

confidence in the Committee. However, a certain series of questions was published and printed for circulation. On examination I considered the questions quite out of place for any ordinary farmers to answer intelligently. The result was, that about twenty lists of questions were given to each member of the House, and I am satisfied that nine-tenths of those given to members of the Opposition were not circulated in their respective counties. The Committee was a purely partisan Committee, and the Conservative members of the House circulated the questions only among their friends, and the questions were of such a nature, respecting Tariff matters, altogether irrelevant to the farming community that very few farmers could answer them. I have received a few copies of the work, but I have not opened it until a few minutes ago, simply because I have some knowledge of what the work is like, having been a member of the Committee. I attended every meeting of the Committee. I notice an answer given to the first question by a gentleman in Waterloo; he replies to a question in reference to the Tariff: "I know nothing about it, ask Moses Stringer." Many of the questions are answered in the same manner. It was never intended that the evidence should be published, and I disapprove very much of the action of the Printing Committee. It was a Joint Committee, composed of members of this House and the Senate, and the latter disapproved of this printing. It could not pass the Printing Committee until a very large portion of the members had left for their homes, when a few members of the Committee met in the Tower Room—I think the day before the close of the Session—and passed the motion. Not one member of the Senate and but half the members from this House were in the Committee Room at the time. I was astonished when I saw the work of nearly 800 pages, which is, in my estimation, of very little consequence, and the distribution has been very lavish. Some members tell me they have fifty copies lying at their homes now, not distributed, having come to the conclusion that the work was not worth distribution.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will remember that Mr. Wark and Mr. McLellan, and one or two others of the Senate, were there.

Mr. TROW. Yes; two or three were there and protested against it, and left the room.

Mr. BOWELL. The motion was put, and as they objected to it, they got up and walked out when it was put.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. What number of these reports was sent to each hon. member?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is in the records of the House. It was ordered by the House, and is not a Government matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. The manner in which this was distributed was very irregular. I never got any at all. Perhaps the entire supply for the county of Wellington was sent to the promoter of the Committee, Dr. Orton. I got none of them, and therefore cannot say anything about the value of the production.

Mr. LISTER. I believe I received thirty or forty, and they are lying at the office. The boy uses them occasionally to light fires. In turning up the report and looking at page 84, I see that Mr. E. P. Watson, Reeve of Sarnia, winds up his answers by saying:

"All politicians here know the above to be correct, but would not, of course, for party sake, admit publicly the facts, or they would be denounced and run out of their party, and many would be ruined in their business."

Another gentleman, Mr. James H. Bowes says:

"I have answered the doctor's questions; will he be kind enough to answer mine? How is it that the Finance Minister has asked \$28,000,000 for the Civil Service of the Government, when he said in the Rink in

St. John, in my hearing, that \$22,500,000 was more than sufficient for all purposes?"

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There ought to be some limit to the expenditure incurred for such purposes. It is not denied that \$10,000 of the public money has been spent for this. That is really an enormous sum to pay for the distribution of a report of that kind, and the thing should not occur again. I am not going to go into the merits of the concern, which I have not read, any more than the First Minister, but I do say that \$10,000 is too much for such a purpose. In all these cases, the Committee, if it chooses, could make a short digest of the evidence and publish that, but should not publish a huge volume of this kind.

Mr. GUILLET. It is within the knowledge of the House that the evidence was ordered to be published last Session, by a motion of this House. The report the hon. member for South Perth speaks of, the publication of the report by the Printing Committee, in the Session of 1882, was brought before the Printing Committee and the usual number of copies were moved for by friends of his own, but a larger number were ordered to be published afterwards. The motion was made, in amendment, that 5,000 copies of the report in French be published, and that was voted down, a majority of his friends of the Committee being present. Afterwards, when a fairer representation of the Committee was present, the motion was brought up again and reconsidered, and 5,000 in English and 5,000 in French were ordered to be printed. That was the report. Last Session on the motion of an hon. member, it was ordered that 5,000 copies in English and 5,000 in French of the evidence should be published, and this is the report the House is now considering. It was done by order of the House on the motion of an hon. member, and not by the Printing Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. But that could not be, under the rules of the House, except after reference to the Printing Committee and a report from them on it, and I understand the Printing Committee declined to do more than order the printing of the report itself.

An hon. MEMBER. It was a recommendation.

Mr. BLAKE. A suggestion or recommendation is all the worse, because, by the rule, any motion to print is referred to the Printing Committee. That is a Joint Committee of both Houses, and it is that tribunal which we have fixed by our rules as the proper tribunal to decide what documents shall be printed; so that I do not understand how this evidence, upon the statement of the hon. member, can have been regularly printed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As I understand, there was a reference to the Printing Committee from the House, under the rules of the House, of a motion for the printing of this evidence last Session, because the report had been printed the previous Session. When the matter came before the Committee, I do not remember whether the meeting was large or small, but I do remember that the motion was carried by the Committee; that a larger number than the usual distribution was determined upon; that the ordinary report on the subject was brought into the House, and that it was adopted by the House on the report of the Printing Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. And adopted in the Senate?

Mr. WHITE. I presume it was adopted in the Senate, but I do not know. The Senate is not the body which provides the money; this is the House which does that.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The hon. member for Cardwell is kind enough to instruct me as to whom I should ask in regard to this matter, but I would repeat my question through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Secretary of State, and would ask