized for the great benefit of the world generally hereafter.

If the principle of "arbitration" is what they really desire to see generally adopted, there is no difficulty whatever now in giving them an excellent opportunity to manifest their earnestness and sincerity in this matter.

We need only to invite them to combine with the British government, and with all the other governments in Christendom also, in the effort to erect a permanent international tribunal which shall thenceforth leave no nation whatever any occasion or excuse for resorting to warfare.

This may very easily be accomplished now, simply by arranging for the purchase of Palestine, at its full present commercial value, that that country may now be made a worthy capital for all the nations of the earth, as Washington is at present for all the United States of America; and as Ottawa is for all the united provinces of the Dominion of Canada.

It need not cost a hundredth part, perhaps not a thousandth part, as much as a great war would cost us, to purchase Palestine and make that country a Paradise, where the representatives of "all nations" may meet at stated intervals, and consult together for the best welfare of the whole world.

The millions of poverty-stricken Jews would of course flock to that country as would also multitudes from "all nations," and the Jews would thenceforth cease to be a separate people, for they would then become completely mixed with other people, as is so plainly predicted concerning this time. Ezekiel xxxvii, 16-23.

Our modern railroads were also very clearly foretold, "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together." It is scarcely possible to describe the grading for railroads more clearly, and more concisely, than in the words just quoted; of course also it is the railroads and telegraphs accompanying them which will enable "all flesh to see it together," when "the glory of the Lord shall be revealed" at this time, as predicted.

It is very remarkable also that it is at this particular time (when railroads are foretold as becoming universal over the whole earth); that the Almighty calls upon all the nations of Christendom to "comfort" the millions of poverty-stricken Jews, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins."—Isaiah xi, 1-2.

More than eighteen centuries have already passed away since the final destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and there were but about eighteen centuries from the days of the patriarchs, Abraham Isaac and Jacob, to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; consequently the Jews have already "received double for all their sins;" and the nations of Christendom are now most emphatically called upon by their "God" to "comfort" the millions of poverty-stricken Jews, who for eighteen centuries have been subjected to the utmost injustice and cruelty although it was by the

earnest efforts and self-sacrifice of many thousands of that devoted race, that Christianity was first introduced and established upon earth.

The whole duty of man from this time henceforth, is summed in very few words as follows:—"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."—Micah vi, 8.

Should the nations of Christendom now begin to exercise "justice and mercy," as required of us by our creator; the long predicted millennium of peace, prosperity and happiness, will immediately begin to dawn upon the earth.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY WENTWORTH MONK.

P. S.—The substance of the matter is this, modern progress having already brought all nations so close together practically, that they can now easily destroy each other and desolate the whole world within a few months; a permanent international tribunal now evidently becomes an indispensable necessity. The foregoing letter indicates very clearly the only possible means of establishing a satisfactory and generally acceptable permanent international tribunal based upon the solid foundations of "justice and mercy;" therefore should Lord Salisbury be now so practically favourable to this grand project, as to immediately do his part towards effecting its accomplishment, others will doubtless soon do their part also, and thus secure the most beneficial results possible, for the human family generally both now and hereafter also.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY WENTWORTH MONK.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—Would the hon. gentleman read Lord Salisbury's reply to that?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—That has not been published. Then there is a letter, dated 30th December, to the Marquis of Salisbury. That letter, which is similar in tone to the former one, is as follows:—

OTTAWA, CANADA,
30th December, 1895.

To the Marquis of SALISBURY,
British Premier, &c.

It is indisputable that a permanent international tribunal (representing the power of the whole world) would be of the utmost benefit to the whole human family; for such a tribunal would naturally abolish warfare, as it would simply be madness for any one nation to defy the combined power of the whole world.

It is indisputable also that the foremost nation of the earth should be the first to take a leading part in advocating in earnest such a permanent international tribunal, to rescue mankind from the incalculable evil of warfare henceforth.

It thus becomes indisputable also that the British people in general, and the British Premier in par-

ticular, are now called upon to do their utmost to realize at once so immeasurable an advantage for "all nations."

It is perhaps about equally indisputable also that the present time and the present circumstances of the nations generally, happen to be wonderfully favourable for the immediate introduction and establishment of such a permanent international tribunal; therefore the British Premier will certainly be inexcusable should he now fail to act in favour of so beneficent a purpose, promptly and faithfully, in accordance with his evident duty to his God, as well as to his country, and to his fellowman in general, upon the present extremely important occasion.

The result of such prompt, faithful and earnest action is described in the following words: "Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children."—Isaiah lxxvi, 8. For "a nation" composed of "a great multitude" of Christians as well as Jews, all mingled together as one people, gathered from "all nations," would suddenly appear in Palestine, when that country is accepted by the nations generally, as the future great and glorious capital of the whole world. Thus "shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day," as it were; and thus "shall a nation be born at once," as was so clearly predicted thousands of years ago.

Why shouldn't the British Premier suggest the immediate establishment of such a permanent international tribunal to the United States Government, as well as to all the other governments with which the British Empire is in constant communication. Whether any of these governments are immediately favourable to such a suggestion, or whether they hesitate or refuse to advocate any such permanent international tribunal, the British Premier's action in the matter would cause the question to come fairly before the world, and agitation and discussion of the subject would not cease until the inestimable benefit should be realized at last.

The inclosed little pamphlet, "The People and the Policy," is calculated to begin to "open the eyes" of people to the evident purposes of our Creator, so long ago plainly foretold, and now actually fulfilled to a considerable extent. The effective publication of such a paper in the *London Times* or otherwise, might tend to awaken many to a consciousness of the "exceeding great reward" now within the reach of man individually and nationally. Perhaps Lord Salisbury could contrive to have this done also, and thus let the public discuss the subject thoroughly, and so, prove its truth and correctness; or show wherein it is false or erroneous if they can.

My old friend, W. Holman Hunt (the well-known artist,) Draycott Lodge, Fulham, London, S.W., who has known me for more than forty years, could supply you with a number of other papers, and any further information that might possibly interest you upon such subjects, should you require it.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY WENTWORTH MONK.

Then the last letter is dated 14th January, and is as follows:—

OTTAWA, CANADA,
14th January, 1896.

To the Marquis of SALISBURY,
British Premier, &c.

The British having now manifested a readiness to defend themselves against any nation, or all nations if necessary, it surely would be well, in the interim before the war spirit again declares itself to take adequate measures to avert the great calamity of warfare, which certainly appears to threaten the foremost nations upon earth. It is evident enough that nothing less than a supreme authority can now possibly rescue the world from the constant liability to very costly and fatal wars. The question is, how can such a supreme authority possibly be established among "all nations?" There is really no great difficulty whatever about this matter; for it needs only that the most powerful nation upon earth should act in accordance with the divine purpose, as is so clearly and distinctly declared in reference to this particular time and to the present circumstances of the world: "In that time shall the present be brought unto the Lord of hosts, of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from their beginning hitherto to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the mount Zion."—Isaiah xviii, 7.

"The place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the mount Zion," means of course "the land of Israel," or Palestine; and the "people scattered and peeled," are of course, the millions of poverty-stricken Jews; while the British are the "people terrible from their beginning hitherto," for no nation has yet proved itself more terrible or powerful than the British people; consequently the British have but to interest themselves in earnest, in restoration of the millions of poverty-stricken Jews to Palestine, and then that one country upon earth (being thus established by the due exercise of "justice and mercy") will naturally become the future capital of the whole world, and all that is most excellent upon earth will also then naturally flow to that country, inasmuch that thenceforth the supreme authority (destined to rescue "all nations" from the constant liability to the most costly and fatal warfare,) will be found in Palestine, "the land of Israel."

This being indisputably as here stated, the British Premier, and the British Government, have only to refer the matter to the British Parliament, and to the British people, for their acquiescence and approval; and invite, at the same time, the government and people of the United States of America, and all the other nations of Christendom also, to join them in such a praiseworthy work of "justice and mercy," and then the universal righteous government of "the Kingdom of God" may thus at once begin to prevail upon earth, as so long ago predicted.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY WENTWORTH MONK.

P.S.—The indisputably true and correct interpretation of a portion of "The Revelation" is inclosed, that Lord Salisbury and his advisers, may have the opportunity to see clearly enough

that I speak with the confidence and authority of one who understands thoroughly the purposes of the Almighty, as declared in the symbolical language of "The Revelation."

HENRY WENTWORTH MONK.

Ottawa, Canada,
14th January, 1896.

Now those are views that the more they are considered the more will they be respected. However much we may think they are in advance of the public thought at this time, yet we cannot but respect the sentiments that are therein expressed. As nations have combined in union for the purpose of peacefully developing the resources within their bounds, for the purpose of taking their part in the advancement of our Christian civilization. Mr. Monk lays down the broad principle that in a similar manner the various nations of the Christian world can form themselves into a new nation with the capital in Palestine. Such a union is no more utopian than the confederation of British North America was no doubt at one time declared to be—than the consolidation of the British Empire is declared to be to-day in the interest of peace and progress. That union of nations is being gradually developed now and at the present moment we have the very best evidences of it, as I have said before, in the formation of alliances such as the Dreibund, and other alliances which are perpetually taking place and perpetually changing again. It is only an extension or a permanency of that same principle that is here sought to be developed and in that respect it can very properly commend itself to the wisdom of hon. gentlemen who compose the Senate of Canada. So far as Canada is concerned, she has a direct interest in anything that will insure her possible development and progress. We are peculiarly situated, more so perhaps than any other nation, in so far as we have a frontier between our own country and the neighbouring country of 4,000 miles, that on each side of this frontier are situated cities and commercial interests that in the case of a destructive war would be entirely or very largely destroyed. We should always be prepared to stand at the back of the people of the United States in upholding that which is right, but at the same time we must always be prepared to defend the integrity of our own country. I have no fear as to the ultimate result in case of an attack, though I am happy to think there is

not much likelihood of it. I believe that Canadians have the ability to defend themselves, and if our country should ever be attacked, we would not only within ourselves be able to show our capacity for self defence, but would be backed up by the power of the British Empire, and there can be no doubt as to what the ultimate result would be. But while we may have that feeling of confidence in ourselves and of the power of the glorious empire to which we belong, yet there is that absolute knowledge that in the progress of war where the passions of men are aroused and where destructive engines of war are brought to bear, it would be utterly impossible to prevent the devastation of everything we have created and developed during the past half century, and our neighbours would suffer in the same way. The same power that they possess to come over here and destroy cities and towns and public works in our country, would enable us to cross the border and do the same thing on their side, and, therefore, having a community of interest in that respect, and, as the destruction would be mutual, that the good sense of the people who speak the same language and are sprung from the loins of the same nation, should look upon that result with equanimity, I cannot believe, and it need not be regarded as a factor in the national progress of this continent, which is likely to move on a higher plane. There has been a movement in Great Britain, and there has been a movement in the United States on the same lines that I am laying down here to-day. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that a deputation came over from Great Britain, composed of a number of members from the House of Commons, and presented a petition, signed by a very large number of members, to initiate the principle of arbitration between these two great nations. The progress of that idea, I am happy to say, shows signs of vitality, and I see of late that a call has been issued for the purpose of calling a meeting from all over the United States, in order to develop still further that idea. I will read a telegraphic despatch dated Washington, 18th March—last Friday—as follows :

WASHINGTON, 18th March.—In view of the fact that a wide spread desire has been manifested, both in the United States and Great Britain, for the establishment between these two countries of a permanent system of arbitration, a call has been

issued for a national conference, to be held at Washington city, on Wednesday and Thursday, April 22nd and 23rd next, to express the general conviction that such a system of arbitration should be speedily provided for by the proper authorities, and with the most comprehensive application practicable. Invitations have been sent to representatives irrespective of party or creed, in every state and territory in the Union. The combined membership in the two Houses of Congress is being taken as a general basis of numbers and apportionment. The call reads: "Assuming you share our belief as to the importance of the end proposed, we deem it unnecessary, in this communication, to enter into an extended statement on the subject. By repeated acts, as well as by repeated declarations, our government has appeared before the world in advocacy of international arbitration as a measure conformably to our own interests and genius, our institutions, as well as to the cause of general justice and civilization. To this effect, patriotism, philanthropy, statesmanship and religion have spoken as with one voice. In confining the present movement to the promotion of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, we are not unconcerned for wider application of the principle involved. But taking into consideration the importance and value of practical results, it seemed wise to concentrate our immediate efforts upon the attainment of a permanent system between the two great English speaking peoples." The signatures attached are those of fifty reputable citizens of Washington, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, St. Louis, and other cities. Among the signers are: Of Washington—Melville W. Fuller, Nelson A. Miles; of New York, Seth Low, Dorman B. Eaton, Abram S. Hewitt; of Chicago, George D. Swift, Marshal Field, Potter Palmer; of Boston, Charles W. Elliott, William E. Russell, Robert Treatpaine; Charles Francis Adams; James Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore; Timothy Dwight, of Yale University; Charles Dudley Warner, of Hartford, Conn.

That information, which is conveyed to us in the press, shows that other people are working somewhat on the same line. Probably the gentlemen who are interested in that movement in the United States are taking a more practical view of the question, than I am presenting under the principle of a more extended international tribunal as being more within the range of practical politics at the present moment, but the very fact that a powerful community like the United States are calling together from every state in the union delegates for the purpose of discussing the very principles which I am now laying before this House, shows that I am not out of order or out of place in bringing up this matter here. It shows that we in Canada are supporting the people and government of Great Britain in every effort that the Imperial Government is making to dispense the blessings of civilization and Christianity throughout the world, and that

the people of the United States are working on the same lines. Hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that it becomes the duty of all nations to try and bring under control heathen nations of the world in order that the benefits of our civilization may be extended to them, in order that the generations that are springing from their loins year after year and century after century may receive the advantages that we enjoy. That can only be done by the steps that are now being taken by the people of the mother land. Great Britain is the only one nation which appears capable of accomplishing that purpose with the most peaceful results, that is to say, the moral power of the Imperial Government such that she is able to bring heathen tribes under control with a less loss of life than apparently other nations can do. She has the spirit and the means within the British Empire to accomplish it. There is no doubt about it that the British Empire, of which we as well as England have the honour to form a part, and no inglorious part, shines out before the world as the foremost nation through the younger nations that have been born through the enterprise of her people, and has developed a strength greater than any other empire that the world has ever known, a strength greater than any other nation has ever shown. The wisdom of the statesmen of Great Britain keeps abreast of the times. There is no new movement, no advanced opinion that is brought before the world, no matter how humble its source may be, but it is turned over and discussed on its merits for the benefit of the British Empire and for the benefit of the world at large, and therefore I humbly submit that although the views I have been expressing, and the sources from which I have drawn those views, very largely are such that hon. gentlemen may not be prepared to accord that consideration to them that perhaps I have given. Yet I hope that they will not think that they are unworthy the time and attention that I am now bestowing upon them. The only profession I can lay claim to is that of a soldier, but that profession is not incompatible at all with a desire for peace. I am not one who would advocate peace at any price. I thoroughly appreciate the words that Mr. Goshen introduced in his speech lately, that he was ready for arbitration, but woe betide the nation that was unable to back up their principles by their own physical power, and I think that we, as Canadians, have a right

to take such steps as are desirable to defend our own country, to maintain our own integrity and to stand side by side with the British nation in upholding the honour of the empire, so far as our limited means will permit us to do it, and it is only by means of that kind that we can attain respect; but while we may take most adequate means for defending our own country, we can at the same time let it be understood thoroughly by the world at large that it is only for the general advancement of civilization in order that we may develop that strength and stand by those nations who propose by their efforts to put down wrong and maintain right, and one of the most noble examples I think we have in the history of the present day, is the example of General Gordon, with which we are all well acquainted. He was an officer of great renown. He undertook the great work of bringing out of chaos the Chinese people when their great rebellions among disunited provinces took place. He undertook the expedition to the Soudan where he offered up his life. He was not only a great soldier, but a great Christian soldier, and worthy of the imitation of any one who makes arms his profession, and no better or higher tribute can be paid to a man of that kind than to connect him with such ideas as I am bringing before this House, to show that while we have a duty to perform as soldiers in maintaining the power and integrity of our country, and supporting the principles that the British Empire is daily developing, that we are doing it in accordance with the highest Christian principles that the world knows. With these remarks, hon. gentlemen, I beg to present my motion for your consideration. As I said before, it may be that I have not brought it before you in as practical a way as I could wish and that it may be too advanced for our unformed ideas upon the subject. It may be modified, possibly, by some hon. gentleman, but I trust that the motives that have induced me to bring this motion before the House are of that character that I may be pardoned for introducing it in the manner I have done.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—On reading the notice of motion I had no idea that my hon. friend was going into the subject in the manner in which he has gone into it, and I thought my own duty would be en-

tirely of a complimentary nature. But the speech of the hon. gentleman has been a rather triangular one; he has alluded to this very noble question of an international tribunal for peace between nations, and also gone into theological questions, giving interpretations of Scripture, which opens the door to a very wide argument. I am not going to dispute with him as to whether these interpretations are true or not, but they are at least open to discussion and doubt. Then, again, he has given us a belligerent speech as well—a jingo speech about what Canada would do and what Great Britain would do, which is entirely out of harmony with the proposal made to the House.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I think the speech should have been entirely one of peace and good-will towards all men and nations. Again, the hon. gentleman has gone into the diplomatic policy of the whole world. He has told us what nations have been doing for centuries, and things of that kind, whereas, we have before our eyes quite enough to show us that it would be a very good thing if nations could lay down their implements of warfare and live in harmony as they have been doing for a number of years now. However, laying all these matters aside, I am very glad to be able, at one time at least during this session of Parliament, to stand on common ground with the hon. gentleman. I think his sentiments are extremely high and noble, and should be pressed from one end of the world to the other. He could not bring forward a brighter example before this House of the universal benefits of peace than the Victorian era. We have had now an era of about forty years of peace. We can count, I suppose, from the time of the Crimean war. I would not count the small conflicts in India and Africa and other places, as they have not really been wars, so that from the time of the Crimean war we have had one long glorious peace, and who can measure the wonderful blessings of that not only to England but the whole world? The fact of being able to live in peace in our homes, to worship our God according to our conscience, and to develop and promote the arts of peace and the arts of commerce, is a very great blessing to everybody and under benign rule, during a long

and glorious peace, England has made wonderful development and progress. The people have been able to live in tranquility and peace, with all the blessings which attend it, for the continuance of which all people and nations should earnestly pray. I am not going to point out to the House—it is not necessary to do so—the difficulties which may surround the presentation of this sentiment in higher quarters, where it might be properly communicated to the nations of the world. I will say this much about it, that it is impossible for a colony, an off-shoot of a nation, to bring the matter before the nations of the world. But how the hon. gentleman wishes the thing to take shape and how it can be pressed upon the attention of those nations who have the powers of peace and war, I do not know. However, the sentiment is a glorious one, and I hope it may do good, and perhaps open the eyes of some people to the blessings of peace.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—The motion before the House must recommend itself to all peaceful men who do not desire to hear war and rumours of war perpetually ringing in the air. Especially must it be pleasing to all who know well how disastrous war would be, if such a calamity could happen between the two great divisions of the English-speaking people. But I have not the slightest fear of such an event, because of the wisdom of those who know well that nothing but misery could result from such a war. However, the motion of the hon. gentleman is a beautiful dream. It is more than a dream, it is a grand thought. But here let me ask: Can this grand thought be put in practice? Would to wisdom that it could! But now comes in the bitterness to know that there is very little prospect of it, so long as avarice dominates the councils of the nations. Still, there is a hope that arbitration may yet take the place of strife, and I will vote for this hope, and also for the hon. gentleman's motion.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN—I rise to say that I am pleased with the sentiments embraced in the resolution which the hon. gentleman from Shell River has presented to this Chamber, and I intend to say something about it. It is difficult to mention anything connected with a subject that is new, now that he has been so exhaustive in his treatment of it. However, I feel that a dis-

cussion of this kind upon the matter is not without its uses, and I rather differ from my hon. friend who has just taken his seat as to that. It is quite in the line of our duty, at this time in the history of the empire, that this second estate of the most important dependency of the Crown should express its views under circumstances which may have some good influence. We have all heard, during the last decade, of a good many projects more or less entangled and mixed up with matters having of a party tinge. We have heard about independence, for instance, as something which should be discussed; we have heard of union with the United States, or annexation, although it is not now a live issue, and very few of our people, I take it, are infused with that idea. Then, again, there is the project of imperial federation, which I believe is undergoing discussion at this moment in another place. I have, I confess, felt that while some of these are proper subjects for discussion, there is another union which would be much more useful, a union, offensive and defensive, calculated to maintain the high standard of civilization and christianity which the world has reached. If the people of Great Britain and North America could become united in sentiment, in order that they might use their moral force in preserving the peace of the world, I think a very great gain would be obtained. If that had been the case, or if there had been less jealousy and ill-feeling on the part of some portion of the people of this continent towards Great Britain at the time the destruction of the Armenians began to take place, the combined moral forces of the people of this continent and Great Britain would have had very much to do in preventing that unfortunate massacre. In short, my reflections lead me to suppose that the influence of that sort of union would have been sufficient to have prevented that most atrocious and unfortunate occurrence which is still proceeding in Armenia. The hon. gentleman from Shell River referred also to the Transvaal trouble and the difference which arose with Germany. I think, however, that was subsequent. The message of congratulation sent by the Emperor of Germany to President Kruger occurred a good while after the Armenian atrocities had progressed, and that may not have been an element in the prevention of action against the Turks,

but I think if the Venezuelan difficulty had not occurred at the moment it did, and when the forces that are inimical to the British people showed themselves so very strongly, even then Britain might have done very much more to protect the Armenians. However, the resolution which my hon. friend has ventured to place before the Senate comprises a very much more extensive question, and takes very much wider scope. He refers to the necessity of, what is called in the United States, an international peace court. How he purposes establishing that, how it is to be formed, or what are to be the rules by which the court should be guided, or such a council of arbitration should be controlled, he has not very fully gone into, but those things would be matters for consideration afterwards. I may say that an expression of opinion on this question is not confined to us, but that many leading men of Great Britain have been for a considerable time anxious for some sort of an international arrangement which would promote the preservation of peace, and I think that the Venezuelan difficulty has developed throughout the United States opinions from leading men, not connected particularly with politics, as to the importance of this great question. I may say that only the other day—seven days ago—a memorial was submitted to the Senate of the United States by Mr. Frye, a senator from the State of Maine, having in view this very object. The memorial is as follows:

This memorial respectfully suggests it to be of paramount importance that something very definite be done in the immediate organization of a permanent international court of arbitration;

Therefore, that until otherwise provided, a standing international board of arbitration be selected and appointed, to be composed of a member of the highest judicial tribunal of each of the following countries, to wit: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Great Britain, Chili, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Hawaii, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Orange Free State, Russia, Transvaal, Turkey and the United States; the same to have power to settle any national or international disputes. And that it be held infraction of international law for any nation, after establishment of this court, to settle its disputes by the wholesale murder of war. The same to be sought and provided for by such legislation and such diplomacy as your honourable body can, in your judgment, wisely bring to bear on the subject.

GEORGE MAY POWELL,
President Arbitration Council.

I take this from the *Philadelphia Evening Star* of the 16th inst. As I said before,

not alone in the United States but in Great Britain there is a growing tendency in favour of action along these lines. My hon. friend from Shell River has spoken a good deal about the preparations for war in these modern times. I read somewhere not long ago, in connection with that subject, that the army and navy equipments of the continental nations of Europe cost yearly a sum of not less than £250,000,000.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—It rather exceeds that.

Hon Mr. McCLELAN—Possibly it does, and there is besides the tremendous navy that is owned by Great Britain. It seems too bad that such an enormous amount of treasure should be spent by these enlightened and Christian nations in equipping navies and armies when atrocities so fearful to be contemplated are going on before their eyes in Armenia. Such, however, seems to be the fact, and my hon. friend has alluded very fully to the difficulties which beset Great Britain in lending a helping hand for the solution of that unfortunate matter. Great Britain would not be in that position if there was some recognized council of Arbitration, some way by which representatives of nations could sit down and discuss matters. Personal contact has great influence in bringing about a solution of difficulties. The century is passing and soon we shall have reached 1900 years since the birth of Him who is the founder of our Christian faith, and whose birth was heralded by the announcement of "peace on earth, good-will to man." For thousands of years before widespread slaughter and destruction to human life had been permitted. The world seemed to require it, for disciplinary or other purposes, but under the new dispensation it would seem as if sufficient time had elapsed when an entirely different feeling, one of charity and good-will, should pervade Christian and civilized people. Taking three great nations, we all know and recognize fully the wonderful improvements in the refined arts and polite literature of France, the solid advancement in metaphysical, chemical and other sciences of the German states, and the progress made by our motherland in bringing to light many important inventions which have been skilfully applied to magnify her wealth, importance and influence. Notwithstanding all these

facts, those three enlightened nations are to-day increasing their expenditure on war equipments and they are unable to take any step to bring about those things which every Christian community seems to be so anxious to accomplish, that is to say, the prevention of atrocities such as those in Armenia. The old axiom of might making right is a wrong one. The strong and the powerful should have learned it appears to me, as nations and as individuals, that might should not necessarily be right, but that power should be used for the protection of the weak and raising those who are helpless. That, it appears to me, ought to be the result of nineteen centuries of improving civilization tempered by Christianity. I trust that the resolution, and the expression upon it by this honourable body, will not be without its influence in some degree, and that results will follow from it which will promote to some extent the objects which the mover has in view.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—I do not generally make any remarks on an abstract question brought before this House, which can lead to no practical result except mere words in the Debates, but as several hon. gentlemen have spoken on this question, I think I shall say a few words. It is a very beautiful chimera which the hon. gentleman has presented to us, but I do not think it is a fact. When the millennium takes place and the lion will lie down with the lamb and a little child will play with the cocatrice, what he wishes will take place, but the present moment is certainly not the time. What has been the effect of arbitration heretofore? In 1834 there was very nearly war between France and the United States on account of claims for United States vessels which had been taken during the troubles when Napoleon Bonaparte attempted to enforce the Milan Decrees. The United States brought claims against the French Government to indemnify people who had lost their goods. England, with that disregard to her own interests which she often shows, interfered and prevented war, and the matter was submitted to arbitration. It was decided that France should pay a large sum to the United States Government to indemnify persons who had been injured. The money was paid over and what has the United States done with it? Although this money was got from France, the merchants, whose claims had been presented, have never

received any of it. It has been lying in the United States Treasury to this day, between fifty and sixty years. We all remember the Alabama claims arbitration. England paid the sum of money which was demanded. Claims of the most extraordinary nature were brought forward to get these funds, and yet after settling every possible claim that could be advanced, a large sum of money still remains in the hands of the United States Government. Would not common honesty have dictated to them that the unpaid balance of money should be returned to Great Britain? Then, again, only the other day we had the case of our sealers which were seized illegally by the United States. Our neighbours agreed to an arbitration at which the United States was represented as well as ourselves; it was decided that the seizures were illegal, and that our sealers were to be paid for the damages they had sustained by the detention of their vessels. Has any money been paid? The money has not been paid, and what is the use of arbitration when you have to deal with persons imbued with the spirit illustrated in these three cases? Then it is proposed to buy Palestine; why should we buy Palestine? Palestine belongs to the Sultan of Turkey. Have we any right to say to England "rob Turkey of Palestine; get Turkey by the throat and oblige the Porte to sell Palestine?" I think we have not. The hon. gentleman who cries "Peace, peace," when there is no peace is not justified in making that proposition. I have a proposition to suggest as to the place where the arbitration should meet, and perhaps the hon. gentleman from Shell River might agree with me, and that is, Sable Island. I am a Nova Scotian, but I think I can speak in the name of my countrymen. Sable Island is, by geographical error, supposed to be part of Halifax County, and I think I can make the pledge that Sable Island will be given up for the headquarters of the Board of Arbitration without cheating Turkey out of Palestine. Any one who has been to Palestine will see that the people there are beggars and persons who have been transported there by charity; they are mere beggars and the scum of the world. Of course there are exceptions to that. The hon. gentleman alluded to Abyssinia and the Italians. My sympathies are entirely with the Abyssinians. I have great respect for the Italians, but I think they

might have saved Italy the trouble they have got into by the invasion of that country. I will not go so far as to say that the Abyssinians were descended from the eunuch who was baptized by Philip, but no doubt their christianity dates as far back as that. I must apologize to the House for the remarks I have made, because I think the question cannot be properly discussed in this chamber.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—From the tone of those hon. gentlemen who have addressed the Senate, I think probably it would be better for me to withdraw the motion rather than seek to commit the House to the principle. The object I had in view is served, and possibly as years go by the question may come up again in the Senate, when the views that are here advanced may be better known. With the permission of the House I shall withdraw the resolution.

The motion was withdrawn.

ALGOMA ELECTION WRIT.

MOTION WITHDRAWN.

The Order of the Day being called—

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before the Senate, a copy of the writ of election dated the 4th day of February, 1891, addressed to Harry Plummer, Esquire, as a returning officer for the electoral district of Algoma, in the province of Ontario, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Algoma, in the House of Commons, for the present parliament. Also, copies of all letters addressed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, Canada, or by any official of the government, to the returning officer for Algoma, at the last election. And also, copies of any letters from the said returning officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is stated that in another place to-day an announcement will be made, in behalf of the government, as to the view they have arrived at as to the length of Parliament, and I see by the accredited organ of the government here it is stated:

As to this matter of the "life of parliament," it is understood the government will announce to the House to-day that it holds to the opinion that Parliament expires on the 25th April.

I presume that the announcement is, in the main, correct. If so, I shall withdraw my motion.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman is quite correct. After considering this matter in all its phases, while there are many different opinions upon the question, it has been thought much better, in order to allay any feeling of distrust or want of confidence in the permanency of the Acts of the first session of this Parliament, and from the fact that, even if the Supreme Court should decide either one way or the other, it might be subject to an appeal to the Privy Council, and, therefore, keep the question in abeyance for some time, that it would be much better for the government to decide, and to announce at once that they do not intend to ask Parliament to sit after the 25th April.

The motion was withdrawn.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (50) "An Act respecting the South Western Railway and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company."—(Mr. Bellerose.)

Bill (62) "An Act to incorporate the Canadian Peat Fuel Company."—(Mr. McKindsey.)

Bill (J) "An Act respecting the Revision of the Statutes."—(Sir Mackenzie Bowell.)

Bill (36) "An Act respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company."—(Mr. Bellerose.)

CANADIAN HISTORICAL EXHIBITION BILL.

REFERRED TO A SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Order of the Day having been called: House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill (F) "An Act respecting the Canadian Historical Exhibition.

Hon. Mr. MACINNES (Burlington) said:—I move that this Order of the Day be discharged and set down for Thursday next. In the meantime I propose that a select committee be appointed to consider the bill and to put it in a shape that it may be acceptable to the House.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I think my hon. friend is not pursuing a strictly parliamentary course in the motion he is making. He moves to discharge the order and set it down for Thursday. What

order? This order will remain in precisely the same position it occupies now if it is brought before the Senate on the 25th of the month. He desires, however, in order to correct some errors that may be in it, or change some of the clauses so as to make the bill acceptable to those who have taken objection, that it should be referred to a select committee. Would it not be better to move that the House do not now resolve itself into a committee of the whole on this bill, but that it be referred to a select committee for consideration? Then it will come back from that committee amended. Then my hon. friend will move the third reading at the following sitting of the House, and we can consider the amendments. Otherwise he would be in this position: he would have a report upon a bill which stands for its third reading.

Hon. Mr. MACINNES (Burlington)—I am perfectly willing to accept the proposal made by the first minister, and I will make my motion in that form. I move that the bill be referred to a select committee composed of the Hon. Messrs. Almon, Pelletier, Masson, Power, McKindsey, Poirier, McDonald (P.E.I.), de Boucherville, Macdonald (Victoria), Sullivan, McClellan, Vidal, Drummond, Ferguson (P.E.I.) and the mover.

The motion was agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (48) "An Act respecting the Canadian Jockey Club."—(Mr. McKindsey.)

ONTARIO BUILDING AND LOAN SOCIETIES BILL.

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been called:

Second reading (Bill "K") An Act respecting Building and Loan Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the province of Ontario,

Hon. Mr. POWER said:—With respect to this bill, which is one of some consequence, as the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill has been absent for a considerable time, I think if there is any hon. gentleman interested in it, that it would be well that it should be taken hold of and pushed along,

because at this stage of the session, unless this bill goes down to the other House very shortly, it will have very little chance of becoming law this year. The bill is in the right direction, I think.

Hon. Mr. McKAY—I understand there is some serious objection to the bill as it is now framed, and that a number of senators have been written to in regard to it, and that it was intended that these communications should be submitted to the promoters of the bill before it was pressed, and that is the reason it has been put off from day to day. I have no doubt something will be done to render the bill unobjectionable.

The bill was allowed to stand.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (45) "An Act to incorporate the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Co."—(Mr. McKindsey.)

Bill (79) "An Act to incorporate the National Sanitarium Association."—(Mr. Vidal.)

Bill (63) "An Act to amend the Act incorporating the International Radial Railway Company."—(Mr. McKindsey.)

Bill (70) "An Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co."—(Mr. McKindsey.)

The Senate then adjourned.