

the people. The people were decidedly averse to anything more in that direction, and he might add that the present so-called Reform Government had distinguished themselves by their desire to take the power out of the hands of the people and centre it in themselves.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) said he presumed the object of the proposed Committee was similar to that of the Sanitary Committee of the United States Congress, namely, to elicit such information as would assist the local Boards in the performance of their duties.

The motion was carried.

Mr. LAUDER jocularly hoped that the Bill would not be of that formidable character which the trip to Washington would involve.

Mr. BAXTER suggested that those who looked to Washington sat on the opposite side of the House. (Laughter.)

Mr. HAY thought the composition of the Committee might be considerably improved. It was composed entirely of doctors and lawyers, and it occurred to him that laymen knew as much about public health as either doctors or lawyers. (Laughter.) In his opinion the less they had to do with doctors and lawyers the better. (Laughter.)

The motion was carried.

PRESENTING PETITIONS.

Several hon. members presented petitions at this stage, and Mr. Speaker said in future, unless there were special reasons, petitions had better not be presented out of order. (Hear, hear.)

DOMINION STOCK.

Mr. LAUDER asked whether or not any of the Dominion stock held by the Province has been sold during the year 1877. If any has been sold, what was the amount thereof, what rate was obtained, to whom sold, what commission was paid, and through what broker, or agent, if any.

Mr. WOOD said no Dominion stock had been sold, but Dominion 5 per cent. bonds to the extent of £149,900 sterling had been placed in the hands of Sir John Rose for sale in pursuance of the statute.

THE TEST LIQUOR CASE.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) asked if a decision had been given in the Supreme Court in the test liquor case, *Regina v. Severn*, as to Provincial or Dominion jurisdiction, and if not, when it might be expected.

Mr. MOWAT said the decision had not yet been given. The Supreme Court would sit next Monday, and it was expected that this and other cases would then be disposed of.

EARLY SITTINGS.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) moved for a Select Committee to be appointed with instructions to amend the first and second rules of this House by providing that the time for the ordinary meeting of the House shall be at an earlier hour than three o'clock in the afternoon. He said the question would naturally arise whether there were any precedents for the change. The Swiss Legislature, he might remark, met at nine o'clock in the morning, and often earlier. In Great Britain, prior to the time of the Commonwealth, the House of Commons met as early as six o'clock in the morning. (Hear, hear.) In Washington and most of the States the Legislatures met at times varying from nine to eleven in the forenoon. The sittings varied in their duration; the Houses usually sat up to twelve or one, and then adjourned for two hours or more, and again sat until six in the evening. He would suggest that the best course for this House to pursue would be as follows:—Meet at ten or eleven and discharge routine business, and give the Speaker power to leave the chair until three or four o'clock in the afternoon, the members in the meantime attending to the Committees. This plan was worthy of consideration as much for economical as sanitary reasons. It would result in a saving of \$30 per day during the session, which was a very material matter. It would moreover give the messengers, pages,

and clerks a chance to enjoy that rest which nature demanded. There were no great difficulties in the way of the adoption of the scheme. Some one had suggested that the debates would lose much of their force and brilliancy if they were conducted during daylight, and that the Assembly would degenerate into the form and status of a large municipal Council. Now, he would suggest nothing for the adoption of the House which might tend to lessen its dignity or impair its power as a law-making body; and he could not see any force in the objection which had been advanced against the adoption of a measure which had so much in its favour.

One good result of early sitting would be the shortening of the session; in his opinion there was at present a great deal of talking against time—(hear, hear)—which would be avoided under the proposed scheme. At night many hon. gentlemen got a sort of false courage which enabled them to talk about the woman with the iron jaw for several hours. That class of oratory would not flourish in daylight, and its absence from the debates would be no great loss. He suggested that early sittings should be tried for a fortnight, commencing to-morrow. If at the end of that time the scheme was found not to work well, they could return to their old custom.

The ayes and noes were taken on the motion, which was declared lost by the Speaker. Several hon. members demanded a division.

Mr. MOWAT suggested that the motion be withdrawn. He thought the subject was a fair one for consideration. If the House desired to change, the Government would have no objection to try the experiment.

HON. GENTLEMEN—Call in the members.

Mr. CLARKE—I will withdraw the motion. ("Question," "question.")

The members were then called in, and the motion was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Ballantyne, Bishop, Benfield, Clarke (Norfolk), Currie, Dawson, Ferris, Finlayson, Gibson, Graham, Hargraft, Harkin, Hay, Hunter, Kean, Lane, McGowan, Massie, Master, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Patterson (York), Ross, Snettinger, Williams, Wilson, Wood—28.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Barr, Baxter, Bell, Boulton, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Code, Cole, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Deroche, Fleisher, Fraser, Grange, Grant, Haney, Hodgins, Lauder, Long, Lyon, Macdougall (Simcoe), McMahon, Master, Meredith, Merrick, Miller, Monk, Mowat, Pardee, Patterson (Essex), Paxton, Preston, Richardson, Robinson, Rosevear, Scott, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Tooley, Watterworth, Widdfield, Wigle, Wills—49.

COMMISSIONS OF ENQUIRY.

Mr. LAUDER moved for an "Address for statement of all Commissions of Enquiry, and to whom directed, issued by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council since Confederation, specifying the subjects directed to be enquired into respectively; the expenses of said several Commissions, giving the names of parties to whom moneys have been paid, or to whom moneys may be due." He said a great many of those Commissions had been issued during the last few years to enquire into school matters, and also to investigate charges against magistrates, and he thought it right that the country should know the expense which was involved.

Mr. MOWAT said it would be found that Commissions were issued in accordance with those constitutional rules which the Government recognized as binding. He had found the difficulty of disposing of complaints against magistrates very great indeed. A memorial would be sent to him complaining of the conduct of an individual magistrate, and he would send a statement of the charges to the magistrate in order that he might forward his story. How was such a case to be tried? Was he to try the case without any sworn evidence, or by affidavit? He had endeavoured to find what the practice was in England and in the old Province of Canada, but he had got no light. The only recorded instances of the dismissal of magistrates were cases tried some way or other before the bar of a court. It was suggested that the Minister should be personally responsible for such matters, but