

of hunting for the convenience of those who preferred still hunting.

Mr. BASKERVILLE supported the amendment.

The amendment was lost on division. Yeas, 33; nays, 44.

YEAS.—Messrs. Baskerville, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Creighton, Deroche, Fraser, French, Gibson (Huron), Harkin, Jelly, Kerr, Lees, Long, Macmaster, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Miller, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Murray, Nairn, Near, Richardson, Robertson (Hastings), Rosevear, Ross, Tooley, White, Wigle, Wood, Young—33.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Boulter, Caldwell, Calvin, Cascaden, Chisholm, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Laidlaw, Livingston, Lyon, McCrauey, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Neelon, Pardee, Paxton, Peck, Robinson (Kent), Robertson (Halton), Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Waters, Watterworth, Widdifield—44.

Mr. FRASER proposed to amend the clause so that the period during which dog hunters should not be allowed the privilege of hunting should be between the 15th of November and the 1st of October.

After a brief discussion the House divided on the amendment, which was carried: Yeas, 41; Nays, 38.

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Ballantyne, Baskerville, Bell, Broder, Creighton, Deroche, Fraser, French, Gibson (Huron), Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Harkin, Hunter, Jelly, Kerr, Lees, Long, Macmaster, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Miller, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Murray, Nairn, Near, Richardson, Robertson (Hastings), Rosevear, Ross, Striker, Tooley, White, Widdifield, Wigle, Wood, Young—41.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Boulter, Caldwell, Calvin, Cascaden, Chisholm, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Hawley, Hay, Laidlaw, Livingston, Lyon, McCrauey, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Neelon, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Peck, Robinson (Kent), Robertson (Halton), Sinclair, Springer, Waters, Watterworth—38.

The House then went into Committee. The Committee rose and reported the amendment.

On the motion for the third reading,

Mr. McLAUGHLIN moved an amendment to provide that dogs accustomed to follow rabbits and hares should not be allowed to run at large within the period mentioned in the Bill. The mover remarked that many sheep were killed by dogs which scoured the swamps all night, and came home hungry in the morning.

After a short discussion the amendment was withdrawn, and the Bill read the third time and passed.

### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read the third time:—

To provide for the erection of new buildings for the accommodation of the Provincial Legislature and the public Departments.—Mr. Fraser.

Respecting the collection of taxes in the districts of Algoma, Muskoka, Parry Sound, Nipissing, and Thunder Bay.—The Attorney-General.

### MUNICIPAL ACT.

The Bill to amend the Municipal Act was read the second time.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

### THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S TRIP.

On the order being called for the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and the proposed amendment of Mr. Widdifield,

Mr. MORRIS said he rose to a point of order. He held that it was the duty of the Speaker to declare that the amendment of the member for North York was out of order. After reading the amendment he said that he believed that the amendment aimed against one of the principles which had long been struggled for in England, and which was now the established practice of the Parliament of Great Britain and of all other Parliamentary bodies which derived their system from that Parliament. The motion distinctly affirmed that the House desired to comply with the expressed wish of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor; and he held that neither the Queen nor her representative here had any right to come down to Parliament and express a wish or an opinion except in the constitutional manner, through the advisers of the Crown, in which that opinion was from time to time submitted to the House. A private letter from His Honour had been read by a Minister of the Crown, addressed to one of his associates in the Government,

and thereupon a motion had been made by the Ministerial whip taking cognizance of that letter and proposing that a certain action should be taken by the House. He thought that the authorities were very plain and precise in condemnation of any such practice. He held with the Commissioner of Public Works that the position of the Lieutenant-Governor in relation to this House was analogous to that of the Queen to the British Parliament or the Governor-General to the Parliament of Canada, and read from Todd and May to show that the practice of the Queen expressing her private opinion or wish to Parliament for the purpose of influencing its members was unconstitutional, and said that this was a doctrine which was necessary for the protection of the rights of Parliament, and one which should be agreeable to those who claimed to be the descendants of the old Reformers of Upper Canada. He concluded by asking for the ruling of the Speaker on the point he had raised.

Mr. MOWAT said he agreed with his hon. friend that the point he had raised was perfectly clear, but that it was perfectly clear in the opposite direction to that suggested by the hon. gentleman. The hon. member had made a mistake or two in considering the question, and his point of order was founded on his own mistake. He had assumed in the first place that His Honour had made a reference to some debate in this House, when that was not the fact. Reference was made in the letter to certain attacks made in the public newspapers, so that the rule of Parliament to which the hon. gentleman referred did not apply in this case. Before referring to the authorities which the hon. gentleman had cited he might observe that it was rather a strong ground to take, and certainly an inconvenient one, to hold that all the rules applicable to Her Majesty's relations to Parliament applied to the relations of the Lieutenant-Governor to this Legislature. The principle upon which the doctrine was founded was the danger of Parliament being overawed by the power of the Crown, which at one time was a serious danger, as the Crown had a very large amount of power, and it was necessary for Parliament to struggle against being wrongly influenced by that power. The whole foundation of the doctrine was inapplicable here, as there was no such thing as overawing this Parliament. The rule so far as it was applicable here at all rested on a mere matter of courtesy or of parliamentary etiquette. Who would suggest that there was any danger of the wish or opinion of the Lieutenant-Governor having any undue weight in influencing the votes of any member of this House? But the hon. gentleman was wrong on another ground; he was wrong when he wished the House to believe and the Speaker to rule that the Lieutenant-Governor had no right to express a wish to this House. The rule and the practice was both diametrically opposite to any such view. On the very first day of the session the Lieutenant-Governor recommended to the House the whole course of legislation for the session; and that was the case in the English Parliament, and the Canadian House of Commons, and in all the Colonies which had a parliamentary system. The Lieutenant-Governor expressed his opinion with regard to the most important matters which came before them from time to time, and in matters relating to the revenue they could not take any action without his recommendation. This was an essential part of our system, but the distinction was that the Ministry must be responsible for what His Honour communicated to the House. Though the Speech from the Throne had the words and the form of His Honour's speech, it was in effect and according to parliamentary usage, and the doctrine of constitutional Government, the speech of his advisers. So with regard to the messages which were brought down to the House from time to time containing His Honour's recommendations, or communicated by one of the Ministers. The only point which they had to recognize was, that for these communications the Ministry must hold themselves responsible. In the present case the Ministry took the full responsibility for the communication which His Honour had made

*Feb 26*