

Committee, consisting of Hon. Mr. Richards, Hon. Mr. Wood, and Messrs. Ferrier, Finlayson, Galbraith, Bardee, Boulter, McKellar, and the mover, with powers to send for all persons and papers, and to report to this House with all convenient speed. Their Committee was approved of by the Government, who had agreed to bring their own officers down, and they would be able to come to a conclusion at once. It would not be for the Committee to express any opinion on the subject, but simply to obtain facts and present them to the House to come to a decision upon.

Atty.-Gen. MACDONALD said it was not customary to refer to a committee's resolutions which had not been adopted by the House.

Mr. BLAKE was quite willing that the remaining resolutions should not be included in the motion, but they contained certain statements of facts, and the House would wish to know if the statements were true.

Some conversation ensued, and eventually the resolutions were withdrawn, and the motion, as amended, was then carried, Mr. Blake remarking that he would bring forward the resolutions after the committee had reported.

AFTER RECESS.

Dr. MCGILL moved the second reading of Bill No. 11, "To regulate the sale of poisons, and respecting chemists, druggists and apothecaries." He said the necessity for such a Bill had been felt for a long time, as well by the community at large as the druggists themselves. This necessity had been felt in consequence of the number of uneducated men throughout our country who had entered into the druggist business. They assumed (he meant the word in its fullest sense) that important business without education or experience to fit them for it, and serious blunders and fatal mistakes were of frequent and alarming occurrence. Instances of fatal mistake from ignorance on the part of druggists were on the increase, notwithstanding the fact that they were increasing in general intelligence and education. The public feel that it was high time to put a stop to these frequent mistakes, and this measure was now introduced for that purpose. The amount of injury was greater than was at all supposed by the public, for many a constitution had been ruined by overdoses of powerful medicines given by ignorant druggists who undertook to prescribe for ailments about which they knew nothing. The respectable, educated chemists felt that they required protection from such men. They required that men should be educated and serve an apprenticeship before setting up as druggists themselves. They should be required to come up to a reasonable standard, and be submitted to a fair examination. This was all the druggists required, and it would be only fair to grant them this protection. The Bill before the House was calculated to give that protection. It was not designed to be severe against anyone now engaged in the business. It proposed to allow all such to continue their avocation, and was only designed for the future. Such an Act was in force in all the civilized nations of Europe, and it was proposed to have such a measure passed in the United States. Quebec was also asking for such a Bill; and before the close of the present session of the Legislature of that Province they would have it. Whenever this law was in force, it had worked well. There were over four hundred druggists in Ontario, of whom about three hundred had united for instruction in their profession. These were unanimous in favour of this measure; and the hundred who did not belong to the Association did not oppose it. He might almost say, therefore, that the druggists of Ontario were unanimous in favour of it. He hoped the House would receive it in the light in which it always did all measures calculated to promote the public good.

Mr. BAXTER approved of the principles of the Bill, and suggested that it should be referred to a Special Committee. The object of the Bill was to form the druggists into a close Corporation, and it would be well to exercise some care in passing it.

Mr. MATCHETT coincided with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Baxter) that care should be exercised in passing it. He, also, would recommend that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. BOYD desired to call the attention of the House to the fact that this was a measure to regulate trade and commerce, and the House might be exceeding its powers in dealing with it.

Atty.-Gen. MACDONALD, while he believed that the Bill was a good one, desired to have it referred to a Committee. There all the particulars of the case could be considered, and when the report should come before the House he would then be prepared to discuss it on its merits.

Mr. BLAKE did not think it advisable to delegate to a Select Committee to decide whether this House had power to deal with it, but it would be well to allow a Select Committee to consider the details of the measure, and make alterations, if necessary. If it were within the competence of the House to deal with the sale of poisons, it would be well to make provision for keeping certain poisonous drugs in certain coloured bottles, so that there might be fewer of those heartrending cases of poisoning we so frequently hear of. It would be found that the bulk of such mistakes did not occur at obscure drug stores, but in the larger, more respectable establishments where inexperienced clerks, were allowed to dispense drugs. It would be well, in examining the details of this Bill to subject clerks to an examination also.

Mr. LAUDER did not believe the House would do well to organize a close Corporation of this kind. Poisonous drugs were used in many arts and manufactures, and if the sale of such drugs were confined to certain persons, it would be throwing restrictions round trade. What was desired was to prevent the occurrence of fatal cases of poisoning by mistakes on the part of druggists. The suggestions of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Blake) would serve the purpose. He opposed going any further than this, but did believe it was necessary to make it compulsory on the druggists to label bottles containing poisonous drugs, and not to trust to inexperienced clerks.

Mr. CUMBERLAND was surprised that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Lauder) should be opposed to close Corporations, for he belonged to one of the closest professions himself. However, he approved of the principles of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time.

Dr. MCGILL moved that the Bill should be referred to a select Committee composed of Hon. Mr. Wood, Messrs. Boulter, Baxter, Rykert, Pardes, Matchett, and the mover.

Mr. RYKERT would prefer not to serve on the Committee for two reasons. In the first place, because he had not sufficient time to spare, and in the second place because he had a lively horror of medicine.

On request of Dr. McGill, Mr. Rykert consented to act, and the motion was carried.

JURIES AND JURORS.

Mr. TROW moved the second reading of a Bill to amend chapter 31 of the Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada, intitled "An Act respecting Jurors and Juries." The principal amendment in the Bill before the House was to do away with the second selection of jurors. The first selection was, he thought, quite sufficient. The sheriffs and clerks ought to be allowed to ascertain and prepare the list of jurors, without the necessity of a second selection. Many of the other clauses of the Bill last session, which had been referred to a Committee, had been altered, and he hoped that the Committee to which this present Bill should be referred would not only send it back complete, but would add to it some of the amendments which had been unsuccessful last session. He moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR approved of the Bill introduced by the hon. member. He had called last session for a return of jurors in each county, the number that were subpoenaed, and the cost of the second selection which was proposed to be done away with altogether. In that year, 20,371 persons had been selected in the local municipalities, and out of these 15,524 were subpoenaed, so that upwards of 5,000 persons had never been called. The expense of the second selection was \$3,400 in that year. He cordially supported the Bill.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON would not oppose the Bill, as it was, he presumed, to be referred to a Select Committee.

The Bill was then read a second time, and referred to the following Committee:—Hon. Mr. Cameron, Messrs. McKellar, McLeod, Clarke, Boyd, Ferguson, Finlayson, Galbraith, Craig (Glenarry), Graham (Hastings), and the mover.

DUAL REPRESENTATION.

Mr. MCKELLAR moved the second reading of Bill (No. 21) "to render ineligible certain persons from being members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario." He said that though this measure had been defeated on a former occasion, he believed that the vote to-night—and he believed that there would be a vote on the measure—would show that the feeling against Dual Representation was growing stronger. He was convinced that the principle involved in the Bill was a correct one, and would ultimately triumph. The only argument advanced by its opponents was that it was necessary that members of this House should attend the Dominion Parliament to protect the interests of Ontario. He thought if the House would look at the measures which hon. members of this Chamber, who represent Ontario in the Dominion Parliament, had supported, they would find the interests of Ontario had hardly been protected as well as might have been expected. He thought on that ground he had no right to continue this system of dual representation, and he believed by abolishing it, it would relieve some members of this House from being placed in a very awkward and embarrassing position. There were at least two or three members of the Government who went to Ottawa to protect the interests of Ontario; but when they got there one voted one way and another voted on the other side; and again, in this House, when the same question was brought up here, these same gentlemen reversed the vote which they gave in Ottawa. He believed, after this display of the beneficial effects of dual representation, it would be felt that it was unnecessary to send members of this House to the Dominion Parliament in future. This partnership between the two Houses was decidedly wrong. The inconvenience members were put to in being called together at this unreasonable period of the year was one of its results. He desired to see the connection between these two Parliaments completely severed. He was opposed to the principle from the beginning. He was opposed to it at his election, and he had been opposed to it ever since, and the more he saw of its working, the more he was convinced that it should be put a stop to altogether. He knew the hon. gentleman opposite would point to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Blake) who held a seat in the Dominion Parliament, as representative of Durham, to show that members of the Opposition took advantage of the present law while denouncing it. But he believed while the law existed as it did, the hon. member for Bruce had a perfect right to hold a seat in both Houses. He only brought up this question to-night to test the sense of the House on it again. He would not repeat the arguments which had been urged against the principle. The matter had been thoroughly discussed before, and there was no necessity to have the same ground travelled over again. He therefore moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. McCALL would be glad to see this Bill go into operation at once. There was an excellent illustration of the evil effects of dual representation the other night. Hon. members who were defeated in the other House came here to raise a noise to cover their defeat. He believed the Bill should originate in the Dominion Parliament, and should be intended to exclude all members of the Local Legislatures from the General Parliament. He cordially supported the Bill before the House. Its necessity was growing more apparent every day.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON was not a little surprised to hear the time of the House occupied in the reconsideration of a measure

which had been fully considered before. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side desired to create an agitation throughout the country for fear they should be kept forever in the cold shades of opposition. The hon. member for Bruce, while always opposing dual representation, practiced it himself. The very best argument in favour of this principle had been advanced by the mover of this bill before the House, when he pointed to the votes of himself (Mr. Cameron) and his honourable colleagues on the Nova Scotia subsidiary question. No better proof could have been given that the fact of holding seats in both Houses did not prevent hon. members from voting as they thought best. It was manifest that the sole purpose of bringing up this question again was to create an agitation in the country. The hon. gentlemen opposite professed a desire to protect the people while in fact they were endeavouring to deprive them of selecting whom they pleased to represent them. The people could decide this question themselves. The solution of the difficulty lay in their own hands. If they didn't want to send members to both Houses, why they needn't elect them. He would, therefore, move, that this Bill be not now read a second time, but be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. MCKELLAR—"And if that motion is lost, shall we vote on the original motion?" (Laughter)

Mr. McDUGALL said his conduct had been referred to, and he admitted that he had voted in favour of the Bill last session, and he should vote for it in this. (Hear, hear) He thought that he could show that his inconsistency was but on the surface. The Bill stated that members should hold their seats until the end of Parliament, and he therefore was entitled to a seat till then, but he would put it into another form, and say that so long as this Bill was not carried and the Government party availed themselves of it, he was entitled to also avail himself of the same in the interest of the party to which he belonged. He thought that they should have the advantage of the debating power of such members as the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Blake) in both houses, while the present law stood. And with respect to those who were not so useful as debaters, he might say that it was quite as right that if the Government endeavoured to gain seats that the Opposition should be entitled to do the same. He would say that the call of private business induced him to resign his seat in the Local Legislature when he was elected to the House of Commons, but his friends could not let him, for they said that he always voted against the Government, (Laughter and cheers), and another member might not do so. When a Bill in favour of Ottawa had passed he should resign his seat in one of the Legislatures.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said they had never heard of Bills which had been introduced to prevent the people from having their own choice. There was no doubt that the hon. member for Bothwell introduced this measure in a captious spirit, and he had no doubt if it was defeated that it would be reintroduced again. It had been said that an arrangement had been made between the Governments of Ontario and Canada, but he denied the fact. It had been held that it was injurious to the Province that members should occupy seats in the Parliament, but he did not think that the interests of the people had suffered by his occupying a seat there, whatever might be the case with the hon. members for South Bruce and North Renfrew. He had used his best abilities in opposing measures which he believed to be incompatible with the interests of the Province and of the Dominion. He had been charged with being inconsistent, but he hurled back the taunt.

Mr. MCKELLAR—Look at the votes.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said he had always held that the passing of the Nova Scotia Bill was destructive of the principle of Confederation, and he had always, and should always, retain that opinion. It was said that the people were not well represented in the Provincial Legislature, but the hon. member for South Bruce might, with his great intellect, of which they had heard so much, represent half a dozen constituencies. He thought that there were many cases in which a man might, with credit, occupy a seat in both Houses; and he would refer to the fact that the Quebec Legislature had no less than fourteen members of her Legislature occupying seats in the Dominion Legislature, and these men walked up a solid phalanx when the interests of the Province of Quebec were concerned. The argument had been brought forward that the system of dual representation was improper, and yet hon. members, while saying this, were willing to occupy seats in both Houses. The hon. member for North Renfrew was desirous to sit in this House in order to gain advantages for his district, for timber men who smuggled timber under false affidavits.

Mr. SCOTT (Ottawa) called the hon. member to order. It was not parliamentary to charge persons with perjury.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said he had the statement on good authority, and that was the reason why the hon. member wished to have his seat in this Legislature.

Mr. McDUGALL entered into some explanations, to the effect that he did not approve of the policy of the Government.

Hon. Mr. WOOD asked the hon. member what he complained of in the legislation of the Government that he was so anxious to come there to oppose them.

Mr. McDUGALL entered into further explanations complaining of the conduct of the Government in refusing to appoint a coroner where it was necessary that an appointment should be made because there was no supporter of the Government.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said there was a great cry for office on the part of some persons, and was the only reason why representation was desired in that House. He considered that the present motion was brought forward in a spirit of buncombe, and he did not think it would be successful.

Mr. BLAKE said it seemed to have become almost a debate on the question of the consistency of the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. McDougall). He should not refer at present to his own position, but he wished to point out to the House the gross

inconsistency of the conduct of some members on the other side. The present Government, of whom there were three in the Dominion Parliament, had passed a Bill which provided that no Executive Councillor, no Minister of the Crown of this Province should occupy seats in this House. (Hear, hear.) The present Bill was to abolish the system of dual representation, but the other measure was not merely proposed, it had become the law of the land. The hon. gentlemen had passed that Bill, they had themselves said that it was wrong that any Minister of Ontario should sit in both Houses, and they have prohibited it. If they, therefore, declared that to be the sound view, he asked the hon. gentleman from Centre Wellington (Mr. Ferrier) whether they were sitting in that House any more in contradiction of their views than they (Mr. Blake and Mr. McDougall) were of theirs. When they found that these gentlemen showed themselves so lamentably inconsistent—three-fold inconsistent—perhaps even the hon. member would consider himself freed from those obligations, and that he would now be able to vote according to what his conscience dictated.

Mr. FERRIER read an extract from an Act of Parliament, on the supposition that it was the one to which Mr. Blake had been referring; but

Mr. BLAKE said he was not talking of that Act at all. (Laughter.) The one to which he referred was to the effect that all members of the Executive Council of Ontario were not to be permitted to be members of the Dominion Legislature; but there was a saving clause, that it should not come into operation till the end of the Parliament. Still, the principle was laid down undoubtedly, that the servants of the Crown ought not to be sitting in this House, and had no right to be here. It was held by the hon. Secretary that an altogether different position was occupied by the servants of the people—that they could not be trusted, by reason of their office, to sit here; but, yet, they found that the hon. Secretary would have violated that idea, if he could have done so; that the hon. Treasurer had done so; the Attorney-General and the Commissioner of Crown Lands had also done so, and continued to sit in this House as Executive Councillors of Ontario, while they continued to sit in the other House, also, in defiance of their avowed principles, in contradiction of their views, and although by their own hand they had written the condemnation of that course. And yet, it was by such men that the argument of inconsistency was urged against them, and he begged the House to listen to them, and say if their endeavour to support their position by his inconsistency was a straightforward one. But he denied that he was inconsistent in his practice. His view was that leading men in the House could not act independently in the other House. Practical men would adapt themselves to a system which existed while trying to remedy it. If he believed he could find an opportunity to do so, he might hold a seat in both Houses, just as long as the law allowed it. It was not a question of morality or conscience. It was a political question, whether the system should be continued or abolished. He believed it should be abolished, but did not think he should not avail himself of the law while it existed. He stood for two constituencies because he held those views. He stood for Bruce because he desired a seat in this House, and he stood for Durham because he did not desire to lose the constituency lost to his party. He desired the success not of that party for itself, but for the principles with which it was identified. And when so many bright and shining lights of that party had fallen away, as the honourable member for Brantford and others had done, (laughter,) he believed the most humble of its members should do all in their power to uphold it. When did the hon. member for Brantford come to the conclusion that a member of the Executive Council had not a right to hold a position in the other House. He had all along been convinced of the fact, but notwithstanding all that he sought the suffrages of two constituencies, and violated a sound principle.

Hon. Mr. WOOD believed a member of the Executive Council of this House would have as much to attend to here as he could manage without going to Ottawa for more business.

Mr. BLAKE said this was not the ground on which the hon. gentleman at first opposed the principle. It was because members of the Executive Council were servants of the Crown. And yet this miracle of consistency charged others with inconsistency. He would recommend the hon. gentleman not to throw stones while he lived in a glass house.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—"A stone wall."

Mr. BLAKE—Well, a wooden wall, at any rate. (Laughter.) He concurred with the opinions of the hon. Treasurer that nothing was more destructive of the privileges of

Parliament than granting public improvements to constituencies which returned supporters of the Government. He was rejoiced to hear such noble expressions from a member of the Government. The hon. member for Brantford, when he asked his constituents to send him to Ottawa, told them that he desired to go there to secure material advantages for Ontario. And to secure these advantages, Ontario was induced to vote in a manner which he would not if he had not occupied a seat in this House as well. The hon. member had charged him (Mr. Blake) with inconsistency. He accepted the challenge. He did not wish to weary the House; but he would refer to the resolution which the hon. member moved in the Ottawa House, and compare it with the one which the same hon. gentleman had proposed in this House the other night. The resolution moved at Ottawa was to the effect that it was inexpedient to disturb the financial arrangements of the Confederation Act without treating all the Provinces of the Dominion alike. The resolution against which the hon. gentleman voted the other night was to the same effect; and almost in the same words. He voted in Ottawa that a certain thing was wrong, and in this House that the same thing was right.