

placed before the House, where is the responsible Minister? He has told the House that he has never seen this report, and I can, therefore, well understand why he has withdrawn from the Chamber, for need there be suggested a greater acknowledgment of negligence on the part of the responsible Minister than for him to say that last year he expended \$30,000 to bring out delegates to this country to examine into our resources, and that not up to this day, the 11th May, did he take the trouble of looking between the two covers of their report? Was it because he was so much interested in looking after his election, or was it that other matters interfered with his doing what he was paid to do? Now, nearly a year has elapsed without his seeing what these men have reported as to the resources of Canada. On one occasion, he said he doubted whether such a report existed, and on another occasion he said that the High Commissioner had the report, and then he said that the report had been sent to him and he had sent it to the High Commissioner without reading it. We have the statement from the Minister of Justice that the report came to Canada, and, without being read, was sent to England, and that he had cabled to have it returned to Canada and it would be here in a few days. That is the position now. Nothing more unworthy of a Government professing to know what is right—I will not say to do what is right, because they have thrown off all that—could be shown than their action in this matter to-day. The interests of agriculture are dear to their hearts when it is suitable for them to so profess, but, when the time for action comes, where are they? My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated that this report contains serious charges against the fiscal policy of the Administration, and for that reason he suggests it is withheld from the public. If that is the case, we may understand how the Government has taken public money and made a fraudulent use of it for party purposes. The Minister of Militia seems to show some interest in this matter. I hope that, since his two colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Justice, have taken their flight from the Chamber, he will have enough military spirit to stand up and defend the action of the Government in this matter. I have no faith in the proposition of the Minister of Justice that this motion should be delayed. It appears as if the motion he has made was a dilatory motion intended to defeat the ends of justice, and I cannot assent to the doctrine that the ends of justice should be defeated at the instance of the Minister of Justice, who is bound to defend the interests of justice.

Mr. LISTER. We have heard frequently the argument of shouting used by gentlemen opposite, and especially by those on the back benches. They answer argument by yelling at the Speaker, and by conduct which would disgrace an ordinary county council. In a matter of this kind, involving the rights of the people of the country, when Ministers of the Crown vacate their seats and hon. gentlemen opposite are not found courageous enough to defend the refusal to adopt the motion of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), gentlemen opposite take refuge in a howl. The Government, in refusing to give information on a very important subject in the interests of the country, are utterly disregarding the acknowledged rights of the repre-

sentatives of the people. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, with a majority of sixty in this House, feel that they can defy the wishes of the minority, that they can rely on hon. gentlemen to support them when they are right, and more strongly when they are wrong. We heard that statement a moment ago. The conduct of the Government in this matter is most discreditable. I say they are disregarding the rights of the people's representatives in this Parliament, and I say, further, that the motion of the Minister of Justice is purposely designed to burke the information which this motion seeks to obtain. Let us look at the true position of this matter. We have it admitted that the Government, through its Agent or High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, in London, selecting his own friends as delegates, paid these men out of the Canadian treasury, in order that immigrants might be induced to come to Canada. These men—honest men, I have no doubt—surveyed the field, they travelled from one end of the country to the other, and they found that the fiscal policy of this Government was inimical to the interests of the immigrants who might be induced to come here, and they so reported to Sir Charles Tupper. That report was not the property of Sir Charles Tupper, or Sir John Thompson, or of the Minister of Agriculture, who dares not face the House to-day on this subject, but it was the property of the people of Canada, and the Government had no more right to suppress this report than to suppress any other public document. The Minister of Agriculture, when he was asked the other night, responded in that mild tone of his, with a smile that was child-like and bland like the heathen Chinee, that he had never read the report, and his secretary had not read it, but that they just bundled it up and sent it back to Sir Charles Tupper. Does that hon. gentleman think there is sufficient credulity in this House to accept that statement unquestioned? An important document is sent to him as a member of the Government for the purpose of having the approval or disapproval of the Government, and then is returned to Sir Charles Tupper for the purpose of having it printed, if necessary, in the old country, and the Minister of Agriculture is simple enough to assert that he never examined it, that his secretary never examined it, that his deputy never examined it, but he bundled it up in an envelope and addressed it back to Sir Charles Tupper, and that is the last we have ever heard of it. The truth of the matter is that these men governing this country, tried to influence these delegates: they tried to give them to understand that there must be no reference made to the policy of the dominant party in this country, that would be distasteful to the Government, it would be disloyal to speak about this great National Policy, or to say that it retarded or interfered with the progress of this country. Sir, it appears they did not know whom they were dealing with. They were dealing with men who were not going to suppress the truth, men who would tell the truth notwithstanding the cajolery of members of the Government; and they go back to England and write out a report, and the Government deliberately suppress that report, they deliberately keep it back from the people's representatives who have a right to have it placed on the Table of this House to scrutinize it, to investigate it, and if there