

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, why did the hon. gentleman suggest such action in regard to the province from which he comes? We are here to legislate for the entire Dominion. I am surprised to hear an hon. member, with the learning and ability the hon. gentleman claims to possess, suggest that hon. members should confine themselves to affairs of their own province.

Mr. QUINN. I never suggested it.

Mr. McMULLEN. You will find it so recorded in "Hansard."

Mr. QUINN. What I said was that if the hon. gentleman would leave the members of the bar of the province of Quebec, who understood the matter, to discuss it, he would probably learn something. And I repeat that statement. It is true that I made a mistake. The figures should have been \$182,000 salaries and travelling expenses for the judges of Quebec, and \$247,000 salaries and travelling expense for the judges of Ontario. I adhere to the statement that \$247,100 is asked for by the Estimates this year for travelling expenses and salaries for judges in Ontario, and \$182,000 for salaries and travelling expense for judges in the province of Quebec. I reiterate that statement, and if the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates, he will find I was correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) may possibly find that in the Estimates, but if he looks over the Auditor General's Report he will find that my statement is correct. He first quoted from the Auditor General's Report, but when he got cornered he deserted the Auditor General and went to the Estimates.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), with his usual wriggling policy, tried to put me in the hole in which he is himself. I have shown he is wrong by the Estimates, and now I will prove it by the Auditor General's Report, from which I quoted that there were actually expended last year, \$13,700 for the travelling of ten judges in the province of Ontario, while 32 judges in the province of Quebec only spent \$21,000. I showed from the Auditor General's Report that 32 judges in Quebec, actually spent in travelling, an average of \$667 each per annum, while the ten judges in the province of Ontario spent an average of \$1,300 per annum each.

Resolution agreed to, reported, read the second time and concurred in.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 150) to amend the Act respecting judges of the provincial courts.

SUPPLY—PACIFIC CABLE FROM VANCOUVER TO AUSTRALIA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House do again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASDY. Before that motion is carried, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring a matter before the House which I consider is of sufficient importance to justify our devoting a little time to it, even at this late period of the session. I need not say that what I shall bring up is not a motion of want of confidence in the Government, nor even any attempt to find fault with the Government. It is a matter on which I hope to elicit the opinion of the House to some extent, and possibly the opinion of the Government; a matter which I consider to be of Imperial importance. I refer to the question of the laying of a Pacific cable to connect Vancouver with Australasia. It will be within the memory of all of us that this subject has occupied the consideration of colonial conferences, of colonial Governments, and of this House at different times. Not to go further back than the first intercolonial conference of 1887, held in London, we know that resolutions were passed there favourable to the laying of such a cable. Subsequently, when the then Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) visited Australia, negotiations took place which led to the summoning of the intercolonial conference in Ottawa in the early summer of 1894, where that question was again considered and the laying of the cable approved by resolution.

I shall not detain the House by reading these resolutions in detail, but I may say they were to the effect that the Imperial Government should be asked to consider as to what aid they would give, and that the Canadian Government should be asked to ascertain what such a cable would probably cost. As a result of that conference, in the year following the Government of this country called for tenders, and the lowest tender for the construction of that cable, and its maintenance for three years by the contractors, including all possible risks during the making and laying of the cable, amounted in round numbers to about one and a half million pounds sterling. None of these tenders were accepted as they were invited merely for the purpose of ascertaining about what such a cable would cost. The matter was not concluded after these investigations, but early in 1896, an Imperial committee was called together in London to consider the subject, at which Sir Donald A. Smith, now Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Sir Sandford Fleming were appointed to represent the Canadian Government; there being representatives present from the Imperial Government and from the Australasian colonies. That committee held