

This amendment was accepted by the mover, and the motion as amended was then carried. AMES AND ACCOUTREMENTS FOR VOLUNTEERS.

Hon. Mr. ROSE moved for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying for copies of all applications on behalf of the volunteer corps for arms and accoutrements, especially guns for the use of the artillery corps—and the answer given to such applications.—The hon. gentleman, in making this motion, said he used to complain of the apathy of hon. gentlemen opposite, while on the Treasury benches, in regard to the issue of arms and accoutrements sent here from England for the volunteers, but he must say that under the present Government he could get no better satisfaction. There could be no doubt that guns and accoutrements had been sent out for the volunteer cavalry and artillery, who had not yet received them. He held in his hand letters from the commanders of corps and Brigade-Majors in different parts of the country, asking for the issue of guns, etc., to various corps, as also the answer to such applications. The following was the application of Brigade Major Macpherson, of Montreal, in behalf of the battalion of Montreal Foot Artillery:—

“Brigade Office,

“Montreal, 20th Feb., 1862.

“Sir,—Lieut. Col. Tyles, commanding Battalion Foot Artillery, has made application for the use of six guns, in order that the men of the corps may be taught the use of that arm, I have the honor, at the request of the commandant of the Active Force, to state that the military authorities would willingly place at the disposal of the Volunteers the guns required, provided the sanction is obtained from your department.

“I remain, sir, yours,

“(Signed) “JOHN MACPHERSON,

“Brigade-Major.”

“Deputy Adjt.-Gen. Militia, L. C.”

The officers making those applications had been given to understand that the Commander of the forces would be quite willing, if requested by the Provincial authorities, to issue the guns and accoutrements to the Volunteers, for whom they were sent out from England. Now, on the 10th of June, 1862, a despatch was transmitted to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, from His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, with respect to the Militia, in which the following passages occur:—

“14. The Militia Commission suggested that the number of Field Batteries of Artillery, active and reserve, should be 29, of 85 men each. I am not aware that we have in store in Canada any guns for arming Field Artillery. There are a few in the hands of the Volunteers. I would submit to your Grace the propriety of placing in store in this Province an armament sufficient for the equipment of the above force.”

“15. The number of cavalry fixed by the Commission was 27 troops of 50 men each, and I would advise that cavalry equipments for that force should be also sent out.” In answer to this, a despatch from the War Office, dated July 30th, 1862 was received by His Excellency the Governor-General, in which the following paragraphs occur:—

“With regard to the application contained in Lord Monck's despatch for additional supplies of military stores, to be sent out so as to be in readiness for issue during the winter, if need be, I am to request that you will acquaint the Duke of Newcastle that Sir Geo. Lewis has given directions to the following effect, and which he trusts will meet the requirements of the case: Twenty 12-pounder howitzers, sixteen 18-pounders, and twelve 20-pounders. Armstrong guns are at present ready for shipment, and will be despatched without delay. These guns will be placed in store, and, if required by the militia artillery, will be issued on loan. Forty thousand stand of rifles will be at once added to the stores in Canada. Sir Geo. Lewis proposes, however, that they should be made issuable in accordance with the recent regulations on the subject, other than on the understanding that they will be sold for, as suggested by His Grace. Of accoutrements, 45,000 sets are at present in store in Canada. Should more be required, demands must be made upon Halifax and New Brunswick, and there are respectively 24,000 and 20,491 sets. With regard to small-arm ammunition, 6,682,000 additional rounds will be sent out to Canada shortly, thus raising the store to 12,888,785 rounds, or 20,000,000 in B. N. America. I am to add that directions have been given for forwarding the 500 sets of cavalry equipments referred to in your letter from Halifax to Canada.—(Signed), E. LECHESSA. Now His Excellency the Governor General, in a despatch of a later date, same year, acknowledged the receipt of those arms and accoutrements, and thanked the Colonial Department for forwarding them. To the request from the Brigade Major and other officers in Montreal, the following was the reply:—

“Militia Dep't.

“A. G. Office,

“Quebec, March 12th, '62.

“Sir, I have now the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th ult., and 3rd inst., respectively conveying applications for six garden guns, for the use of the Montreal Artillery, and for the Montreal Field battery, being supplied with Armstrong guns in place of those now in use by that corps, and am now instructed by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to direct you to acquaint the Commandant of the Active Force, for the information of the officers concerned, that there are some available for either in the hands of the Provincial Government.

“Yours &c.

“A. DE SALABERRY,
“D. A. G. Militia, L. C.”

“MAJOR MACPHERSON.”

Hon. Mr. ROSE, continuing—There was certainly something mysterious about this matter, and he was determined to probe it to the bottom. There must be an extraordinary amount of red tape somewhere. He knew personally that there were numbers of those guns in store in Quebec, and in St. Helen's Island at Montreal; and the Commander of the Forces said that all that had to be done was for volunteers to make application through the Provincial authorities to have them issued, when the corps would receive their armaments, and yet we were told there were no guns available for the purpose. A similar answer was returned to the application for the cavalry equipments. He could not see why these things should be refused the volunteers. The House should know whether they had been sent here for the use of the volunteers, or whether, having been sent here, they were to be kept en permanence in store. (Cheers.)

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD said there could be no objection to bringing down all the correspondence in a very few days. In consequence of the urgent request of a number of artillery companies in both Upper and Lower Canada, the Government had applied for the issue of 24 twelve-prd. guns to them. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. ROSE was understood to ask what was to be done with the cavalry accoutrements, and

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD do reply that the Government could give no answer yet. The motion was carried, after some further discussion.

MILL-BLOCK, TOWNSHIP OF AMABEL.

Hon. Mr. CARLING moved for the papers and documents relative to the sale of the tract known as Mill-Block, on the River-au-Sable, Township of Amabel.—Carried.

REPORTING THE DEBATES.

On the Order of the Day being called for Mr. T. FERGUSON'S motion for a select Committee on the subject of the official reporting of the debates of both Houses of Parliament.—

Mr. T. FERGUSON said he rose to make a motion that be verily believed would be supported, if not by this House as a whole, by a large majority of it. He thought that the necessity of having proper reports of the proceedings of this House, every session from this forward, would be acknowledged by all who ever gave the matter the slightest consideration.

We had something of the kind during the session of 1858, and the records then made, in the *Mirror of Parliament*, had been of great benefit up to the present, and were still useful. He thought that that system of reporting the Parliamentary proceedings ought to have been continued up to this time. We heard very frequently members complaining of not being fairly reported, for which blame was cast upon the press generally. But for his part he believed no blame whatever was to be attached to the members of the press, in reference to the matter. He really thought that those gentlemen were not adequately remunerated for the amount and description of work they were called upon to perform, and that they reported the proceedings of Parliament at greater length than could be expected at their hands, when their number was taken into account. (Hear, hear.) He thought that a sufficient amount of the matter of the debates should be preserved and kept on record. In England, the system of reporting the Parliamentary debates on the scale now contemplated by this motion, was maintained by private enterprise. And those reports had not only been beneficial to that country, but to this Province also, as every member would admit. (Hear, hear.) Members here could not pretend to say that the record of the debates in this House would be as important or perhaps as useful as that of the debates in the House of Commons; but still it would be serviceable and beneficial to this Province. It was impossible to expect that any member or proprietor of any particular journal would take the responsibility of reporting and publishing, at his own risk, the debates of this House in such a way as to serve as an ample and reliable public report. If the time had arrived when a private party could be assured a sufficient support for such an undertaking, it would be unnecessary for the House to take

any action in the matter. But such time had, unfortunately, not yet come. The gentleman who established a *Mirror of Parliament* in 1858 carried on the work for some time at a great personal sacrifice, and was afterwards obliged to give it up. He, for one, did not like to see any gentleman connected with the press or with any other profession in the country—or any individual whatever suffer loss from an enterprise from which the public derived or was likely to derive benefit. (Hear, hear.)

He did believe that the public would derive great benefit from the carrying out of the proposition he was about to submit. He would move that the Hon. Messrs. J. S. Macdonald, John Simpson, McDougall, H. L. Langerin, Cancho, Huot and the mover, be appointed a Committee to consider and report to this House as to the expediency of having the debates of the Legislature reported during next and succeeding sessions, at the public expense. He did not care particularly at being himself upon the Committee, being only desirous of seeing a Committee appointed to take the matter into their consideration, and report thereon. Some arrangement might be made by which the debates would be henceforth reported as contemplated, and he was convinced that only a small amount would be required to render such an enterprise successful—an amount so small that a few members would object to it. A very thousand dollars, for instance, given to any public journal that would assume the responsibility of the work, would no doubt ensure the publication of the debates in a form that would give satisfaction to the House and public. If the House did not approve of the Committee, it could select whatever gentlemen it pleased to consider the matter. If a Committee should be appointed and the matter considered and reported upon, he, for one, would be satisfied. Had the Hon. Mr. Brown been present when he (Mr. F.) drew up the motion, he would have willingly added his name to the Committee, he being the proprietor of one of the finest papers in the country; he had no objection, even yet, to Hon. Mr. Brown being put on the Committee, if it were desired. (Hear, hear.)

The motion was carried without discussion

CULTIVATION OF THE VINE.

Mr. HUOT moved for the appointment of a select committee to inquire as to the possibility of cultivating the vine in this country.—Carried.

WALLACE MINE.

Mr. BOWN moved for copies of all papers, documents, orders in Council, &c., relative to the sale of the mineral locality known as the Wallace Mine.—Carried.

POSTMASTER OF NEW HAMBURG.

Mr. COWAN moved for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying for papers and documents relative to the removal of Andrew Ross from the Office of Postmaster of New Hamburg.—The hon. gentleman spoke in support of his motion, and was understood to characterize the dismissal in question as most unjustifiable.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL attacked hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, and charged them with having weakened their avowal on political antagonism, by dismissing them from office. He then went on to defend the course of the late Government, and said they had never dismissed except for cause—drunkenness, incompetency, or some such valid reason—and after a thorough inquiry had been made in every individual case. He concluded by referring to the fact that the Postmaster General was still retained in office, notwithstanding the fact that he was not in this House, nor in a position to be held responsible to the country.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD said that of course there could be no objection to the motion for the papers relative to this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) had moved for full information, and had a perfect right to obtain it; but it was very much to be regretted that an hon. member like the hon. gentleman from North Ontario (Mr. McDougall) could not allow it to pass without raising a party debate by making a violent partisan speech. (Hear, hear.) No doubt, we should have another constitutional discussion out of this very simple question.—The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) charged hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with having made partisan dismissals. (Hear, hear.) Yes, the whole course of the late Government in reference to appointments to office and removals from office, was characterized by political partisanship. (Hear, hear, and “Yes, yes.”)—The hon. gentleman then went on to refer to the appointment of Mr. Walker Powell to the office of Deputy Adjutant General for Upper Canada, in 1862, which, he held, was a notoriously partisan appointment, inasmuch as the gentleman in question had no particular fitness whatever for the office—he had no qualification

to all for a trust of such importance—he was totally ignorant of military matters—he did not know one end of a sword from the other. Adjutant Generalship; and hon. gentlemen opposite had claimed particular credit for his skill in the purchase of "peppercorns" and "nuts" (Hear, hear, and laughter). Going back to the charge made by the hon. member respecting the Postmaster Generalship, he (Mr. Macdonald) would say that hon. gentlemen opposite had themselves, while in office, filled offices in the Cabinet with men not members of Parliament, the hon. member for South Orford, in 1858, then forming his administration, selected as his Commissioner of Public Works, the present hon. member for Chateaugay, who had just been defeated in his attempt to re-enter Parliament. Then it was not such a monstrous affair to have an unseated party in the Cabinet as it had since become. (Cheers and laughter.)

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—How long did he remain there?

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD wondered that the member for North Ontario did not then frown down what he now considered a monstrous practice. (Laughter.) Take the case of the County of Essex, the member for which had been kept out of his seat two sessions pending the contesting of his claim to the seat—would it not have been unreasonable, had he formerly been a member of the Cabinet, to exclude him from office because he was not actually in occupation of a seat in the House? Now, Hon. Mr. Foley was not in office for his seat, from which he had only been a few weeks excluded. Did any one suppose that if Mr. Gladstone was defeated at an election, Lord Palmerston would not retain him in the Cabinet, and endeavor to get him a seat? Why, for four years Mr. O'Hagan, Attorney General for Ireland, had no seat in Parliament, though filling this office; and a Secretary of State, during a portion of Sir Robert Peel's administration, retained his portfolio for a whole session, during which he was out of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) And hon. gentlemen opposite, while in power, allowed some Departments to remain for some time unoccupied altogether. Hon. Mr. Dorion resigned in September, 1862, and his office remained vacant till the following December, to the detriment of the public service. Was it not infinitely better to have some one at the head of the departments than nobody at all. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Hon. gentlemen opposite had permitted a vacancy to continue in the Upper Canada section of the Cabinet, thus allowing six Lower Canadian members to predominate over their five conferees, and the whole of Lower and especially of Upper Canada, with its great preponderance of population—some 250,000. The thing was monstrous. (Cheers and laughter.) They allowed six Lower Canadian Frenchmen to dominate over Upper Canada all the time from August to January—why the thing was really monstrous and unparalleled. (Renewed laughter.) Mr. Richards was defeated in his constituency in January, and was obliged to leave the Cabinet, yet no successor was appointed, and the public interests were neglected and injured. (Hear, hear.) Hon. Mr. Foley was defeated on returning for re-election, and he (Mr. M.) would say that, of course, unless that hon. gentleman got his seat speedily his place in the Cabinet must be filled by some one else. The retention of Hon. Mr. Foley in the Cabinet was a mere matter of expediency, and designed for the good of the public service. He (Mr. M.) did not think, however, it was altogether fair of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McDougall) to raise all this stir in reference to the position of the Postmaster General. (Hear, hear.) The Government only returned from their constituents a few weeks ago. No Government, under such circumstances, could be expected to ask any hon. supporter to vacate his seat and return for re-election in order to be able to accept a portfolio, especially at this late period of the session, and when this would have the effect, in the present case, of decreasing a very small majority. (Laughter from the Opposition benches.) Hon. gentlemen opposite would not do it themselves, and could not expect as to do it. (Hear, hear.)

After a considerable length of time spent in discussion—hon. members on both sides taking part—

Mr. J. DUFFRESNE said he really could not allow the statement which had been made on the other side—to the effect that there had been no dismissal for partisan causes during the regime of the late Government—to pass unnoted or uncontradicted. He would refer, as a most glaring case in point to the dismissal of the Postmaster of L'Assomption, Mr. Lesage, without the shadow of a cause. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN defended the action of the Government in this case, and stated that all they had done was to re-appoint Mr. Gauthier, his former incumbent of the office.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER stated that these were charges—of a serious nature, too—against the person mentioned, which had resulted in his dismissal from office. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. T. FERGUSON said that, in reply to the assertions of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McDougall) he would just mention one among many cases of unjustifiable dismissal by the late Government, of which he had a list before him. This was the case of Mr. McCarroll, of the Customs, at Toronto. (Hear, hear.) A more glaring case than this could not be found. The real cause why Mr. McCarroll had been sacrificed by his political enemies was because he had refused to falsify a report for the purpose of cutting can unjust and untrue aspersion upon Mr. Thomas Cotton, the Collector at Port Credit. This was the real cause of that gentleman's dismissal. He had stated the facts over his own signature—they had been made known through the public press, and hon. gentlemen opposite could not deny them. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) had made another very sweeping assertion—namely, to the effect that there were no dismissals except in the cases of drunkenness and incompetency. Now this statement was not justified by the facts, and he (Mr. Ferguson) certainly thought the hon. member should retract it. There were no such cases to justify the removal either in the case of Mr. McCarroll or that of Mr. Cotton, as the hon. gentleman very well knew.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL said he had only mentioned the two causes alluded to by the hon. member (Mr. Ferguson) as among other causes. No doubt there were other causes, such, for instance, as the service of the parties being no longer required, &c.

Mr. T. FERGUSON remarked that the hon. gentleman might say so now, but his assertion, when he first spoke, was of the most sweeping nature as to the cause.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD defended Col. Walker Powell, who, he said, was a most efficient officer. If the hon. gentleman from Kingston really believed that Col. Powell was not an efficient officer, it was his duty to dismiss him.

The discussion continued until six o'clock, and the motion had not been carried when the Speaker left the chair.

After the recess—

A number of bills were transmitted from the Legislative Council.

THE SEVERAL DIVORCE BILLS.

The Bill from the Legislative Council, known as the Benning Divorce Bill, was read a first time.

On the motion by Mr. SCOBLE, that it be ordered for a second reading on Saturday, Mr. BELLEROSE moved the six months' postponement.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN spoke at great length in opposition to the bill, quoting a large number of authorities in support of his position as opposed to the principle of divorce.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS also proceeded at considerable length to express his views upon the subject. He was practically opposed to making the Parliament of the province the tribunal for granting divorces to any party, however flagrant the cause of complaint might be. If we allowed this tide of human wickedness and marriage strife to pour into this Chamber, cases of divorce would multiply, and the *Official Gazette* would be filled with notices for applications for divorce. The increase of such applications was precisely in proportion to the facilities afforded for divorce. The experience of every country had demonstrated that fact. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN said that all the House did was to dissolve the civil or legal contract—they had nothing whatsoever to do with the religious bond, nor did they pretend to meddle with it. The bill should be allowed to pass.

Mr. SCOBLE said he entirely concurred in the remarks made by the hon. member for South Orford; but he would not stop at this stage of proceedings to reply to the arguments used by the hon. Solicitor-General East and the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER expressed himself opposed to the bill on principle.

The vote was then taken on the motion for the six months' postponement, which was lost on the following division:

- YEAS—Archambault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bourassa, Brousseau, Caron, Cartier, Chambers, Chapais, Corneiller, Coupal, Daoust, De Boucherville, Denis, Dorion, A. A. Dorion, Erie, Dockett, Dufresne, Alex. Dufresne, Joseph, Estabrook, Fortier, Gagnon, Gaudet, Grosjean, Houde, Hoat, Jones, Ford, Levesque-Viger, Lafrenoy, Lajoie, Langevin, McGea, Paquette, Perras, Pilon, Langlois, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Raymond, Remillard, Robitaille, Ross J. J., Sylvestre, Tess, Thibodeau—47 yeas.
- NAYS—Abbott, Auld, Bell (Lacark), Bell (Russell), Bown, Brown, Buchanan, Barwell, Brown, Cairns, Cartwright, Conklyn, Côté, Dantin, Dunsford, Ferguson, Thibault, Ferguson, Whitton, Galt, Higginson, Hinton, Howland, Irwin, Jackson, Knight, Macdonald D. A., Macdonald John, Macdonald J. A., Macdonald J. S., Mackenzie, Alex., Mackenzie Hope, McConkey, McCreagh, McCreagh, McLachlan, McKellar, Morris, Moxart, Murray, O'Halloran, Parker, Pappas, Pappas, Ross, Ross J. Sylvester, Russ Waiter, Rymal, Scoble, Scott, Simpson, Smith, Smith J., Shuter, Stron, Street, Thompson, Wallbridge T. C., Walsh, West, Wells, White, Wilson, Wright—Amos—61 nays.

The motion for the second reading was carried on the same division reversed.

AMENDMENTS TO THE MILITIA ACT.

The bill to amend the Militia Act of 1862 (from Legislative Council) was introduced.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN moved the first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD wanted the Government with having nothing to offer in the way of a Militia policy, but a slight amendment to the act of last session, after having repeatedly made political capital by attacking hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and charging them with neglecting the important duty of providing for the defence of the country.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER pointed out that, but for the amendment now proposed, the act of last session would be inoperative as regarded towns in Upper Canada. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

Considerable discussion followed, several hon. gentlemen stating in reply to the hon. member for Cornwall that he could not claim the bill of last session as his bill, inasmuch as more than twenty amendments had been made; and he had thanked members of the Opposition for the assistance they had given him in perfecting the measure.

In the course of the debate on this bill, Hon. Mr. BROWN said he held in his hand a copy of a work called "Code Militaire," published by the Messrs. Desbarats, and compiled by Major Suzzor, the Brigade-Major of the Lower Canada Military School. The introduction of this book was of the most extraordinary nature, containing as it did an unjust and untrue aspersion on the loyalty of the people of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.)

He would now read a translation of a portion of the preface in question, for the purpose of showing the nature of the attack. (The hon. gentleman then read a part of the preface, which was, in substance, a defence of the loyalty of the Lower Canadian; by contrasting the success of the Military School, at Quebec, on its opening, with the small attendance at the Upper Canadian School.)—He (Mr. Brown) characterized the statement he had just read as untrue and unfounded. He could not conceive how an officer holding a high position in the militia service of the Province could venture on making such an assertion. Yet the person who wrote this preface was in the Government employ—he was paid by the Government—and the book appeared to be sanctioned by the Government.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER—never saw the book. I cannot say what is in it. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN said that the insult offered to Upper Canada by this public officer was of the grossest kind. Moreover, it was untrue. There was a larger attendance at the Upper Canada Military School than at the school in Quebec.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER—I repeat, I have no knowledge of the book. I did not know there was such a book published. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. McCONKEY—Is it published at the expense of the Government?

AN HON. MEMBER—Not at all; it is a matter of private enterprise. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CARTIER said he did not like for the purpose of assailing Major Suzzor, neither was he about to undertake his defence, inasmuch as he believed that gentlemen were perfectly capable of defending themselves from any attack which had been made upon him. He desired merely to remark, that in writing the paragraph which had been quoted, Major Suzzor doubtless referred to the two military schools of instruction at the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. (Laughter and cheers.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN—No; here's the date, at the bottom of the introduction—"1st June," only a few days ago.

Hon. Mr. CARTIER would merely observe, in reply, that a book of this size must have taken many weeks to compile; so that the author evidently referred to the state of affairs when the late Government was in power. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN failed to say that the reply of the Hon. Attorney-General East at all justified the insinuation, or improved the state of the case. He was surprised that hon.

Canadian members of the Government did not rise in their places and denounce the sentiment contained in Major Sutor's book.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN—I indignantly repudiate the book and the sentiment. (Laughter and cheers.)

Hon. Mr. BROWN—That is perfectly satisfactory. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FERRAULT said that the author of the "Code Militaire," Major Sutor, was an able and deserving military officer. He would say that the reading of a simple paragraph from the preface conveyed an unfair and partial idea of the writer's meaning. If hon. gentlemen would read the next paragraph, they would find that Major Sutor attributed, in a great measure, the wonderful success of the Quebec Military School to the personal exertions of Col. De Salaberry.

Hon. Mr. BROWN read the paragraph referred to; but argued that it did not alter the force of the imputation cast upon the loyalty of the people of Upper Canada by the preceding paragraph.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said that Major Sutor was an active and intelligent officer; and under the late Government he would not have ventured to publish such a statement while occupying such a post. The statement moreover was notoriously untrue. Instead of the case being as stated, there were more students attending the Upper Canada school of instruction than the Lower Canada school. It was disgraceful that such an untrue statement should be sent forth to the world by a Government officer, and, so to speak, under the auspices of the Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that the hon. members for South Oxford and Cornwall had uttered a great deal of solemn nonsense about this matter. There was no ground whatever for an attack on the Government, simply because an officer holding high militia rank had chosen to compile a useful work for the benefit of his fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.) The Government were not blameable for any sentiment the writer of that work expressed, yet the hon. member for Cornwall charged the Government with being responsible.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD denied that he had done so.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—Then the hon. gentleman's remarks, if not intended to cast blame on the Government, were utterly pointless. But he had attacked the Government in the most direct manner.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD repeated his denial.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON would say distinctly that the observations he made were in consequence of his having heard the hon. member for Cornwall say that the book was published "under the auspices of the Government." He appealed to members on both sides if that was not correct. (Hear, hear, and "No, no.")

Hon. Mr. BROWN had listened to what fell from the hon. member for Cornwall, but such a statement had not reached his ears. The imputation contained in the preface was that, in Lower Canada, candidates rushed to the military school, while in Upper Canada they held back—that he incentive in the former case

was patriotism, and in the latter money. The fact was that the number at the Lower Canada school was 82, and at the Upper Canadian 104 pupils. That was the fact when the book was written.

Hon. Mr. McGER called attention to the fact that members were in the habit of speaking four or five times on questions before the House, occasioning a great loss of time. As to the objectionable passage in the "Brigade-Major's book," he (Mr. McGer) did not at all approve of it.

Hon. Mr. BROWN said that if the Attorney General East had repudiated the book as the members for Hamilton and Montreal West had done, he (Mr. B.) would not have said another word about it. He proceeded to accuse the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Cameron) of having justified the Brigade-Major in insulting, by the preface to his book, the people of Upper Canada.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON denied he had justified any one insulting that Province. The member for South Oxford could not be accurate in dealing with his (Mr. Cameron's) remarks.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the Brigade-Major had worked long to give his countrymen an idea of military matters; and a more efficient Brigade-Major did not exist. He (Mr. Dorion) did not approve of the sentiments in the objectionable preface. But the President of the Council (Mr. Buchanan) had insulted the people of Lower Canada, in his speech at Hamilton, by stating that a compulsory militia law would have to be passed to bring them into the ranks. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. ALLEYN believed Brigade-Major Sutor was a most zealous officer, though his preface was injudicious. It was wrong to take up this militia question in either a Lower Canada or Upper Canada point of view. He

was surprised that Hon. Mr. Brown should have raised such a discussion about a small matter. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN would observe, in reference to the allusion to his speech in Hamilton, that the remarks made on that occasion were not to the point mentioned. He stated, at the time in question, that there could be no more compulsory militia act than the present. He made no reference to two bills at all. He also remarked that the people in Lower Canada, like those of all old countries, wished to act under authority; that in Upper Canada there would be enough volunteers to obviate any exercise of authority. There was no idea of two bills. The idea he wished to convey was that in Lower Canada the people would come out when called on, but that in Upper Canada there would be no necessity for the operation of the act. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

The bill was then read a first time, and afterwards a second time, at full length.

THE BILL TO AMEND THE LAW RELATIVE TO THE PRACTICE OF PHYSIC AND SURGERY (from the Legislative Council) was then read a first time.

SETTLERS IN LOWER CANADA.
Mr. J. B. E. DORION moved the third reading of a bill to protect settlers in certain cases in Lower Canada.

Considerable discussion took place on this bill.

Mr. POPE moved in amendment, to the effect that it be resolved that the principle of legislation involved in the bill should be extended to Upper Canada as well as Lower Canada.

This was lost on a division—Yeas, 8; Nays, 57.

Mr. IRVINE then moved to send back the bill to Committee of the Whole, in order that a clause might be introduced to provide that persons entering upon the lands of others, without the permission of the proprietors, after this bill should become law, may be ejected therefrom without having a right to claim any indemnity.

The hon. gentleman explained that he was in favor of the bill; but believed that it ought to be amended as proposed by his motion.

This amendment was also lost on a vote of 29 to 37.

The bill was then read a third time and passed on a vote of 37 to 25.

The House adjourned at a quarter past one a.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

FRIDAY, 10th June, 1864.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES IN LOWER CANADA.

Hon. Mr. PROULX, from the Special Committee to whom was referred the bill relating to Local Municipalities in Lower Canada, situated partly in Seigniories and partly in Townships, reported the bill with certain amendments. The amendments were concurred in, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

SALARIES OF OFFICERS.

Hon. Mr. McCREA, on the order that the petition of the Clerk and others, officers, clerks and servants of the Legislative Council, praying for the suspension of the re-payment of certain moneys advanced to them, be taken into consideration, moved that the Clerk of the House be instructed to follow, in regard to the officers of this House, whatever course may be taken by the Legislative Assembly and the Executive Government, in reference to the balances still remaining to be paid by officers of the Legislature or officers of the Civil Service.

Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR thought the course of the member for the Western Division in attempting to revive a report of 1859 was objectionable. This House had always opposed any attempt to base its action on the action of the other House. He cited cases to prove this, and contended that the Legislative Council had been remarkable for its regard for economy in the expenditure of the public money. The officers of the House had always been well treated and amply remunerated—better paid than any other class of public servants in Canada. He went on to cite the cases of different officers, whose salaries had been largely increased at different times. He contended that the advance, which was now the subject of discussion, had been made without any proper authority, and the Committee on Contingencies of the Legislative Assembly had reported that there was no authority. In view of the large increases made to the officers at different times, it was asking too much now, that these gentlemen should come down and ask farther indulgence. The hon. member proceeded to ask that the officers had been so accustomed to ask and get, that they thought they need only do so in the present instance.

Hon. Mr. BOUTON said the petition of the

officers was a piece of great disrespect to the Committee; and, if the motion were carried, he thought every member of that Committee should resign. He would move, in amendment, that all the words after the word "adhere," in the motion, be struck out, and that the following be inserted: "To the recommendation of the Committee on Contingencies of last session then adopted by this House."

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said that he meant no disrespect to the Committee, whose Report he thought as much of as of the Report of any Committee, but he did not think the Committee infallible. The advance first commenced with the Government, just as the grant of six dollars a day to the members of this House, when no one found fault with the proposition. Mr. Ferrier went on to say he wished the thing should end where it commenced.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST regarded it as the duty of the House to decide for itself what they should do; and, at any rate, he did not think this was a proper time to ask the repayment of this advance.

Hon. Mr. ROSS said the hon. members (Messrs. Seymour and Boulton) seemed to discuss this subject as if they indulged a good deal of feeling on the subject. His opinion was that both Houses should endeavor to act as much as possible in concert, as they had lately been doing in relation to the library, the printing, &c. All was asked was an extension of time, and the question for the House was whether the request was reasonable.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON said he thought it was unfortunate that the officers of the House should have put themselves in a position of apparent hostility to the Committee. There was no desire to deprive these officers of any part of their income; and it came with very bad grace from them to ask to be relieved of the obligation they had contracted in this matter.

Hon. Mr. A. P. TACHE said his feelings were with the officers but it was true that they had asked for delay over the winter, which they had got, and now they wanted further delay. Under the circumstance his thought he ought to support the Committee.

Hon. Mr. MOORE said that when the incomes of the officers and the smallness of the amount they owed the House were taken into account, it could hardly be considered as a hardship that they should be asked to repay the sum due. He certainly did not wish to see the officers of this House treated differently from those of the Assembly, but as he believed the Assembly would order the immediate repayment of the debt, he thought this House should do the same.

Hon. Mr. McMURRIOH said he understood some expressions of his had been held to mean that the Clerk had paid this advance without authority. He had not said, as he believed, anything which would bear that construction, and certainly he never intended to say so. On the contrary, he believed the Clerk had received the necessary authority. As to the repayment of the money due, he thought the Report of the Committee seemed to be undervalued, and if the motion carried, it would be a bad precedent. The real question seemed to be whether the Committee or their officers should rule in future. All he wished was that the matter should be decided on its real merits, without regard to the other House.

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER said it was very unfortunate that our retrenchment should be confined almost exclusively to small things of this kind—the salaries of employes. The officers only asked postponement, and he was sure the country would not complain if it were granted. He wanted a very different kind of retrenchment to be pursued, as he had often before pointed out.

Hon. Mr. McCREA said if the question were to give up the debt, or to reduce the salaries, he could see the force of the arguments adduced by hon. members, but that was not the question. Hon. members were strong advocates for permanent legislation, but when they rescinded the Report of the Committee of 1859, were they as great sticklers for the principle. If it was wrong for the officers to petition for postponement now, it must have been wrong for them to petition for the same thing in 1863. He held it would be unfair to ask the officers of this House to repay before those of the Assembly and the Civil Service were called upon to do the same.

Hon. Mr. ARMSTRONG said his impression always was that this House should await the action of the other, in respect of the repayment of this advance.

After further debate, the question was taken on Hon. Mr. Boulton's amendment, which was carried on the following division:—

CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Tache, Campbell, De LaTerriere, McDonald, Sandborn, Seymour, Simpson, Blake, Reesor, McMurrich, Leonard, Flint, Smith, Atkins, McEaster, J. Dachesnay, Moore, Gordon, Belleau, Perry, Boulton.