

OTTAWA LETTERS.

Joseph Perrault's Wine and Beer Bills Once Again.

Mr. Borden's West Huron Enquiry Cannot be Much Longer Blocked by the Government.

Rounding Out Confederation by a Union With Newfoundland—Premier Bond so Friendly to the Project.

OTTAWA, March 30.—It is believed that the work of the session will begin in earnest before very long and as the house has now been sitting nearly seven weeks, it would seem to be not too early to get down to business. There is a suggestion that the ministers have no intention of doing business at this stand, and are preparing for dissolution before Mr. Fielding produces his budget. This may be taken for what it is worth, but the emissaries of ministers are giving the senators to understand that it may happen. The idea seems to be that a fear of sudden dissolution may prevent the senators from destroying the gerrymandering bill. Before this threat will be known.

All the afternoon yesterday was expended in answering questions and in refusing to answer them. The number of questions was less than 99 interrogatories, covering 23 printed footscap pages. Many of these are retaliatory questions, put on the paper by way of moral lesson to Mr. Mulock and his friends, who have been making a campaign document out of a decidedly business character. The theory is that the questions are asked for the information of members and of the country. The practice this session is to ask questions for the sake of placing on the record some government action which the ministers or their supporters desire to furnish in the most suitable form to make votes. Mr. Foster suggested some days ago that two parties could participate in this match, and there is no doubt now that this is so. Mr. Mulock's three bills, from which extracts from his own reports are matched by such questions as that proposed yesterday by Mr. Mills of Annapolis.

Mr. Mills wanted to know if Joseph Perrault is a commissioner to the Paris exhibition, and if he is the same Joseph who was chief commissioner to the Philadelphia exhibition, and if a statement which he submits is a correct statement of Mr. Perrault's expenses in Philadelphia. The matter is perhaps a live issue if Mr. Perrault and his associates are likely to cut wide a swath in Paris as they did in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia statement contains an account running from April to December, from which the following sample extracts may be taken:

- John Gilmour & Co.—
- June 22—1.2 doz. claret.
- " 22—1 case sparkling wine.
- " 22—2 doz. Bass' ale.
- " 22—1 bottle amber sherry.
- " 22—1 gal. D. G. sherry.
- " 22—1 doz. claret.
- " 22—1 doz. ale.
- July 13—3 cases Madoc claret.
- " 13—2 doz. Hennessy brandy.
- " 13—2 cases sparkling wine.
- " 13—1 case sparkling wine, in pints.
- Aug. 31—1 gal. pale sherry.
- " 31—1 case Madoc claret.
- " 31—4 doz. English ale.
- Sept. 16—1 case sparkling wine.
- " 16—4 doz. ale.
- Nov. 27—1 case champagne.
- " 27—1 case Chateau claret.
- " 27—1 gal. pale sherry.
- " 27—1.2 doz. port wine.
- " 27—1.2 doz. sauterne.
- " 27—1 doz. pale sherry.
- " 27—1 gal. pale sherry.
- " 27—3 gals. pale sherry.
- " 27—3 bottles Hennessy's brandy.
- " 27—1 gal. pale sherry.
- " 27—1 case Pleasant Valley wine.
- " 27—2 doz. Bass' ale.
- " 27—1 gal. pale sherry.
- " 27—2 gals. pale sherry.
- " 27—4 doz. Bass' ale.
- " 27—1 case Pleasant Valley wine.
- " 27—1 bottle Hennessy's brandy.

The statement of expenses covers five or six weeks and amounts to some \$40,000. Sir Wilfrid Laurier desired the items to stand.

Another page of motion papers is occupied with a question asking when a report will be made of the proceedings of the international commission, which has been making a treaty between Canada and the United States. Incidentally, Mr. Taylor wants to know whether any more money has been paid than is mentioned in the auditor general's report covering expenditure of \$34,600. The premier does not feel at liberty to say when the report will come. As to the expenses, they are \$170 more than appears in the auditor general's account.

In accordance with the modus vivendi established the other day, the commons took a run through the notices of session and passed a number of orders for papers. The decision was that Mr. Borden should not press his motion for the re-opening of the West Huron and Brockville cases until his turn should come. As there are a dozen debatable motions ahead, he asked that it be struck off the paper. He is now free to bring up the question in some form where it cannot be headed off by questions of precedence and rules of order. Even Mr. McMillan would not be able to stop a motion made in amendment to a government motion for supply, and though Mr. Britton may talk and talk in his grandmotherly way, he cannot head off the vote.

Mr. Martin of Prince Edward Island has strong opinions in regard to rounding out confederation by a government union with the other neighboring island of Newfoundland. Not only does he see great sentimental and national advantages from the completion of

confederation in this form, but he considers that Newfoundland would find a market in Canada and Canada a market in Newfoundland, most of which we are now easily wanting. Mr. Martin does not understand why the government does not have more to offer to the fishermen of Canada, and incidentally suggests that the home market for fish products is not protected as well as the home market for foreign products. Mr. Kaubach joined in the expression of regret that our trade with our nearest neighbor is growing less instead of greater, although Newfoundland is enjoying a period of development and Canada is increasing her trade with the United States and foreign countries. Mr. Kaubach does not believe that the French shore difficulty should stand in the way of negotiations, and he agrees with Mr. Stroule and Mr. Martin that Canada should be ready to offer Newfoundland the best of the bargain in negotiations.

There was some ground for Sir Charles Tupper's protest against the discussion of government seats during the session. Sir Charles considered that the question was of greater importance than the gerrymandering of constituencies or the interception of supply by government amendments in favor of government policy. Yet during the discussion Sir Louis Davies and Sir Hector Lacombe were the representatives of the government in the house. Mr. Fisher having made a flying appearance and disappearance. Sir Louis Davies did not think that the opposition attendance was large enough to justify Sir Charles' criticism, though he must have observed that there were not as many empty benches behind Sir Charles as there were on the government side. Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Louis Davies appear to be agreed regarding Premier Bond of Newfoundland as unlikely to take up the question of union with Canada. They seem to think better of the late premier, and it is made a reproach to the Laurier government that no effort was made to interest Sir James Winter and his colleagues in the question.

S. D. S. CTTAWA, March 21.—We have reached the end of the latest little obstacle which the government has interposed to the despatch of its own business. We have also reached the end of seven weeks in parliament and positively nothing has so far been accomplished except the ordinary routine of answering questions and passing estimates bills through their proper stages. Twice the motion of the finance minister to go into supply has been headed off by amendments on his own side of the house. The Bourassa amendment was probably put up by agreement, and the Russell motion was admitted as a part of the government programme. It is probably the first time in parliament in which the finance minister has asked a supporter to amend his own motion to go into supply. On this occasion the house was asked not to agree to the minister's request to go into supply, but to spend a week or so deciding that the finance minister's policy was satisfactory. Mr. Fielding himself declared that the opposition had never opposed the preferential programme until they were forced to do so by Russell's motion, which, as he expressed it, "brought them up to the ring bell." We may therefore assume that the government is more anxious to bring the opposition to the ring bell than it is to get ahead with business.

Opposition members have no objection to a statement of their policy. The conservative policy is the same as was presented three years ago, or five years ago. It is protectionist now as it was then. It is in favor of preferential trade now, as it always has been. But the party does not choose to allow Mr. Fielding or any member acting in his interest, to define its policy. It is able to do that better itself. Mr. Foster's notice of motion makes a distinct statement of the creed of the liberal conservatives on the trade issue. The announcement of that resolution by Mr. Foster sufficiently meets the sharp trick of the government, which sought to force the opposition to vote against the alleged imperial preference without having an opportunity to state their own views by way of amendment. Mr. Foster's motion serves all the purposes of an amendment.

It is deemed advisable to limit the statement to trade matters, but at the proper time there is no doubt that the liberal conservatives will find opportunity to set forth their views on matters outside of trade and commerce. More than once leaders of the party have affirmed their view that the discriminating tax by which British goods shall have a real preference instead of a sham one over foreign products shall be used to produce a fund for the benefit of the unemployed. The fact, however, is that nobody cares how Mr. Bourassa votes. He will keep himself square with his own party in any case. We shall see how really he will go back to the government when the motion is made of which Mr. Foster gave notice.

Mr. Bourassa is still carrying out the original design of the party by casting his vote where it is expected to do the premier the most good. His vote with the opposition last night was not cordially welcomed, and it will probably be used to show that he is more in touch on this issue with the opposition than he is with the government. The fact, however, is that nobody cares how Mr. Bourassa votes. He will keep himself square with his own party in any case. We shall see how really he will go back to the government when the motion is made of which Mr. Foster gave notice.

Mr. Borden's speech last night was not long, but it was forcible and cogent. He does not take any too seriously his colleagues' lecture as to the duty of Borden himself and of the conservative party in the present emergency. Dr. Russell took occasion to rebuke Mr. Borden because in another session he had argued that the Belgian and German treaties were applicable to Canada and were in conflict with the Fielding tariff as originally introduced. Mr. Borden did not find it necessary to apologize for having expressed a legal opinion which was afterwards shown by the Imperial law authorities, and to which the government was ultimately obliged to yield. It does not strike him as a particularly disloyal act to state a

constitutional fact bearing upon proposed legislation. If it were the Imperial advisers of the crown were equally open to rebuke. Apparently Mr. Borden would rather be the lawyer who expressed a correct opinion of the law of the case than the other one from Halifax, who now says that he knew the government was acting contrary to the law but did not say so; or Sir Louis Davies, who shouted out the opinion with confidence that the treaties were not binding on Canada, and found afterward that his law was not worth a cent. Neither is Mr. Borden troubled over the Russell lecture, which was still more severe on Lord John Russell, who, in the opinion of the senator member for Halifax, was not altogether contemptible.

Mr. Foster's speech was short and rather caustic. A part of it was devoted to the extraordinary claim made by Mr. Russell, Mr. Maxwell, and Mr. Foster charged, by Mr. Patterson, that the government had kept all the seats open for rebuke. Mr. Patterson protested that he had not made such a statement. As to the others, Mr. Foster reminded them of several very distinct pledges made by the premier himself, and very distinctly violated.

Mr. Fielding made the usual appeal, intimating that this government had done about the only loyal thing since confederation, and that to do anything to the contrary is a disloyal act. He has information from the Queen and intimations of some kind from all the Royal family and all the newspapers in Great Britain showing that the Emperor and his colleagues are themselves and his colleagues for this so-called preference, which does not prefer. It is rather odd that with the solemn and unanimous testimony of the empire and the universe to his great act of statesmanship which he has done, he should stop business for a week in order to add thereto the testimony of Mr. Russell.

Now that the government has got this certificate from its supporters, one looks back with surprise at the original Fielding tariff and the original Fielding-Davies argument. They brought the tariff in not as an Imperial preference but as a general reciprocity measure. Over and over again Mr. Fielding argued that his tariff was not intended to favor Britain more than any other country, which had a tariff lower than Canada. Over and over again Sir Louis Davies declared that foreign countries were treated the same as England by this tariff. Sir Louis Davies went to London to convince the Imperial government that Canada was not giving preference over other favored nations. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has somewhere on his premises on Sandy Hill a Cobden medal, which was given him because he had refused to allow a preference to Great Britain, which was not intended to commemorate a preference to England, but celebrated the declaration of Canadian fiscal independence and her supposed advent into the arena of commercial negotiations and arrangements with foreign nations. The central point in Ruydard Kipling's poem is found in two expressions. In one the commercial independence of this country is set forth: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in mine own."

The other night Mr. Maxwell repeated with great fervor Ruydard Kipling's "Lady of the Snows," omitting one verse. Mr. Maxwell does not enter into the spirit of that poem, which was not intended to commemorate a preference to England, but celebrated the declaration of Canadian fiscal independence and her supposed advent into the arena of commercial negotiations and arrangements with foreign nations. The central point in Ruydard Kipling's poem is found in two expressions. In one the commercial independence of this country is set forth: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in mine own." The other night Mr. Maxwell repeated with great fervor Ruydard Kipling's "Lady of the Snows," omitting one verse. Mr. Maxwell does not enter into the spirit of that poem, which was not intended to commemorate a preference to England, but celebrated the declaration of Canadian fiscal independence and her supposed advent into the arena of commercial negotiations and arrangements with foreign nations. The central point in Ruydard Kipling's poem is found in two expressions. In one the commercial independence of this country is set forth: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in mine own." Mr. Fielding has an entirely different view of the matter. He now favors the British Empire, though the Empire treats Canada the same as other countries. The other countries that favor Canada now get no favor from Canada. Therefore the poem has its point in the fact that it is not a matter of importance. As a matter of fact it has been shown a hundred times that the original idea of the Fielding tariff has been lost, because it was found inconsistent with the tariff arrangements and could not be carried out. The force of circumstances has changed the original scheme to what it is now, and has made an imperialist out of a commercial unionist. Mr. Fielding has been equally ready to be either.

It was understood that Mr. Fielding was to close the debate, which he did in a half hour's speech. But it did not stay closed, for Mr. McMillan, the tall Scotchman from Huron, cannot be headed off by any arrangement, when he gets fairly under way there is no tide flowing from his Caledonian mountains that rushes more fiercely and froths more than he. So he put in nearly an hour, not discussing Russell's motion nor the British preference, but praising the government for taking the duty off corn, commanding Mr. Fisher and the Ontario government for instructing the farmers, declaiming on cold storage and explaining West Huron corruption. Mr. McMillan buys stock steers and fattens them in his stables. Free corn seems to be a benefit to him. What the farmer who raises other grain may think of it is another question. There are those in Ontario who think that the United States ought to have given free barley for free corn. But Mr. McMillan does not sell barley and the buys corn. Moreover, he goes out at certain times of the year at a certain rate per day, paid by the Ontario government, and instructs farmers. On the whole, he is a contented and prosperous man, making money off his farm, as he has a right to do, seeing that he is one of the best in his line of agriculture in Western Ontario. He has a perfect right to commend the government for giving a preference to the United States by putting the products of that country on the free list. It is not quite so clear why he should commend this real preference at the particular moment when

he is asked to praise a sham preference made to Great Britain.

The little matter of the minister of militia and the officers appointed to take a staff course is not yet settled. It will be remembered that Mr. Foster asked why certain officers, including Col. White of Guelph and Col. Vance of Woodstock, who had been appointed to take this course, were afterwards struck off the list. Dr. Borden explained that they had been appointed without his instruction and were struck off because they were on the retired list and overage. It turns out that their appointments open to the same objection were not cancelled. Further light on the subject was given by the following letter:

"Department of Militia and Defence, Ottawa, Feb. 1st, 1900. Sir—In reply to your letter of the 20th ult., I am directed by the major general commanding to inform you that your name was removed from the list of officers to undergo the staff course at the Royal Military College, Kingston, by the hon. minister, on the ground that you have of late taken some active part in politics on behalf of the opposition. I have the honor to be, Your obedient servant, H. FOSTER, Colonel, Chief Staff Officer, Lt. Col. White, Guelph, Ont.

Here we have two distinct statements, one sent to Col. White by the chief staff officer, stating that the removal was on political grounds, the other made in the house by the minister of militia, that the removal was on military grounds.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell yesterday brought up the matter in the senate, to him the secretary of state representative of the action of the minister, with the addition that the statement made by Col. Foster was not true and that the reason given by him was not the one given by the minister to the general. Sir Mackenzie Bowell pointed out that there was a deliberate official falsehood somewhere and he wanted to know what the government proposed to do with Col. Foster. It seemed to him that the case demanded a thorough investigation. Col. White has been asked by the government to conduct an investigation into the matter. Col. White has been asked by the government to conduct an investigation into the matter. Col. White has been asked by the government to conduct an investigation into the matter.

The minister of justice, coming to the rescue, said that Col. Foster was the author of uttering a falsehood. He repeated instructions as he received them from the general. In short, Mr. Mills' contention is that General Hutton had lied. The facts, according to Mr. Mills, are that General Hutton put Col. White's name on the list without instructions from the minister, that the minister ordered the name to be taken off because of Col. White's age and infirmities, and that instead of causing this reason to be given to Col. White, General Hutton placed in the mouth of the minister a reason which the minister never gave.

Senator Ferguson pointed out that no voice accusation against a British officer could be made in the house, unless he had invented a statement, placed it in the minister's mouth and caused it to be sent to another officer. This was a charge of deliberate and malicious falsehood, made against General Hutton in his absence. Ruydard Kipling's poem is found in two expressions. In one the commercial independence of this country is set forth: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in mine own."

After some further discussion, the secretary of state gave another suggestion of the kind of relations that have existed between General Hutton and the government. He stated that in his discussions with General Hutton he has often reminded the general that he had been recalled from Australia on account of politics. We may judge from this that General Hutton's attempt to carry on the affairs of the militia outside of politics has been attended with great difficulties. It must have been pleasant to him to be told by the minister every day or two that he must believe himself, as he had been driven out of Australia, especially as the Australian story is said to be creditable to Hutton. S. D. S.

OTTAWA, March 22.—The gerrymandering bill will probably have met its fate or passed its second reading before this letter is printed. So far as one can see from the discussion yesterday, there is no change in the attitude of senators who supported, or of those who opposed the measure last year. The minister of justice gives no arguments different from those he advanced last session and his case is not as strong now as it was then. One of his own supporters in the other house has condemned the measure as unjust and unfair in one particular, and pushed his attack so far as to have the clauses struck out which apply to his province. The rest of the bill is no better. Mr. Mills has obtained the authority of certain English lawyers for the statement that it is competent for parliament to pass the bill, even though it is not introduced after the decennial census. The opinion does not appear to be a reasoned opinion or a justified one. It is merely a statement that the law has called in their case. Mr. Ganong having learned from the premier that the Charlotte county lists were ready and passing through the printers' hands, waited a reasonable time and then sent for his colleagues. He was informed that the lists had been sent to him several months ago, and on further enquiry ascertained that the official was talking about the lists of 1898. Other amusing experiences were given and the power franchise act was kicked and quaffed about in a most unceremonious manner. Mr. Charlton came to his relief by attacking the late franchise law. Mr. McMullen, who has arrived at the point now of justifying everything which he considers no worse than the worst acts of the late government joined in the counter-attack.

Mr. Mills seems to think that the senate has no such right, even though presently the happy thought struck

it may have the power. He claims that it is a matter to be dealt with by the house of commons by the authority of the people whom the house is supposed to represent. This view is a new one to some of the senators, including the present secretary of state and Senator Fowler of Halifax. These two gentlemen, with all their liberal colleagues in the senate in 1892 and in 1893, took the ground that the senate had full authority to reject a redistribution bill which had passed the commons. They had not the means to do so, but the bill was ultimately passed because it was introduced at a time which is required by the British North America Act. Their objection was not to the right of parliament to pass a bill, but to the character of the bill itself. On both occasions they did what the majority of the senate did last year and may do this year. They voted for the six months' hold. If it was competent for Senator Scott to move the hold, in other years, it is competent for Sir Mackenzie Bowell to do it now. If it was right for a number of senators to vote against the commons representation bill in 1892, or 1893, it is right for senators to do the same in 1900. No one will pretend that the question of the right of the senate to move an amendment or to vote in a certain way is made less by the fact that he is one of a majority rather than of a minority. Senator Scott and his friends allowed the bill of 1892 to pass, not because they had not enough power to vote against it, but because they had not enough votes to throw it out. So far as their voting power went, they used it. Sir Mackenzie Bowell and those who agree with him have exactly the same right to act so far as their voting power goes. It is not to their voting power, but to the rights and powers vary according to the number of men who may stand up with him to be counted.

In the commons yesterday Mr. Blair took up the transportation problem and talked for three hours. The question is one which is supposed to interest all Canada and particularly the Ontario members representing the district interested in the various hand and water routes. The minister has had the same power to interest Mr. Blair did not draw a large house. He spoke with some fervor at times, but he was addressing benches in front of him which contained from six to ten members and benches behind him which for two hours together had less than a dozen occupants. The speaker called his substitute and went away, all the ministers but two disappeared, and the private members slipped off until Mr. Blair addressed a large array of unappreciative wood and apathetic leather.

There is nothing very definite in the minister's programme except that he intends to push the existing canal route to a completion, to arrange a two million dollar harbor at Port Colborne on the western end of Welland canal and to make Montreal a well equipped port. As to the Georgian Bay programme and all the other rival enterprises, he has a general counsel of delay with a judicious mixture of optimistic encouragement. For his predecessors Mr. Blair is not disposed to speak in too high terms. He claims that they were dilatory, did not spend money fast enough, or push on the work with sufficient energy. The Commons syndicate, which through this good will of Mr. Turle and other promoters has obtained large concessions in Montreal, is highly commended by the minister, as was naturally expected. On this matter and in several others Mr. Blair takes issue with the excellent liberal organ, the Montreal Witness, which has had a hard struggle in dealing independently with the Blair and Turle transportation schemes.

The house of commons had two other matters of some importance before it in yesterday's sitting. The unfortunate franchise bill which was adopted two years ago has kept the government in hot water ever since. The minister of justice is to revise the lists and send copies to Ottawa as slow in their performance, and as they are not federal officers the government has no way of dealing with them. Then the bill itself is full of anomalies, inconsistencies and uncertainties. The minister of justice is supposed to have some vague glimmering of understanding as to what was meant. But he only visits parliament about once in ten days, and therefore is not on hand to explain the mysteries of inquiry. There are hardly a number of the house who has not a franchise bill amendment among his papers. They are keeping them back this year because the government is supposed to have a general franchise amendment bill somewhere to be brought up when the solicitor general has time to come to parliament. At present his private law practice seems to be taking his whole attention.

Meanwhile Mr. Carroll, a government supporter, had a little bill which he brought in yesterday, thus opening the door to the general discussion. It comes out that lists which should have been here three months ago have not arrived yet, and that hardly any are printed, whereas they ought to have been printed at the beginning of the year. The law requires that each member and each defeated candidate shall receive a certain number of copies. The defeated candidates are not here to tell their experience, but the members are strongly in evidence with the announcement that the law has called in their case. Mr. Ganong having learned from the premier that the Charlotte county lists were ready and passing through the printers' hands, waited a reasonable time and then sent for his colleagues. He was informed that the lists had been sent to him several months ago, and on further enquiry ascertained that the official was talking about the lists of 1898. Other amusing experiences were given and the power franchise act was kicked and quaffed about in a most unceremonious manner. Mr. Charlton came to his relief by attacking the late franchise law. Mr. McMullen, who has arrived at the point now of justifying everything which he considers no worse than the worst acts of the late government joined in the counter-attack.

Mr. Mills seems to think that the senate has no such right, even though presently the happy thought struck



Snowy whiteness of sheets, shirts and shirtings come from the use of Surprise Soap on the wash—never yellow or streaked, always clean and white. Surprise Soap has peculiar qualities for Laundry purposes—good for all uses. SURPRISE is the name of the Soap.

Mr. Campbell, the flour miller from Kent, who has retained his tariff protection. He suggested that the members ought to get their lists from the local authorities and not insist upon the useless expenditure of public money by having them printed at Ottawa. Mr. Wallace pointed out to him that a revised list suitable for his purpose could be obtained at the clerk's office at a cost of about \$750, and then it would not be printed. It was suggested to Mr. Campbell that he ought to have put in his protest against the printing of lists at the bureau some time ago. That was one of the provisions of the government bill, and is the law of the land, so that Mr. Campbell though he did not know it was among the members who were kicking and cuffing the unfortunate franchise law. The fact seems to be that the law is not to be unsatisfactory, as it provides no machinery within the control of the house. It does not save one cent of expense, for the printing of lists at Ottawa is still found necessary and the local officers will not work for the dominion parliament unless they are paid for it.

The other discussion of yesterday arose on a question of order. When Mr. Foster told the members that if the privilege of putting questions for campaign purposes was abused on one side it would be abused on the other, he was a good prophet. Mr. Mills' long question about exhibition commissioner Perrault's bill for wine, liquors, and dinner and cook, and waiter, and more dinner, and more wine, and more brandy, and more cigars, and for "Annie," is quite relevant to the appointment of the same Joseph Perrault to the Paris exhibition. If a parliament has arisen that is not to be remembered, together with his Madoc and his Hennessy, his Chateau and his Pleasant Valley and his other untimely vintages.

The government side hit upon an expedient for the suppression of Mr. Mills' curiosity. They ordered him to read his question. He could have done it in an hour and had no particular objections, but the members of the house were disposed to get along with business. For three years no member has been asked to read questions. They stand on the order paper with a number over them and the member rises, saying: "Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask question No. 23 standing in the list." The question of order was never treated differently from other members. Sir Charles Tupper took the ground that an unbroken usage of several years had the force of a rule of the house. Sir Wilfrid did not take that view of the case. The speaker who means to do right, but is nevertheless apt to be wrong, because he usually does as the ministers suggest, took the same view, though he did not produce any rule to support it.

The discussion was long and brought out among other speeches a vigorous one from Mr. Davin, who expressed his opinion of a government which had one rule of order for its friends and another for its opponents; which promoted the efforts of Mr. Mulock to fill ten pages of Hansard with an alleged question chopped out of a blue book and discouraged the laudable curiosity of Mr. Mills, whose question was not so long. The government was informed that if Mr. Mills read his question everybody else would have to do the same. Mr. Davin assured Sir Wilfrid that he would never lead the house in an orderly manner if he had not the respect of the opposition, and this he could not have if he made different rules for different sides of the house. An interruption from Mr. Blair told Mr. Davin to get out of order by saying that the minister of railways "had the air of a bully." He hardly waited for the speaker to intervene, but hastened to withdraw, remarking that "the minister of railways can put on the manners of a gentleman." Then after a pause in which a doubtful and disturbed expression stole over his face he added thoughtfully, "though I have never seen it myself."

Finally Mr. Mills began to read, and was doing it with considerable union and enjoyment, having just got launched fairly in the direction of the wine list, when the premier repeated. Perhaps the premier's repentance was due to the fact that the members were constrained to keep order during the reading. When Mr. Mills commenced Sir Louis Davies entered into conversation with another member who was standing. Mr. Foster expressed his opinion that the speaker should hardly hear a word that was read two or three times, and that the lists had been sent to him several months ago, and on further enquiry ascertained that the official was talking about the lists of 1898. Other amusing experiences were given and the power franchise act was kicked and quaffed about in a most unceremonious manner. Mr. Charlton came to his relief by attacking the late franchise law. Mr. McMullen, who has arrived at the point now of justifying everything which he considers no worse than the worst acts of the late government joined in the counter-attack.

TWO-P
Astonish
Night

Alfred Hain
Sums

As Dr. Pug
Ottawa, th

FREDER
bridge char
summed this

The cross
was contin
Dr. Pugsley
somewhat i
than a pin
sibly from
pound more
ceded to a
the contents
statement
compelled t
bidders me
were tender
from 4 to 5
figures cov
erection an
ready for t
The price
lar part
cents per p
planation is
eracted by
better work
by hand,
as a labor
of the fact
He had n
engineer r
coming to
not commu
during the
only with
The 75 pe
in which h
labor in t
given him
calculate h
company. I
made in h
expenses, a
and he u
cent. Me
Items. He
money and
was the co
not his bus
MR. ROY

Dr. Pugs
of Mr. Roy
what he w
Brunswick
Mr. Roy
Brunswick
the sinceri
the Hamilt
ity to tend
which are
quickly fin
make contin
had mean
satisfy ever
and specif
too.
RE-EXAM
Mr. Roy
Stockton.
statement
completed b
tion. Non
in the stat
so long s
Campbell
per pound
bridge the
Lefebvre,
during him
upon the
would not
this the w
would not
lbs. at the
erection
was very
pleined w
steel since
As far as
prices of s
1891 and
Prices were
during the
Bridge N
which Dr.
tion to as
was contra
1899, and
pleated by
pleted, be
was rushed
the compar
strove of t
put in a te
were aware
was 80 f
pounds; t
Upon a ru
pany havin
tably be a
was very
pleined wh
was higher
No. 926 v
112 feet s
94 lbs., a
structure.
550, a rate
bridge wa
Northwest
freighted
freight cla
\$22.05.

No. 568 v
weight; co
another ru
No. 971 v
372 pounds
of \$4.83 per
No. 572 v
12,500 cent
3-10 cents
No. 1063,
high in pri
\$2,520 pound
rate of 59
was a rust
to go on. He
stop when S
laughingl
that the ca
was dispes
It goes in
S. D. S.

Mr. Roy
what he w
Brunswick
Mr. Roy
Brunswick
the sinceri
the Hamilt
ity to tend
which are
quickly fin
make contin
had mean
satisfy ever
and specif
too.
RE-EXAM
Mr. Roy
Stockton.
statement
completed b
tion. Non
in the stat
so long s
Campbell
per pound
bridge the
Lefebvre,
during him
upon the
would not
this the w
would not
lbs. at the
erection
was very
pleined w
steel since
As far as
prices of s
1891 and
Prices were
during the
Bridge N
which Dr.
tion to as
was contra
1899, and
pleated by
pleted, be
was rushed
the compar
strove of t
put in a te
were aware
was 80 f
pounds; t
Upon a ru
pany havin
tably be a
was very
pleined wh
was higher
No. 926 v
112 feet s
94 lbs., a
structure.
550, a rate
bridge wa
Northwest
freighted
freight cla
\$22.05.

No. 568 v
weight; co
another ru
No. 971 v
372 pounds
of \$4.83 per
No. 572 v
12,500 cent
3-10 cents
No. 1063,
high in pri
\$2,520 pound
rate of 59
was a rust
to go on. He
stop when S
laughingl
that the ca
was dispes
It goes in
S. D. S.