



Declaration of Canada.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Monday, July 5.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Tuesday, July 6, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Wednesday, July 7, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Thursday, July 8, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Friday, July 9, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Saturday, July 10, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Sunday, July 11, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Monday, July 12, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Tuesday, July 13, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Wednesday, July 14, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Thursday, July 15, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Friday, July 16, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Saturday, July 17, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Sunday, July 18, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Monday, July 19, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Tuesday, July 20, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Wednesday, July 21, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Thursday, July 22, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Friday, July 23, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Saturday, July 24, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Sunday, July 25, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Monday, July 26, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Tuesday, July 27, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Wednesday, July 28, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Thursday, July 29, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Friday, July 30, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Saturday, July 31, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Sunday, August 1, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Monday, August 2, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Tuesday, August 3, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Wednesday, August 4, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Thursday, August 5, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

On Friday, August 6, the House resumed its proceedings.

The House proceeded to ballot for a committee to enquire into the election of the House of Representatives.

There were certain objections to the list of names, and the House adjourned till the next day.

them; and he thought they had every reason to expect that there would be no delay in bringing them forward, as there were a double number of law officers of the Crown, a double number of Secretaries, &c.

Sir ALLAN McNAB.—As there were two election committees to be struck on Wednesday next, he would move that there be a call of the House on that day.

Mr. JOHNSON said he could see no necessity for a call of the House.

Mr. DURAND was of the opinion that there should be a call of the House, otherwise it would be difficult to procure a sufficient number of members to be present, especially as two election committees were already sitting.

Mr. VIGER remarked that a call of the House should only take place in cases of urgent necessity, and upon questions of the utmost importance, (hear, hear,) and when put in practice the attendance of members should be enforced.

Mr. AYLIWY said he believed it was a matter of absolute necessity that a call of the House should take place, lest the House should be left without a quorum.

Mr. CAMERON accorded with the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Ayliwy,) that there should be a call.

Mr. CHILDE observed that the language of the motion should be somewhat different—it should be a call of the whole House.

Mr. MERRITT said it must clearly be understood that a call of the House meant a call of the whole House. He thought, however, that calls of the House should be avoided on all occasions where it was possible to avoid them.

Mr. HARRISON said that a call of the House was a matter of great importance, and that it should only be resorted to in cases of urgent necessity.

Mr. BLACK remarked that a call was rarely made in the House of Commons, and when made a remote place was invariably fixed for the call to take place; for upon a call being ordered it becomes the duty of the Speaker to cause the proper officer to notify absent members.

Mr. HARRISON said that the business of the House was of great importance, and that a call of the House would be required; it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. HARRISON said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He thought that a call of the House would be required, and that it should only take place upon the determination of some great Constitutional question.

Mr. HARRISON said that the proposition had no right to assume that members would be guilty of a dereliction of duty in the present case.

Mr. SHERWOOD was of opinion that the intention had been that the report should lie upon the table until today that the hon. member from Gaspé might have an opportunity of examining it, and he would have ample opportunity of expressing his views when the house went into committee of the whole upon the report.

Mr. JOHNSON said his understanding of the matter was that the report was to be re-committed.

The motion for receiving the report was negatived.

Mr. MORRIS moved that the order of the day for receiving the report of the select committee to whom had been referred the subject of the printing of the House, which had been lost by the adjournment on Friday last, be revived, and that the report be received.

In making this motion he was aware, he said, that he should be opposed by the hon. member from Lincoln. The committee had given notice to all the printers in town to attend and give information before the committee; and they all stated that the price which had been determined on was a reasonable one; but he believed that an individual from the city of Toronto had since stated that he would be willing to do the work for less; hence the opposition of the hon. member.

Mr. THORNBURN said he should oppose the motion as the hon. gentleman had very correctly supposed; but his opposition did not rest upon the ground proposed by the hon. gentleman. His objection had arisen before he saw the paper alluded to by the hon. member. It had come to his knowledge that a combination had taken place among the printers of this town: there had been a meeting of all the trade, at which meeting it was agreed that only should put in a tender for doing the work with the understanding that it should be divided among them.

Mr. MORRIS was well aware that the work could be done at a saving to that host of at least three thousand dollars; it became therefore an important consideration whether the house would allow a band of individuals to be brought together, and to obtain from the house a large sum of money over and above what the work really worth. He thought it should be thrown open to competition, and that tenders should be received anew. Another point was, that as the paper was furnished by the house, he thought it would be as well that it should be paper manufactured in this Province. He desired that it might be referred back to the committee, with instructions to receive new tenders.

Mr. MORRIS said he would move for leave to withdraw the motion which he had made. And it was withdrawn accordingly.

Mr. HARRISON moved that the order of the day for receiving the report of the committee to whom had been referred the subject of subscribing to the different newspapers published in this Province, and which was lost by the adjournment on Friday last, be revived, and that the said report be now received.

On this motion a division occurred—yeas 29, nays 21.

Mr. HARRISON then moved that the said report be concurred in.

Mr. HARRISON said he should oppose the motion; not that he thought their constituents ought not to be made acquainted with the proceedings of that House, but he thought the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

Mr. HARRISON said that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional. He thought that the mode proposed was altogether unconstitutional.

quid pro quo from those papers, and he (Mr. J.) thought therefore the vote proposed, would be a useless expenditure of money. He did not see the propriety of voting away five hundred dollars a month to so little purpose. Besides he did not altogether believe in the correctness of the motion he proposed, and he would not mention an instance when exactly the reverse of what he (Mr. Johnston) had said was stated; he was represented to have demanded from the gentlemen on the treasury benches, whether they would rest their popularity upon those measures which they themselves introduced; now what he had asked of them was whether they would rest their popularity on such measures as that hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Durand) might introduce.

Mr. DURAND said it appeared from the hon. gentleman's observations, that he feared other papers would benefit by the labors of the publisher of the Mirror of Parliament. He (Mr. Durand) hoped it would be the case; it was the very thing which was most desirable; the more they could diffuse information the better, and as the vote they were about to give would have the effect of placing all newspapers in the possession of the reports, he thought there could be no reasonable objection offered to it on that score. It was expected that very shortly the Budget would be opened, and there would then be abundant materials both for the employment of hon. members in that House, and also for those whose business it would be to furnish to the country information of the proceedings of the House. He thought the arguments of the hon. member tended to strengthen the proposition. He would cheerfully support the motion.

Mr. HARRISON said he merely rose for the purpose of cautioning hon. members against consuming the time of the House unnecessarily by going into a debate upon this subject. The resolutions had been already carried by a considerable majority in committee of the whole House on a former occasion.

Mr. CHESLEY said he observed on the part of the hon. gentlemen who were in favor of the proposition a great fear of entering into any further discussion upon the subject. For his own part he had heard subjects of far less consequence discussed, and he was particularly desirous of hearing and understanding the full merits of the case. He (Mr. Chesley) was perfectly aware that there were among the constituents of hon. members many who would be extremely glad to obtain information without expense to themselves; but he would not to gratify the selfishness of any one, consent to waste a large sum of money.

The yeas and nays were then taken upon the question, and stood as follows: yeas 35, nays 31.

The division upon this question will be found in our next number.

Mr. AYLIWY, Col. PRINCE, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. VIGER, a select committee appointed to enquire into the expediency of the Governor General with address, reported that his Excellency would consent to this answer by message.

Mr. HARRISON rose and stated that the answer to that address had been placed under his charge, and with permission of the House he would now read the same. But before doing so perhaps he would be allowed to make one observation. There would be no necessity on future occasions for messengers from the House to wait upon his Excellency in cases where information or papers were asked for. All that would be necessary would be that twenty-four hours notice be given of the intention of the House to apply for such information, or for the production of any particular document. Then when the address is passed the proper officer will be prepared in his place to the House to furnish the reply. This method he believed would greatly facilitate the business of the House. Mr. Harrison then read the answer to the address.

Mr. VIGER objected to this mode of proceeding. It was out of all form of parliamentary practice. They had no right to receive this as an answer to their address.

Attorney General OGDEN said, perhaps it might be new to the hon. gentleman, but nevertheless he considered it perfectly unobjectionable. It was not necessary that his Excellency should give the answer to the messengers. A gentleman holding a high office comes into the House and says: here is the answer of his Excellency. He (Mr. OGDEN) could see nothing irregular or improper in this method of communicating with the House. Here the channel of communication is direct between the Governor General and the House of Assembly, and all the House required to know was that the gentleman presenting the answer of his Excellency was an officer of the government.

Mr. VIGER.—Really if this mode of proceeding be adopted to-day, how are we to know what innovation may be attempted next. His Excellency informed the messengers of the House that he would communicate to the House his answer by message. Now let any hon. member bring in his communication which has been produced by the hon. gentleman opposite, who is a member of his Excellency's administration, and see whether it can be called a message such as this House is entitled to expect. A message to this House should be signed by his Excellency—this is not a message, it was treating that House with very little consideration.

Mr. STURSON said with all due deference to the hon. and learned member who had just spoken, he conceived that hon. Gentleman, was out of order in making the observations he had made. What could be the difference between the hon. gentleman—the secretary to his Excellency appeared at the bar of the house and there delivered the message of his Excellency, or whether he delivered it in his place in the house. The new practice arises from the new system which is now to be put in operation, and he (Mr. Sturson) was not inclined to quarrel with it.

Mr. VIGER said he did not object to the message being brought by the hon. gentleman who had brought it; he only wished that the message itself should be such as it ought to be.

Mr. CAMERON said if he understood the meaning of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Viger) he certainly thought he would be borne out by authorities. The message should have been addressed to the Legislative Assembly, and should have been signed by his Excellency the Governor General. He (Mr. Cameron) concurred with the hon. gentleman in thinking that the practice should correspond with that pursued in England with regard to messages communicated from the head of the Government to the House of Commons.

Mr. HARRISON said there seemed to be a slight misapprehension on the minds of hon. members with regard to the intention of the officers of the government in adopting this course. The communication which he (Mr. Harrison) had made to the house was the answer which the Governor General communicates through him (Mr. Harrison) to those gentlemen who were the bearers of the address.

Mr. VIGER said if it were possible to view it in that light, he certainly had no objection.

Mr. HARRISON moved that a select committee be appointed to enquire into the expediency of the existing laws &c. and in making the motion he observed that he had long been persuaded in his own mind that the industry law as at present in force, was productive of very serious injury to the true interests of the country. It was a question of very great importance, and he desired that the Subject should be fully discussed; and to this end he would move for the appointment of a committee who were favourable to the measure in order that a report might be made and the subject be brought under the consideration of the house.

Mr. JOHNSON said he would oppose this motion upon this principle, that the committee named by the hon. gentleman, consisted of the very last persons who ought to be appointed to enquire into the expediency of the existing laws &c. and he desired that the Subject should be fully discussed; and to this end he would move for the appointment of a committee who were favourable to the measure in order that a report might be made and the subject be brought under the consideration of the house.

Mr. HARRISON said he would oppose this motion upon this principle, that the committee named by the hon. gentleman, consisted of the very last persons who ought to be appointed to enquire into the expediency of the existing laws &c. and he desired that the Subject should be fully discussed; and to this end he would move for the appointment of a committee who were favourable to the measure in order that a report might be made and the subject be brought under the consideration of the house.

Mr. H