

ducing that result is so small in comparison with previous years as to satisfy the strictest economist in this House. I hold in my hand some information furnished to me by the courtesy of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, which I shall give to the House, because no words of mine could so expressively of the immense progress which has been made in this respect as the figures themselves. In 1882, as I have stated, over 113,000 immigrants were brought to settle in this country, and the cost of bringing them was a little over \$3 a head. In the year 1876, we find that 23,000 odd was the number brought in, and at a cost of \$19.60 a head. That is a result which, I should say, ought to command the entire approbation and admiration of this House. In the year 1881, when everything was looking well in this country, and we were making rapid advances in the march of nations, the number of immigrants was only 47,961, who were brought in at a *per capita* cost of \$6.32. Now, it must be pleasing—it must be, indeed, refreshing—to find that as the number of men coming into the country increases, the cost of bringing them here decreases in such a wonderful proportion as I have mentioned. Not only, however, have men been brought into the country, but capital has been brought here also. From an estimate made in Manitoba only a short time ago by a gentleman, most capable of judging, I find that over \$10,000,000 of hard cash was brought into the North-West by immigrants during the year 1882. These are large figures which might be regarded with some doubt, but that they come from the highest authority on the subject in the Province of Manitoba. Now, I think that the fact that we are in respect of immigration rapidly treading on the heels of our neighbors; that the difference in the proportion of men who are directed to this country from the proportion who are directed to the American Union is decreasing every year, shows not merely that this country is becoming better known abroad, but that the success which has attended the administration of its affairs is equally well known. In reference to another part of the Department of Agriculture, I am very glad to see a sign of the material progress of the people of this Dominion; I refer to the Patent Office—an office which has had the special supervision of the Minister presiding over it. This House will remember that in the year 1872 the present hon. Minister of Agriculture succeeded, after many a difficult fight, in bringing in a Bill which contained a clause enabling individuals of all nationalities to enjoy the privilege which had previously been denied to them, upon the condition that the articles they patented should be manufactured in this country. What has been the result of that change? The statistics are eloquent regarding it. They show that in the year previous to the passage of that Act, the number of patents issued was 509, and the amount received in the office \$14,000, while ten years after the introduction of the Act the number of patents issued had more than trebled, amounting to 1,732, and the amount received in the office was \$52,000; and to-day—aided no doubt by the successful working of the fiscal policy and the railway policy of this country—the success is such, under Providence, that the number of patents issued has increased to 2,137, and the receipts to \$60,000, a sum, I believe, amply sufficient not only to pay the expenses of that branch of the Government, but also to provide the interest on a sum large enough to complete an extension of apartments for the patents which are rapidly pouring in. I leave, therefore, that part of the subject with the feeling that a mere mention of these facts is sufficient to command the admiration of us all. The subject next alluded to in the Address is one that has always a peculiar interest to all people—that of the franchise. This is a question which, no doubt, will be fully discussed in the House, and will command the attention and interest of the country at large. For a long time it has seemed invidious to me that of all the Legislatures in this immense country,

Mr. TUPPER.

this Legislature alone occupied the anomalous position of not regulating the franchise by which the hon. members of this House were to be elected. It has seemed to me a curious feature in the history of a great country, occupying the position that Canada now occupies, that this House should suffer that loss of dignity, if I may use the expression, of having the qualifications for its membership regulated by other Parliaments. It has struck not me alone as curious and anomalous, for I notice that a leading paper of the Liberal Party in Nova Scotia, the *Morning Chronicle*, alluded, a short time ago, in the same spirit, to the necessity of legislation in regard to this important subject; and in concluding a very able article upon the question, said: "It will soon be necessary for the franchise to be made uniform by the Dominion Government." I am glad that the Government of the day have sprung to their work so quickly. I am glad that they are about to remove this curious state of affairs. As we are promised uniform legislation, and while, speaking for myself, I am not in favor of universal suffrage, I shall be glad, indeed, to see a measure brought down which will greatly extend the suffrage in the Province of Nova Scotia. I feel, as a Nova Scotian, that we can as well afford to have the suffrage extended as the larger and perhaps more prosperous Province of Ontario. I believe that while the franchise should be greatly extended, still the line must be drawn before we reach that stage arrived at in the neighboring Republic. There is a subject next touched upon in the Address, that is also one of very frequent discussion and equally one of great interest to the people of this country—a question daily growing in interest. I allude to the question of temperance. In one particular, I think there will be no discussion in this House regarding this important question. I am sure that every hon. member will agree with me in the opinion that the Parliaments of this country are bound to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. I think the day has come when no desire to discuss that point will arise. Feeling thus, I think that since the decision in the case of the *Queen vs. Russell*—a decision of the highest judicial tribune of this Empire—this House must undertake the responsibility of dealing with this important question in the way pointed out in the Speech. Not only has the Supreme Court of Canada decided that this House had jurisdiction in regulating that branch of trade, but in that decision of the Privy Council there is ample ground to show that the opinion of that high tribunal agrees with the remarks of its Chief Justice. I am, therefore, certain that the question will be approached by this House with a desire to regulate the liquor traffic in a manner conducive to the material interests of the people at large. In regard to factory labor, it is obvious that, as the country is progressing, as new industries spring up, we are being brought face to face with a large, and every day more important, class of laborers in these factories; and as the policy of the present Government is to protect the industries of the country, it must accomplish the task of affording necessary and ample protection to those engaged in building up our industries. The question of the Canadian Pacific Railway I approach with a great deal of pride and pleasure. I approach it with the pride and pleasure of a Canadian. In that pride and pleasure I recognize no party, because I feel that, as a Canadian I am bound; and I have a right to rejoice that the progress of this important work has been such as no man in this House or out of it anticipated, either last year or the year before. When a paper on the opposite side of politics to the party to which I have the honor to belong, had only the day before yesterday to meet this extraordinary advance in that work with the suggestion that it was going too fast, I have a right to feel not only a party