

OTTAWA LETTERS.

Flint's Extraordinary Speech on the Fairlie Episode.

And Gets the Ministers into a Very Warm Corner.

Gross Attack on a Clergyman Who Would Not Let Tarte's Party Take Liquor on the Indian School Premises.

Ottawa, May 14.—The plebiscite bill should be brought down within a few weeks, and have Mr. Laurier's statement that the government does not yet know anything about the character of the proposition that shall be made. It is not decided whether the dominion lists will be used, whether a majority of the provinces will be required, whether the condition of direct taxation will be included in the vote, or whether compensation will be allowed to the liquor dealers.

Yesterday a large delegation in the interests of the liquor trade appeared before Mr. Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright in the lower room of the house of commons. They claimed to represent the interests of the trade of all the provinces and had for their spokesman James Haverson of Toronto. Mr. Haverson submitted certain propositions, which are given below, together with Mr. Laurier's remarks upon them. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Haverson made only one speech apiece, but for convenience their remarks on each topic are placed together.

Mr. Haverson remarked that the plebiscite vote should be taken on the dominion list. It was a dominion measure, and neither the provincial nor the municipal lists were proper ones to be used for federal purposes. He however pointed out that in a popular vote like this one must be allowed to vote twice, and therefore asked that where a man had votes in two districts he should on this occasion exercise his right once. Mr. Laurier in reference to this proposition agreed pretty well with Mr. Haverson. He was not prepared to say that the present moment what course would be taken, as the subject had not been considered, but favored the idea that the votes should be taken on the present lists. He could not see, however, any way to abolish the double vote.

The next proposition was that the absolute majority of all the electors be required and not the majority of the vote polled. Mr. Haverson dwelt at some length on the result of Scott act votes where the poll had been very small and the affirmative vote constituted relatively a small proportion of the total electorate. The outcome of it has been that in Ontario the act was not enforced, and has been repealed in every county and municipality where it was adopted. He objected to the plebiscite vote being taken on the present lists. Mr. Laurier seemed to be rather at sea. He did not quite endorse the proposition of Mr. Haverson as a general statement, because all politics in this country went on the principle that only the votes polled should be regarded. On the other hand he conceded that a vote to be conclusive should give expression unmistakably to the popular will. How this was to be accomplished he was "not at the present moment prepared to say."

Mr. Haverson's next question was that in submitting the question to the people the government should ask two questions: The first one is "Are you in favor of direct taxation in order to make up the deficit which will be caused by prohibition?" Mr. Haverson argued that it was only fair the people should know what their vote meant before they cast it. It would be an unfortunate thing if the people should accept prohibition without considering these consequences and should afterwards become annoyed and dissatisfied with their conduct because of new burdens thrust upon them. The government knew exactly what revenue it derived from the sale of liquor and knew what the loss would be. As statesmen they were now able to say whether the revenue could be made up without direct taxation. If they knew that direct taxation was the inevitable consequence it was only fair that they should give this information to the people. Even if the question were not placed on the voter's paper the government should make a declaration on the subject. Mr. Laurier did not dissent from the spirit of this proposition. He stated that beyond question the adoption of prohibition was the adoption of direct taxation. There was no other way to obtain the \$2,000,000 that would be lost to the revenue. This government was rather disposed to reduce than increase the taxes on imports, and there was no other way to get money than by direct taxes. The premier was quite sure that the prohibitionists were ready to accept that condition and would not object to the payment of the taxes in full. He regarded it as perfectly fair that this result should be placed before the people so that they would vote on a full understanding of the matter. But he was "not prepared at the present moment" to say that the direct taxation conditions should be printed on the ballots.

The other question that Mr. Haverson wanted to have submitted to the people was whether a compensation should be granted to those who were affected by prohibition. He pointed out that Switzerland had given prohibition with compensation, that Sweden in adopting the Gothenburg scheme had given compensation to the trade, that Great Britain had adopted a like principle in abolishing slavery. The only case which he could recall when compensation

was refused on the destruction by bill of great vested interests was the abolition of slavery in the United States, but that was a war measure, and compensation would undoubtedly have been given if the thing had been done in the time of peace. Mr. Laurier was "not prepared to say at the present time" whether compensation ought to be given. He recognized the importance of the question. He recognized also the freedom of the people to do as they liked in such matters. The proposition had not been considered, but the government would weigh the argument.

Mr. Haverson next urged that a prohibitory law should not be forced upon one province, which should declare itself opposed to it, by the votes of other provinces. He pointed out the difficulties that would be met in enforcing the law, say in Quebec, if the great body of the people there had not asked for a change. Mr. Laurier dwelt upon this question at some length. He said that he was quite sure the people in his province were quite satisfied with the present system. They had a local option law which suited them very well. In his own county there were never more than two parishes where liquor was allowed to be sold. In the neighboring county of Lotbiniere it was the same way, and the same might be said of Montcalm. This condition had existed for forty years, and was quite satisfactory. On the other hand it must be remembered that this was a dominion law, and must be made applicable to the whole country. Recognizing the force of both contentions he was "not at the present moment prepared to say" how the government would meet the difficulties.

In conclusion Mr. Laurier said that the question was full of difficulty and embarrassment, but it was the business of the government to overcome these difficulties, and they would deal with them as best they could. He thought he could undertake to satisfy all reasonable men of both parties by the scheme that he had adopted. Sir Richard Cartwright, who spoke briefly, assured the gathering that Mr. Laurier would carry out the promises that he had made during the morning. Nobody present seemed to have any doubt on that subject.

It will be seen that Mr. Laurier is not yet prepared to say at the present time anything of importance. The address yesterday was even for him unusually deficient in information.

Yesterday afternoon there was a good deal of "scrapping" in the house. The minister of agriculture was working his way through his quarantine vote when the ruder element about him began the usual tactics to choke off criticism. It followed that when the speaker left the chair a good deal of criticism had been offered, and Mr. Fisher had no money voted. In the evening the proceedings went along quite smoothly, and Mr. Fisher and Mr. Davies got pretty well through with their appropriation. Evidently the Lists and Somervilles had been seen by the ministers, for there was a great clamor among them. The battle flags were furled and money was poured into the treasury while white winged peace hovered beneath the chandeliers.

Before the orders of the day were called Mr. Patterson was requested to explain the effect of the change of tariff in mining machinery. Mining machinery is supposed to be free. Mr. Patterson and Mr. Fielding have called upon the public to admit them for the change made. Formerly only such machinery as is not made in Canada was on the free list. The controller said this was a difficult clause to operate, and so all machinery was made free, but he finds the clause equally difficult to operate now. Mining machinery includes many articles which are useful for other purposes than mining and the department is embarrassed with claims. Mr. Fielding now explains that he probably will have to amend the clause by specifying the articles. Mr. Prior of British Columbia brought the question up, and Mr. Foster improved the opportunity by criticizing the "business men's government" for their unbusiness like proceedings. They might have considered this question before they brought the tariff down.

This led to other things. It has been three weeks since the tariff bill was read and the measure is not yet ready for committee. Mr. Fielding explains that the business men affected have been to see the department and he is trying to find out what he can do for them. He gave them some to understand that there would be a good many amendments to the tariff proposals when they were brought before the house.

This announcement made Mr. McMullen look sad. His face extended about six inches making it nearly a half feet long. Mr. McMullen defended Mr. Fielding for delaying the budget. He shouted to Foster several times before budget day that when the tariff was brought down it would not require to be amended as Foster's did. At the current of Mr. McMullen's being turns to the ministers, and it grieves him deeply when they fall to rise to his expectations. Mr. Casey was also very much given to boasting of the finality of the tariff when it should come. Even the premier himself took the time to observe at the beginning of the session that the tariff would stand as it was brought down. It is not to stand, so Mr. Fielding says, and Mr. Foster looks pleasant and tells Mr. Fielding that he knew it wouldn't all the time. Mr. Foster knew very well that the finance minister would have to see the business men, and if he did not see them enough before he brought down his tariff, he would see them more afterwards. It has been a bad three weeks for Mr. Fielding, and he has another bad week or two before him, but he is acquiring information with great rapidity.

The soap manufacturers have been here and organized a deputation. The members of parliament representing districts interested in this branch of manufacture were called together. Those who responded were Mr. Heyd of Brantford, Robertson of Toronto,

Order of Toronto, Borden of Halifax, Bills of St. John and Genong of Charlottetown. They represented that the duty on soap at one cent a pound amounts to seven and a half cents per box, which sells for \$3.40 to \$3.90, wholesale, making the rate about 20 per cent. With the reduction proposed on European soap the percentage would be reduced to 15, and when the more complete system of extracting glycerine used in England is considered, the duty will be only 13 per cent. They ask for increase to 11-2 cents a pound, but are met with certain objections involved in the French treaty. It seems to be uncertain whether the French treaty reduces the duty on all soap or only on castile, and pending the settlement of that question the matter is in abeyance.

The matters in dispute yesterday in committee led to a general discussion of dismalls. The first and principal case was that of the quarantine officer at Victoria. One Dr. Duncan, admittedly a very capable man, had long been an officer there. The government turned him out abruptly on a remarkable charge. They said that he allowed two persons to pass the isolation hospital where there was small pox, to vote for Tory candidates. In Dr. Duncan's behalf it is stated that the two persons allowed out were one patient and one attendant. The patient was admitted on suspicion of having small pox. It turned out that he had chicken pox. As he had recovered and was thoroughly disinfected as to his clothes, he was allowed to go about his business. He did go and vote for the government candidate. The other man had an order from Dr. Duncan, but he also was disinfected and was permitted to go abroad and vote if he liked. On his own affidavit, he voted for the Laurier candidates in the election, so the two men from the hospital formed a pair and their votes were no good to anybody. Dr. Duncan does not seem to have paid any attention to that part of the matter. The facts seem to be that he was dismissed because another man wanted the place and that he was denied an investigation.

Now the other man, Dr. Watt, is charged with a much more serious offence than his predecessor. Mr. Prior produces evidence to show that he did not attend a patient who was ill with small pox, though the victim came in a vessel on which the signal was hoisted, the doctor allowed him to remain without care, and before any help came to him he had died in his loneliness and neglect. Sir Charles Tupper, Dr. Sproule and other medical men vehemently denounced this conduct, which was as heartless as it was unprofessional. Mr. Prior asked the minister very closely to know whether he had made enquiry into the matter. Mr. Fisher had no information, and was waiting for some one to take the responsibility of a charge. Mr. Prior satisfied him very suddenly on that point by offering to take the doctor's affidavit. Mr. Fisher said that the only information he had was that an order had been procured for a casket for the victim, and Sir Charles, with a kind of grim humor, asked the minister if he did not consider that some evidence of the man's death.

The next specific case was that of the dismissal of a quarantine officer at Halifax. Mr. Borden brought it up in a gentle way by asking for ten thousand dollars of the money that had been paid to the officers who are investigating charges of partisanship. Mr. Russell had explained that he was paired with Mr. Borden, and that was the reason he did not vote against Davin's motion. Dr. McLellan intervened and stated that he was no reader of election writs, but that he really could not obey a summons received at eleven o'clock at night to appear at somebody's office at 8 o'clock the previous morning. The orders of the day were called. Mr. Fielding moved the house into committee, and it seemed likely that a million or two would be voted before sundown. Then an evil spirit entered into Mr. Cameron, who rose with his most truculent air and said "he had a quiet and cultivated member of the opposition party, interposed some observations. He thought that Mr. Fairlie should be defended when he had done right. He put it to the house whether "a temperance crank" was necessarily a vicious man. Mr. Fairlie obeyed his order in keeping out liquor had politely invited the whole party to take luncheon at the school, had offered them good bread, good roast beef, good tea and coffee and such other delicacies as the premises afforded. But the law forbade, and Mr. Fairlie's duties to his wards still more strongly forbade, the presence of liquor in the school. Mr. Fairlie knew that the course of the Indian races was this same fire water, and he could do nothing else as a true and honorable man, and a devoted minister of the gospel, than to keep out champagne and whiskey, even at the risk of offending the great minister and his great supporters. Well, it appeared that Mr. Tarte's party declined to be separated from their liquor, and therefore they moved to another place. Mr. Craig could not believe that Mr. Fairlie intended to depart from the facts in his account of the occurrence, and he could not see, even on the showing of his assailants, that he had done so. There seemed to be no grounds for accusing him of lying. If he had been a liar, Mr. Craig gently remarked, he would have known how to get such a character was disqualified from holding office under the present administration.

Now came another surprise. What ever Mr. Fairlie may have done to offend the convivial tastes of his visitors was the result of his strong temperance principles. If he had gone to any extreme it was because of his hatred to intoxicants, a hatred deepened by observing their effects upon the Indian race. When Mr. Flint of Yarmouth rose it was believed that could not believe that Mr. Fairlie's principles were to offer some extenuation, if not a complete defence. Mr. Flint is supposed to be the temperance leader in the house, and when the men who wanted to introduce champagne and whiskey into the St. Andrew's school assailed the principal as "a temperance crank." Mr. Flint was rather expected to say something in behalf of the temperance crank. But Mr. Flint commenced and ended without a word of sympathy for the unfortunate victim of this attack further than to join Mr. Richardson in approving the exclusion of liquor from the school premises. Mr. Flint declared that Mr. Fairlie was evidently no gentleman. He reminded the house that the use of liquor at meals was common in Ottawa society and other society, and mentioned a circumstance which had not occurred to anyone else, that the party had been driving long in the cold and might therefore find a little liquor the more tempting. He could not forgive the refusal of hot water. If it was intended for tea it ought to have been provided. Even if it had been intended to mix with the whiskey, the ordinary courtesies of life would have induced Mr. Fairlie to furnish it. In short, Mr. Flint had

decent banquet, such as a prominent visitor might expect to receive. It was true that there was whiskey, and it was also true that Mr. Fairlie was "an extreme temperance crank" and would not let them take their liquor into the building. He did not even allow them to take the chairs and tables out to another part of the town, where they had the feast in the public school house. He denied the hot water. Mr. Jamieson said that Mr. Tarte did not drink any liquor, though he himself partook of the flowing bowl. He certified that there was no "jamboree." Nobody got drunk. Mr. Fairlie had another banquet at Winnipeg that night and they were all able to take part in it. Mr. Jamieson is no temperance crank and has no sympathy with that kind of people. He looks like a man who enjoyed high living and plain thinking. But he had very little to say against Mr. Fairlie and did not insist upon the sacrifice of his head. Mr. Jamieson was pleasant but serious, but the house refused to pity the sorrows of wandering ministers.

Then arose Mr. Richardson, who poured out several vials of wrath upon Mr. Fairlie. He said there was the greatest indignation in Winnipeg and all over the Northwest about that letter of Mrs. The letter had been sent to the Tribune, which Mr. Richardson's attacks on his convivial friends had made upon him. He only regretted that Mr. Sifton now seemed disposed to apologise for his own very proper course and seemed almost to sanction an attack on a principal of an Indian school who, as he must know in his heart, had done no more than his duty.

Mr. Tarte testified. He had made no complaint of Mr. Fairlie's behaviour to his party. Mr. Fairlie took him aside and explained to him in a civilly enough why he could not carry out the wishes of Mr. Tarte's friends, and had invited him to inspect the school. For himself he had no fault to find with what he saw, except that one room seemed to be in disorder. It may be said here that Mr. Fairlie explained the condition of this room by saying that he was having it kalsomined. Mr. Tarte, however, is not pleased with the Fairlie letter.

This letter had been so much discussed and condemned when Mr. Davin rose to address the house that the members had been led to suppose something outrageous had been said in it. Mr. Davin cleared up that matter by reading it from end to end, paragraph by paragraph, and the members who complained to state what was in it that was not true. It turned out to be a dignified and proper defence from the false charges that had been made. Mr. Fairlie explained about the request made to him for offered to feed the company, how he had been asked to admit liquor and had given his reasons for refusing, how he had declined to allow the furniture to be carried out, because the department had given him strict orders to that effect, and how he had offered the services of his own staff. He denied utterly the refusal of the hot water. He had not refused it, but, as a matter of fact, the hot water used by the company was supplied from the school. Mr. Fairlie defended himself as a teacher, and declared the building was perfectly clean, that the children under his charge were well cared for and well taught, and invited the closest inspection of the institution. He said that he spent two hours over a company which had fifteen minutes in inspection was not reliable. He remarked in regard to a charge that there was an ill smell in one room, that this room was very small and could not be expected to be fragrant when a score of men who had been sitting over champagne and cigars for two hours were crowded into it. Mr. Davin also read a letter from the rector of the parish, Mr. White, who spoke very highly of Mr. Fairlie's school and pronounced him a model principal in every respect.

Mr. Davin was heard with great attention during the serious part of his speech, and the delicious badinage which followed provoked much laughter. His definition of a jamboree was rather entertaining. It was brought out by a question addressed to him, Mr. Davin said that a jamboree was a kind of performance that might be expected when the most hospitable mayor of the most hospitable city in Canada entertained a minister of the crown with "seventeen gentlemen and others" in a little village at the end of a cold drive. There was nothing offensive in the term any more than in the refrain of the jovial Irish song: Some beef, some bread, some porter in a jar, Oh, that's the way to travel in an Irish jaunting car.

But this was no Irish jaunting car. It was a palace car with the great minister in it, with Mr. Richardson in the party declaring to the multitude how one of the immortal gods had come down from Parliament Hill. Mr. Davin did not see anything offensive in the suggestion that the presence of so many feasters in a small room might impair the atmosphere. No matter how great and glorious the men were, how aristocratic and blue blooded, if they were together long, if they drank champagne and whiskey with or without hot water, if they smoked and exuded, the result would not be conducive to a sweetly perfumed air. There was a good deal of talk from Mr. Flint and others about good manners. It seemed that not a dandel only but a Chesterfield had come to judgment. The protagonist of prohibition had accused Mr. Fairlie of bad manners because he did not admit whiskey in the voluminous manner which the hospitality of the Alps required. But Mr. Fairlie knew the law, he knew his duty, and not all the great barons from Ottawa could drive him from it. No doubt he remembered that great king of England who thanked God he had a judge so just as to condemn a prince. No doubt he thought that even the intelligent and honest man would approve his course. Unfortunately and deluded Fairlie, even the prohibition leader could not appreciate him. But the wolves of the spoil system might run after the devoted and wise man. They might tear him down, and destroy him, but that noble letter of his would

remain to cravling in might pre Mr. Flint, Fairlie and assue minist protector charge, an man.

The next the gospel announcing way that debate in level and more fitting ment. He up in a stru had no sympathy Having t Maxwell stions upon ly intimat onal chara what it o suggestions Mrs. McM from office character of in a rather character of intimation subsequent ardon and whit emp Maxwell's words to s and adm Pacaud h opposition the fraitle ed to cha with all m assual part dead and elevation o of afterw speech an dament by Quinn of strong opi Powell, w read, cer certain st prayer. M ad his r regretted to the re conduct he heroic. A to Mr. Fa of pleasur these men that they and his livr true, taking hands rath abandon tish him if had the p forever rest the men w his proper

During the messals ge Charles F Isaac and mentals ge But say, "is a past one chair, and thought it had to be all the m April day was born Cameron, of Lanark

Ottawa, that Mr. ception to his remar Fairlie ca stants who said. But necessary that led members gun with Cameron, near the Cameron, the public and with said that scandalou into it. The cr have been Cameron son, who was discou extreme. Richardson vehemently also insu Then cam of the in greatest t minister o not as on this offic promise t as the se

Now governm these man been exp see that shown to might be anything man who, w ther to b and his o of liquor that he The first he was to be br Indian se have been in the m also accu hot water takes an charged a slanderou ster of a By wa, we will a which o cipal off will be u plans h also dema was the reference his scho made up the gov whose e visiting This Mr chief ac house be written a