

That would indicate, Mr. Fraser went on to say, that by some ruling of the speaker unprecedented, without any parliamentary usage to sustain it, and contrary to the usage and procedure of the house hitherto, the bill in charge of Mr. Marter was not proceeded with. There was a very plain rule of the house bearing on the matter, which bound the speaker, and which he could not set aside without the consent of every member of the house. This would be found at page 7 of the rules of the house: "If at 6 p.m. on a Wednesday or a Friday a motion on the notice paper be under consideration, that question will stand first on the orders of that evening after the hour assigned to private bills has elapsed." Therefore it was not necessary that the speaker should make any ruling, nor did he make any ruling. What he had done was to allow the ordinary, long-followed, well-established usage and rules of the house to govern in this case as they had governed all through. Mr. Clancy was perfectly in his right when the order of the day were called to proceed with his notice, and the motion having been proceeded without being concluded at 6 o'clock, there was no other rule to follow than that which had been followed. He mentioned it because it would be unfair to the house that it should be assumed that there was any understanding that the bill should be shoved off in any way. Mr. Meredith on the previous night had made mention of the fact that there appeared to be some understanding that the bill of Mr. Marter's should be proceeded with next day, but he took care to intimate that he thought that would be subject to the ordinary procedure; that was, that the bill would be proceeded with only if it was reached. That was what took place.

#### AN INTERVIEW WITH MR. DRYDEN.

Mr. Meredith admitted the correctness of the account of what had taken place by Mr. Fraser. Proceeding, he said that the minister of agriculture, if correctly reported in *The Star* of Thursday, April 27, hardly did justice to Mr. Marter or the members of the house. Over the article were these headlines:—"Laid the bill away." "Someone Shirked the ticklish question." "And Mr. Dryden says that it was the Conservatives." "The government was ready to go on." In the article he was reported to have said:—

"It looks like a put-up job," said Mr. Dryden this morning in reference to the way in which the Marter bill was shelved.

"The opposition did not want to have it come on, and they worked that way. The night before, Mr. Clancy came over and told Mr. Gibson he was going to press his motion, and Mr. Preston came over and let me know he would go on with his motion on the travelling dairy; and then, a moment after, Mr. Meredith was asking about the prohibition bill. It looked curious."

"And, besides that," Mr. Dryden went on, "the papers are saying it was contrary to the rules of the house to go on with the discussion after dinner. It was the idea of some of us that we should leave it over after dinner, but the clerk of the house discovered that we were, in so doing, in reality adhering to the rules."

"At any rate, we were ready to go on with the prohibition debate, and were primed and ready with our arguments. It was the opposition who did not want to go on."

Proceeding, Mr. Meredith said that he could hardly believe that Mr. Dryden could have been understood by the reporter, because there could be no justification for the statements or the insinuations Mr. Dryden was said to have made. He did not see what need there should be for suggestions that anyone should be to blame in this matter, as there would be ample time to discuss the bill. Monday and Tuesday were set apart for it. If Mr. Dryden had said these things, he should, in justice to Mr. Marter, refrain from making observations of the kind.

Mr. Dryden said that he had not seen the paragraph which had been referred to by Mr. Meredith. He might have made the remark that it looked as if Mr. Marter did not desire to go on with the bill, but other statements had been added by the reporter.

Mr. Clancy said that that portion of the statement referring to him was correct. He had arrived at an understanding with the provincial secretary.

The following bills were read a third time:—

Mr. Monk—Respecting the Rideau club.

Mr. Biggar—Respecting certain agreements between the village of Alvinston and the Grand Trunk Railway company of Canada.

Mr. Dryden—To amend the charter of McMaster university.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton)—Respecting the Hamilton Street railway.

#### QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

Mr. Gibson, in reply to a question by Mr. McColl, said that in the opinion of the government the act respecting the establishment of houses of refuge does not authorize a subsequent grant to be made to committees for subsequent improvements, in cases where they have been already assisted, as provided by section 5 of the act. The government had no present intention of proceeding to amend the act to authorize additional grants to be made.

Mr. Hudson asked:—Is it the intention of the government to introduce during the present session legislation for making compulsory the weekly payment of wages?

Sir Oliver Mowat, in reply, said:—The subject has been under the consideration of the government. It is not the inten-

tion of the government to introduce a measure for that purpose during the present session.

#### TRAVELLING DAIRIES.

Dr. Preston, in moving for a return showing the number and names of the places visited in the different electoral constituencies in the province in 1891 and 1892 by the travelling dairies, the number of lectures given by the agent, and the expense incurred, said that the system was one which had been recommended by the opposition ten years ago, and which, though opposed then by the government, had been since adopted by them.

Mr. Dryden expressed surprise at hearing Dr. Preston claim for the opposition the credit of suggesting and recommending the travelling dairy. However, since it had been established for two ever since it had been established for two it was the very best system that could be adopted for the instruction of the people of the country in the art of butter-making. He knew of nothing that had been done that seemed to give greater satisfaction generally than the work of the travelling dairy.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Evanturel had a motion on the paper covering almost the same ground, which he consented to withdraw.

Mr. Hudson moved for a return showing as to what offices or services, orders in council have been passed commuting the fees, the dates of the orders in council, the amount of the commutation allowances, with a schedule or table showing the amounts paid to each official in each year since the order in council was passed, and the amount received by the province in each year from the fees of his office. He wished it to be understood that he did not desire to say anything in disparagement of any public officer, but he wished to draw attention to the fact that there was a large drain upon the province by the commutations in excess of what the fees warranted.

The motion was adopted.

#### THEY ARE BOUND TO HAVE IT.

Mr. Waters moved for an order of the house for a return from the treasurer of the medical council, giving a detailed statement of the sums paid to each member of the medical council during the past five years, for travelling expenses and hotel accommodation while attending council and committee meetings, and also of the details of the amount not down in the financial returns for 1891 and 1892, under the heading "Expenses of legislation."

He explained that the Medical Defence association had been refused this information by the medical council and that he had been asked to endeavor to procure it.

Dr. Meacham read the reply of the treasurer of the council to an application made by Dr. Sangster, secretary of the Medical Defence association for the information. The treasurer declined to give it.

Sir Oliver Mowat, in view of the fact that the matter had been the subject of correspondence and that there appeared to be an objection to supplying the information asked for, requested that the motion be allowed to stand.

Dr. Preston said that it was necessary that the information asked for should be brought down.

Mr. Waters said that the doctors of the province were anxious to know how the money put down for legislation had been expended. In 1891 \$614 was put down as the expenses of legislation, while in 1892 the amount charged under that head was \$317. Their's was public legislation and not private, and therefore there should have been nothing to pay. He consented to allow the motion to stand.

#### THE GAME LAWS.

Mr. Reid moved for a return of copies of all correspondence between any member of the government and any other person or persons respecting prosecutions