

THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1896.

The Boston Journal has taken a glance at the political situation in this country and has made the following interesting observation: "The Canadian liberals are false to their name in taking up an economic policy which has just been overwhelmingly condemned by the enlightened sentiment of the American people. Free trade has been rejected by every important country in the world, with one exception. To embrace this dogma is not liberalism, but Bourbonism."

The News-Advertiser of Vancouver, B. C., in a recent issue contained the following prophecy: "And so—after seventeen years of efforts to formulate a trade policy—the unhappy hosts—with that awful Durham denunciation still ringing in their ears—are marching forward to meet another of those defeats which the voters of the Dominion have periodically inflicted on the great Canadian Know Nothing Party." This is rather an ominous prediction for the Liberal Party, whose leading members, were recently described by an enthusiast as "chirpy, confident, masterful, and aggressive."

The fishery report submitted to Parliament the other day shows that the value of the fisheries in 1894 was \$20,730,000, being a slight increase over the previous year. The Nova Scotia increase was one hundred and forty thousand and that of New Brunswick over six hundred thousand in advance of 1893. There was a large decrease in British Columbia and the Northwest. The largest gain was in herring, cod and pickled and the largest loss in salmon and white fish. The total yield of last year was the largest in the history of the country. The value of the fishing plant is nine and a half millions, or three-quarters of a million in excess of any previous year.

A debate took place in the British House of Commons on Friday last, on the subject of the regulation of sealing in Behring Sea. Thomas Gibbons Bowles, conservative member of parliament from Lynn, Regis, asked whether Canada had consented to the arrangements embodied in the bill. He complained that while America had made restitution for the unlawful seizure of sealers, Russia had not moved in the matter. He moved an amendment against withdrawing of British protection from British subjects and subjecting them in time of peace to search and seizure by foreign naval officers. Sir Edward Grey, parliamentary secretary to the foreign office, replied that the Russian dispute was still under negotiation. Continuing, he said that the government had done everything to meet the Canadian objections consistent with executing the agreement with Russia. He believed that the restrictions imposed by the bill were only fair and reasonable. Mr. Bowles' amendment was rejected by a vote of 87 ayes to 11 nays. The second reading of the bill was postponed.

Advices of the 1st instance, from New Westminster, B. C., say the customs returns for May may be taken as the most important index of the prosperous building up of that young Province that has ever been recorded. In the first place, say the advices, it shows a slight increase—the figure is \$7,349,721—in the amount of collection from dutiable goods brought into this port. But when we look at the exports, a total \$35,340 sent out in the month of May, 1894, and compare them with the amount exported in May 1895, \$293,083 we find an increase of \$257,743. This simply means that our mines have increased their output and export to over a quarter of a million dollars, and it may be said that they have hardly yet got a fair start, and are only just beginning to get a move on. In the items of the next importance the fisheries \$3,293, represents only the amount of fresh fish, nearly all spring salmon. Lumber in round figures \$10,000 makes up the total; all items showing an increase over the exports of May, 1894. With regard to the fish products of this port it is estimated that the provincial consumption of salmon, halibut, sturgeon, etc., is more than double any former year, while the local building purposes in the past month has been well up to the average for the same period in former seasons.

As will be seen by reference to the report of Parliamentary proceedings at Ottawa, Mr. L. H. Davies has lately been distinguishing himself by opposing the vote covering the expenditure incurred by the Government in connection with the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson, as well as the Parliamentary grant to Lady Thompson, the late Premier's widow. The peculiar circumstances surrounding the late lamented Premier's death and the noble and generous manner in which the Imperial Government dealt with the case, made it next to impossible for the Government of

Canada to perform their part, with becoming honor and dignity, without incurring a very large expenditure. In honoring the illustrious dead they were honoring the country, to whose service he had devoted his best years and had consecrated his great intellectual powers. The expense incurred by England in connection with the sad event, possibly reached £50,000 sterling; yet not a voice was raised against it in the Imperial Parliament. But they believed in honoring the Empire's great men. Honor is the incentive of noble minds. In discussing this question in Parliament and in voting on it, it is satisfactory to notice that men on the opposition side of the House supported the Government. Mr. Laurier, Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Edgar, and other prominent members voted with the Government. By this action these men have shown that they are capable, on occasion, of rising above party feeling and placing themselves on record in support of a worthy cause. Not so, however, with our Mr. Davies. He must carry his bitterness and his prejudice to the furthest extreme. The grave of the dead leader has not effect in tempering his party anchor. Conduct of this kind gives strong indications of an ignominious mind. It tends to degrade a man and to pull him down from the pedestal on which reason has placed him, above all other animals. A live ass may kick a dead lion, although during life he would fight shy of the king of the forest.

Hon. J. G. Ward, Treasurer and Postmaster General of New Zealand, was at Ottawa a week or two ago, whether he had come on his return from London, at the special invitation of the Government to confer on the question of the Pacific mail service and the proposed cable, as well as the development of closer trade relations between the Dominion and the antipodean colony. From Ottawa Mr. Ward started across the continent via the C. P. R., to Vancouver, there to take a C. P. R. Steamer for home. In an interview, he made some most interesting statements regarding our sister Colonies beneath the Southern Cross, and his own colony of New Zealand, in particular. He considers the Australian colonies far in excess of the second rate powers of Europe, in commerce, financial resources and wealth of natural products. He says New Zealand, with a population of a little over 700,000, will begin the next financial year with a surplus of \$2,150,000. When the Australian colonies were suffering from financial collapse, New Zealand had \$15,000,000 worth of unpledged securities lying to its credit in London, and was, at the same time, able to help out its leading banking institution in time of danger, with a guarantee of \$10,000,000 in addition to the bank's capital. The annual revenue of the colony is about \$22,000,000 and the expenditure \$21,833,500. The gross debt is \$39,526,000 which is decreasing. The wealth per head of population is \$1,100, exceeded only by Great Britain. The yearly imports are valued at \$33,944,315, and the exports at \$46,196,385, a large increase in fifty years. Mr. Ward gave details of the railway mileage and many other interesting facts about the island colony, such as the system of aid extended to intending settlers, agricultural and pastoral resources and manufacturing interests. Regarding the last named, he said, that in 1893, 29,000 people were employed who received upwards of \$11,000,000 in wages. The materials operated upon were valued at \$17,855,000, while the manufactured goods turned out were worth \$37,200,000. Mr. Ward stated that New Zealand took a deep interest in the project of laying down an all British cable between that colony and Canada, and that he himself was the first person to move in the matter on the occasion of the cable conference at Brisbane a few years ago. Being asked if his colony was interested in the proposed Canadian Pacific mail service, he answered as follows: "Yes we take a keen interest also in that highly important subject, and I am glad to see that both Canada and New Zealand already recognize their mutual interests in the matter. There is no doubt in my mind that the remarkably picturesque scenery and salubrious climate of New Zealand, which offer so many alternatives to the tourist and the seeker after health resorts, added to the fact that the voyage across the Pacific is in comparatively smooth water, need only an efficient mail service to greatly increase the passenger traffic between the Australian colonies, New Zealand and Canada. With the growing disposition on the part of both countries to admit each other's product the favorable terms, a great impetus would be imparted by the carrying out of these proposals to trade and commerce between them. I recognize and fully appreciate the enterprising spirit that your government has shown in their efforts to foster internal trade with the colonies, and in so far as we in New Zealand are able to reciprocate we will gladly do so."

His Lordship and Rev. Dr. Walker left here for Georgetown on the 10th of April. From there they crossed to Pictou on the 11th in the Stanly. Thence they proceeded to Halifax, where they were joined by the Bishops of St. John and Antigonish and all took shipping for Liverpool, on the Parisian, on Saturday April 13th. They reached Liverpool on Monday April 22nd, and London by rail the same evening. Thence they proceeded on their journey without much delay, arriving in Paris on Wednesday the 24th, leaving there the following day and arriving in Rome on Saturday morning the 26th. They departed from the day they sailed from Halifax. They remained in Rome nearly a fortnight taking in the sights and points of interest. On Friday May 3rd, they had an audience with the Holy Father, and on the following Friday, the 10th, they started on the return trip, travelling by short stages and visiting the principal famous shrines and notable places in Italy and France. The first stopping place was Ancona, where they went to Loreto, not far distant from the place where the happy saying Mass in the Holy House. From Ancona they proceeded to Venice, the ancient queen of the Adriatic. After taking in the famous sights of this city on the water, they visited Padua, and paid the respects to the tomb of the illustrious Milani. The next stopping place, the famous Cathedral and the shrines of St. Charles Borromeo, and St. Ambrose were duly visited. Genoa, with its famous cemetery, was next in the order of stopping places.

From Genoa they passed through the Riviera, stopping at Nice and other places. From Marseilles, on their journey from southern France they stopped at the most notable places—Cannes, Lourdes, Bordeaux, etc., before coming to Paris. After a brief stay in Paris, they set out for London, via Dieppe and Southampton. Two or three days were spent in London, when they went to Edinburgh, on Saturday May 25th. Having spent Sunday in Edinburgh, they started for Glasgow, thence across the Trossachs. Here Rev. Dr. Walker parted with his companions, and went on to Oban, and from there went to Uist, the home of his ancestors. It is proper to mention here that Bishop Sweeney, on account of feebleness, did not accompany his fellow travellers to the different places in Italy and France; but came direct to Paris from Rome. He joined them there and intended to go with them to Scotland and Ireland. He did not feel himself equal to the task, however, so he remained in London. And now, Father Walker having started for the Western Isles, only Bishops Cameron and McDonald were left to complete the visitation. On their return to London from Scotland, they started for Ireland. They visited Belfast, Dublin, Cork, Killarney, and several other places. In the meantime Bishop Sweeney had come to Liverpool, and Father Walker had joined him. On the 7th inst. Bishop McDonald and Bishop Cameron boarded the steam tender at Derry and joined their travelling companions, the same day, on board the Parisian, at Moville. After a pleasant passage they reached Rimouski, on Saturday, as above stated.

His Lordship says the first appearance of His Holiness impresses one with the idea of great feebleness; but when he begins to speak he becomes animated, and shows signs of much vigor, notwithstanding his 86 years. All the Island students in Rome are well, and were delighted to see the Bishop and Father Walker. On Sunday next the Bishop will address the congregation in the Cathedral, and impart the Papal Benediction.

The Manitoba Legislators met on Thursday last, after an adjournment of over a month. The purpose of the adjournment was to allow ample time for thorough study and investigation of the School question. Immediately after the House met the Government submitted its decision on this all-important question. It refuses to comply with the decision of the Imperial Privy Council, as requested by the remedial order issued by the Government at Ottawa. In that order the Manitoba Government has thrown away a grand opportunity of manifesting its patriotism and liberal-mindedness. None know better than the members of the Greenway Government that the minority have a grievance and that their rights under the constitution have been infringed upon. That this grievance and injustice are well founded has been shown by the decision of the

highest court in the Empire. Notwithstanding all this, the Greenway Government refuses to right this wrong, to remove the injustice of which themselves are the authors. They prefer, for political advantage, to perpetuate these evils and hardships thereby inflicted on their fellow-countrymen. In their reply to the remedial order of the Dominion Government, the Manitoba authorities evade, as far as possible, the principle involved. Good faith and the observance of contracts is the first principle of good government; but what is that to them in comparison with political advantage? They advise in their reply to the great difficulties they labor under in maintaining an efficient system of primary education. The school laws they say, bear heavily upon their people. In this declaration they unwittingly bear the strongest testimony to the hardships and disadvantages under which the minority labor, inasmuch as they have not only to pay these taxes which bear so heavily on the people in general; but other taxes equally heavy in order to have such schools as their consciences approve, while deriving no benefit from the laws for the public schools. It will thus be seen that the Manitoba Government having refused to remedy the evil complained of, the question comes back to the Dominion Government for action.

A large crowd, including very Rev. Mr. McDonald, V. G., and several other members of the clergy, assembled at the railway station, to welcome His Lordship's party. As the train pulled up the station, the League of the Cross Band sent forth its sweet strains. After a few minutes of hand-shaking and kindly greeting, His Lordship was escorted to his carriage, and proceeded to the Cathedral, preceded by the band, the crowd following. By the time the Cathedral was reached a vast congregation had assembled. His Lordship having vested in cope and mitre and bearing his crozier officiated at solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Immediately before the Benediction a grand Te Deum was sung.

His Lordship and Rev. Dr. Walker left here for Georgetown on the 10th of April. From there they crossed to Pictou on the 11th in the Stanly. Thence they proceeded to Halifax, where they were joined by the Bishops of St. John and Antigonish and all took shipping for Liverpool, on the Parisian, on Saturday April 13th. They reached Liverpool on Monday April 22nd, and London by rail the same evening. Thence they proceeded on their journey without much delay, arriving in Paris on Wednesday the 24th, leaving there the following day and arriving in Rome on Saturday morning the 26th. They departed from the day they sailed from Halifax. They remained in Rome nearly a fortnight taking in the sights and points of interest. On Friday May 3rd, they had an audience with the Holy Father, and on the following Friday, the 10th, they started on the return trip, travelling by short stages and visiting the principal famous shrines and notable places in Italy and France. The first stopping place was Ancona, where they went to Loreto, not far distant from the place where the happy saying Mass in the Holy House. From Ancona they proceeded to Venice, the ancient queen of the Adriatic. After taking in the famous sights of this city on the water, they visited Padua, and paid the respects to the tomb of the illustrious Milani. The next stopping place, the famous Cathedral and the shrines of St. Charles Borromeo, and St. Ambrose were duly visited. Genoa, with its famous cemetery, was next in the order of stopping places.

From Genoa they passed through the Riviera, stopping at Nice and other places. From Marseilles, on their journey from southern France they stopped at the most notable places—Cannes, Lourdes, Bordeaux, etc., before coming to Paris. After a brief stay in Paris, they set out for London, via Dieppe and Southampton. Two or three days were spent in London, when they went to Edinburgh, on Saturday May 25th. Having spent Sunday in Edinburgh, they started for Glasgow, thence across the Trossachs. Here Rev. Dr. Walker parted with his companions, and went on to Oban, and from there went to Uist, the home of his ancestors. It is proper to mention here that Bishop Sweeney, on account of feebleness, did not accompany his fellow travellers to the different places in Italy and France; but came direct to Paris from Rome. He joined them there and intended to go with them to Scotland and Ireland. He did not feel himself equal to the task, however, so he remained in London. And now, Father Walker having started for the Western Isles, only Bishops Cameron and McDonald were left to complete the visitation. On their return to London from Scotland, they started for Ireland. They visited Belfast, Dublin, Cork, Killarney, and several other places. In the meantime Bishop Sweeney had come to Liverpool, and Father Walker had joined him. On the 7th inst. Bishop McDonald and Bishop Cameron boarded the steam tender at Derry and joined their travelling companions, the same day, on board the Parisian, at Moville. After a pleasant passage they reached Rimouski, on Saturday, as above stated.

His Lordship says the first appearance of His Holiness impresses one with the idea of great feebleness; but when he begins to speak he becomes animated, and shows signs of much vigor, notwithstanding his 86 years. All the Island students in Rome are well, and were delighted to see the Bishop and Father Walker. On Sunday next the Bishop will address the congregation in the Cathedral, and impart the Papal Benediction.

The Manitoba Legislators met on Thursday last, after an adjournment of over a month. The purpose of the adjournment was to allow ample time for thorough study and investigation of the School question. Immediately after the House met the Government submitted its decision on this all-important question. It refuses to comply with the decision of the Imperial Privy Council, as requested by the remedial order issued by the Government at Ottawa. In that order the Manitoba Government has thrown away a grand opportunity of manifesting its patriotism and liberal-mindedness. None know better than the members of the Greenway Government that the minority have a grievance and that their rights under the constitution have been infringed upon. That this grievance and injustice are well founded has been shown by the decision of the

highest court in the Empire. Notwithstanding all this, the Greenway Government refuses to right this wrong, to remove the injustice of which themselves are the authors. They prefer, for political advantage, to perpetuate these evils and hardships thereby inflicted on their fellow-countrymen. In their reply to the remedial order of the Dominion Government, the Manitoba authorities evade, as far as possible, the principle involved. Good faith and the observance of contracts is the first principle of good government; but what is that to them in comparison with political advantage? They advise in their reply to the great difficulties they labor under in maintaining an efficient system of primary education. The school laws they say, bear heavily upon their people. In this declaration they unwittingly bear the strongest testimony to the hardships and disadvantages under which the minority labor, inasmuch as they have not only to pay these taxes which bear so heavily on the people in general; but other taxes equally heavy in order to have such schools as their consciences approve, while deriving no benefit from the laws for the public schools. It will thus be seen that the Manitoba Government having refused to remedy the evil complained of, the question comes back to the Dominion Government for action.

highest court in the Empire. Notwithstanding all this, the Greenway Government refuses to right this wrong, to remove the injustice of which themselves are the authors. They prefer, for political advantage, to perpetuate these evils and hardships thereby inflicted on their fellow-countrymen. In their reply to the remedial order of the Dominion Government, the Manitoba authorities evade, as far as possible, the principle involved. Good faith and the observance of contracts is the first principle of good government; but what is that to them in comparison with political advantage? They advise in their reply to the great difficulties they labor under in maintaining an efficient system of primary education. The school laws they say, bear heavily upon their people. In this declaration they unwittingly bear the strongest testimony to the hardships and disadvantages under which the minority labor, inasmuch as they have not only to pay these taxes which bear so heavily on the people in general; but other taxes equally heavy in order to have such schools as their consciences approve, while deriving no benefit from the laws for the public schools. It will thus be seen that the Manitoba Government having refused to remedy the evil complained of, the question comes back to the Dominion Government for action.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Wednesday Mr. Mellock moved the second reading of his bill forbidding members travelling free on Railways to attend sessions at Ottawa. There was no discussion and the bill was voted down, 46 to 100. Supporters and opponents were found on both sides of the house. Mr. McLennan, of Glangary, moved the second reading of his bill for a contract bill. Supporting his measure, Mr. McLennan pointed out that he only intended a reciprocal law to that of the United States, which excluded Canadian contractors or laborers from the privilege of contracting or working on contracts in that country. He proposed that the United States contractors should not have the privilege of taking a Canadian contract since Canadians have no privilege in the United States. He explained very fully the nature of the federal and state anti-alien laws. Hon. Mr. Haggart said he understood and somewhat sympathized with the view of the mover of the bill, but he could not support all the provisions of the measure, which went further than the former intention. The bill would prevent giving small contracts by the federal, provincial or municipal government to persons in foreign countries, some of which foreign states had treated us generously. Mr. Haggart could not support the bill, but intimated that the time might come when legislation would be required to meet the legislation of other countries. Mr. Casey said the bill was evidently to create a contractors' combine. Mr. McLean of Toronto supported the principle of the measure, but could not support some of the details. Mr. Tisdale affirmed the principle that the federal government in giving contracts should always prefer Canadian contractors and workmen. He thought the thanks of the country were due to Mr. McLennan. Mr. McAllister pointed out that the measure as drafted would exclude from contracts the class of people who, though not citizens of Canada, are residents of the Dominion, and property owners in this country. This would be a hardship. The discussion was continued by Messrs. McDonald, Algoma, Gibson, Lincoln, Dr. Sprague and others. Mr. Taylor of Leeds complained that the United States people were getting fine contracts here all the time, while in the condition of labor and contractors was unfair. He proposed that the bill be amended so that it would be brought into operation by proclamation of the governor general and made applicable only against subjects of those countries which excluded Canadians from the benefit of labor and contracts. Mr. Gillies of Nova Scotia opposed the measure as too sweeping. After recess Mr. M. Lennan's alien contract bill was stood over on motion of Hon. Mr. Costigan adjoining the debate. The house then took up Mr. Edgar's bill, imposing a penalty on any officer or contractor of a railway company having government subsidies who sell or promise money for the promotion of the election of a member of parliament or the legislature. The bill was discussed by the Ontario and Quebec members. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper moved the adjournment of the debate in order that he and his colleagues might consult as to the action they should take on the bill. Mr. Edgar consented to the adjournment and the measure stands over.

Answering questions on Thursday, Hon. Mr. Oimet stated there had been three public funerals since confederation, that of Sir George Cartier cost ten thousand dollars; Sir John McDonald's six thousand nine hundred and thirty-eight; Sir John Thompson's in the neighborhood of the amount voted, there was an appropriation of two hundred and ninety-five dollars for the funeral of D'Arcy McGehe, who did not have a public funeral. To Mr. McCarthy's question, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that nothing which could properly be called negotiations had taken place between the Government and Lord Aberdeen concerning the Manitoba Schools. There had been some communication between the Governor-General and the Manitoba Ministers. The Governor-General was not in this matter acting with the advice of his ministers. From these communications there had been no results that could be communicated to parliament. Hon. Mr. Costigan explained that an extension of twenty days lobster fishing had been allowed to certain districts in P. E. Island. Hon. Mr. Costigan moved the second reading of the fisheries act, which provides that the seaward provisions of the fisheries laws may for two years be suspended by the Government. Mr. Davies objected to the measure as giving too much power to the department. In reply it was explained that until last year the Government always had power to exempt. Last year's legislation absolutely prohibited seaward, but the lumbermen all over Canada had complained that such emergency and hasty legislation would, if enforced, be disastrous. A long discussion followed on the effect of seaward on navigation and fisheries on various streams. Mr. Kaubach pointed out that a strict enforcement of the present law was very injurious to mill owners in his county. After recess the House went into committee of supply, Mr. Laurier announcing that he would not bring the Carran bridge matter up that day. On the vote for the prohibition commission Hon. Mr. Foster, replying to Sir Richard Cartwright, explained that the commission had received the following amounts: Sir Joseph Hickson, chairman, \$3,220; E. J. Clarke, 2,468; Mr. Gignac, \$3,374; Rev. Dr. McLeod, \$5,915; Judge McLeod, \$3,041; Secretary Patrick Monaghan, \$10,068.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Tuesday of last week, in the House of Commons the minister of finance had to defend himself and the government against the charge of too great economy. A petition was lately presented to parliament by the auditor general protesting against the action of the government in refusing to provide means to promote two of the auditor's clerks to a higher class and for declining to increase the audit office contingent account. It was supported by Mr. Mills, who brought the matter up, and by Sir Richard Cartwright. The auditor general covers a good deal of ground. The auditor, who was supported by the opposition leaders, complains that the minister has a spite against the audit department and discriminates against it because the auditor closely questions the items of expenditure. In reply, Hon. Mr. Foster stated that if he refused to provide for the promotion of the two clerks in the audit department he did the same in the penitentiary, militia, public works and geological survey, and various other services. So he must have a spite against all his colleagues. There were three departments where the number of clerks had been reduced, and in the whole service there was no increase of first class clerks. There was no discrimination. Another complaint was that the contingency allowance to the auditor was small. To this Mr. Foster said that the auditor had a larger allowance than Mr. Foster took for himself in the finance department. Mr. Mills protested because the auditor's twenty-four clerks had a smaller average salary than the officials in the finance department or justice or geological survey. To this Mr. Foster replied that the geological survey staff were largely composed of accomplished geologists and other scientific men not to be compared with men in the finance department. The finance minister pointed out further that while his own department had a larger number of clerks and cost more than it did fifteen years ago, the auditor's general staff had increased in number and cost by sixty-eight per cent. As to department interference with the auditor, which Mr. Mills complained, Mr. Foster said that the late Sir John Thompson and himself had introduced legislation to give the auditor power to bring the house back on a staff, a privilege the house had taken away. But it was necessary that the government should deal with the cost of this as all other departments. Messrs Mills and Cartwright intimated that Mr. Foster had not replied to the auditor's request for increased allowance. To this Mr. Foster said that he had intended to bring the matter before the council, but in the meantime the auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it. The auditor who claims to be an officer of parliament and not of the government, had written him again saying that if his case was not attended to by the finance minister at once he would bring it before the house. This letter said Mr. Foster, was put away, and he took no further notice of it.

On Wednesday Mr. Mellock moved the second reading of his bill forbidding members travelling free on Railways to attend sessions at Ottawa. There was no discussion and the bill was voted down, 46 to 100. Supporters and opponents were found on both sides of the house. Mr. McLennan, of Glangary, moved the second reading of his bill for a contract bill. Supporting his measure, Mr. McLennan pointed out that he only intended a reciprocal law to that of the United States, which excluded Canadian contractors or laborers from the privilege of contracting or working on contracts in that country. He proposed that the United States contractors should not have the privilege of taking a Canadian contract since Canadians have no privilege in the United States.